

Evaluation of Development Effectiveness and
Accountability (DEAP)

FINAL REPORT

Stephen Chipika – International Consultant¹

Peter Mwanza – National Consultant

PREPARED FOR

THE UNITED NATIONS

30 June, 2017

¹ Refer to consultant biodata details in annex.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| ACRONYMS | iv |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | vi |
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation..... | 1 |
| 1.1.2 Scope of the Evaluation..... | 1 |
| 1.1.3 Specific Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation | 2 |
| 1.2.1 Design and Relevance..... | 2 |
| 1.2.2 Implementation | 3 |
| 1.2.3 Efficiency | 3 |
| 1.2.4 Effectiveness | 3 |
| 1.2. Sustainability..... | 4 |
| 2. Methodology | 4 |
| 2.1 Theory of change | 4 |
| 2.2 Data sources | 4 |
| 2.3 Data collection and analysis..... | 5 |
| 2.4 Performance and ethical standards | 5 |
| 3. Malawian Context and Programme Background..... | 5 |
| 3.1 Weaknesses of the Programme in addressing critical issues | 6 |
| 3.2 Gender Mainstreaming | 8 |
| 3.3 Sustainability of Results | 8 |
| 3.4 Theory of Change Overview | 9 |
| 4. Evaluation Findings..... | 12 |
| 4.1 Assessment by Evaluation Criteria..... | 12 |
| 4.2 Relevance | 13 |
| 4.3 Implementation | 17 |
| 4.3.1 Results-Based Management..... | 18 |
| 4.3.2 Strengthening M&E System at all Levels..... | 20 |
| 4.3.4 National Statistical System Strategic Plan and Use of Statistics | 20 |
| 4.3.5 MGDS II annual - mid-term and end of term review processes supported..... | 21 |
| 4.3.6 Performance Enforcement Department Strengthened for Results Assessment..... | 22 |
| 4.3.7 Support to Programme Based Budgeting | 23 |
| 4.3.8 Strengthening of the Sector Working Group Process..... | 25 |
| 4.3.9 Support to Effective Development Cooperation | 26 |
| 4.4 Efficiency | 27 |
| 4.4.1 Assessment of Efficiency for Different Components | 29 |
| 4.5 Effectiveness | 31 |
| 4.5.1 RBM capacity and practice enhanced in public sector..... | 31 |
| 4.6 Sustainability | 36 |
| 4.6.2 Strengthening M&E system, National Statistical System and other components.... | 37 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 4.6.3 | Support to Programme Based Budgeting | 37 |
| 4.6.4 | Strengthening of the SWG process..... | 38 |
| 5. | Gaps and Challenges | 40 |
| 5.1 | Coordination | 40 |
| 5.2 | Implementation of workplans | 40 |
| 5.3 | Staff turnover and availability of human resources | 41 |
| 5.4 | Delays in implementing activities due to procurement challenges | 41 |
| 5.5 | Changes to policy on off-duty allowances | 41 |
| 5.6 | Lack of trust for mutual accountability | 42 |
| 6. | Good Practices And Lessons Learnt | 42 |
| 7. | Conclusions and Recommendations | 44 |
| 7.1 | Main Conclusions and Recommendations..... | 44 |
| 7.2 | Synthesis of Key Actions from the Evaluation of the DEAP | 50 |
| | Biodata of Consultants – Stephen Chipika | 55 |
| | ANNEXES | 56 |
| | Draft Terms of Reference | 56 |
| | List of Stakeholders and Persons Contacted | 65 |

ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|--|
| AMP | Aid Management Platform |
| CABS | Common Approach to Budget Support |
| CO | Country Office |
| CSOs | Civil Society Organisations |
| DAD | Debt and Aid Division |
| DCS | Development Cooperation Strategy |
| DEAP | Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme |
| DMEC | District Monitoring and Evaluation Committee |
| DPs | Development Partners |
| DSA | Daily Subsistence Allowance |
| EP&D | Economic Planning and Development |
| ET | Evaluation Team |
| EU | European Union |
| GoM | Government of Malawi |
| HLF | High Level Forum |
| HQ | Headquarters |
| HRBA | Human Rights Based Approach |
| HRBA | Human Rights Based Approaches |
| IFMIS | Integrated Financial Management Information System |
| JP | Joint Programme |
| M & E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MASEDA | Malawi Social and Economic Data |
| MDA | Ministry Department Agency |
| MDGs | Millennium Development Goals |
| MGDS | Malawi Growth and Development Strategy |
| MIM | Malawi Institute of Management |
| MIS | Management Information System |
| MOFEPD | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development |
| MTEF | Medium Term Expenditure Framework |
| NDS | National Development Strategy |
| NPC | National Planning Commission |
| NSO | National Statistical Office |
| OPC | Office of the President and Cabinet |
| PBB | Programme Based Budgeting |
| PED | Performance Enforcement Department |
| PETS | Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys |
| PFM | Public Finance Management |
| PMCC | Programme Management and Coordination Committee |
| PPP | Public Private Partnership |
| PS | Principal Secretary |
| PSC | Programme Steering Committee |
| PSIP | Public Sector Investment Programme |

| | |
|--------|--|
| RBM | Result-Based Management |
| SMART | Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound |
| SPSS | Statistical Package for Social Scientist |
| ST | Secretary to the Treasury |
| SWG | Sector Working Group |
| TA | Technical Assistance |
| TC | Technical Committee |
| TOC | Theory of Change |
| TORs | Terms of References |
| TWG | Technical Working Groups |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNFPA | United Nations Fund for Population Activities |
| UNICEF | United Nations I Children Education Fund |
| UNVs | United Nations Volunteers |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Background

The Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme (DEAP) seeks to entrench a culture of accountability for the effective use of resources and achievement of results in public institutions. Key strategic areas of support include: 1) institutionalizing Results-Based Management practices in the public sector; 2) harmonization and alignment of development planning and budgeting tools including the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) and the national budget to support implementation of MGDS priorities; and 3) strengthening capacity for development assistance management.

DEAP is a four year programme (2013-2016) with financial contributions from the EU, UNICEF, UNFPA and UNDP, while other UN agencies such as UN Women also contribute to some activities. UNDP and the EU have signed a contribution agreement and combine their resources while UNICEF and UNFPA provide parallel financing. The EU/UNDP contribution agreement initially covered the period 2014-2016 but has since been extended to November, 2017.

The Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development (MOFEPD) is the Implementing Partner (IP) for the Joint Programme and is responsible for the overall planning and management of the programme and achievement of its objectives. The Debt and Aid Division of MOFEPD, the Economic Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation Divisions of the Economic Planning and Development Department of MOFEPD, and the Department of Performance Enforcement in the Office of the President and Cabinet are Responsible Parties for the activities of the JP. The MOFEPD's Budget Division and the National Statistics Office are responsible for implementation of individual activities supported by the programme.

The purpose of the end of term evaluation is to:

- (a) Determine the extent to which the outcome and outputs of the programme have been achieved;
- (b) Assess UNDP and other participating UN agencies contributions to the achievement of the outcome;
- (c) Document the achievements and lessons learnt during the course of implementation to inform future decisions in design, implementation and management of similar interventions.

B. Major Findings

B1 *Relevance*

Finding 1: DEAP is highly relevant in most aspects, and moderately so in some of the sub-components. However, DEAP priorities and results-matrix were not properly revised to reflect the available resource envelope, resulting in the programme being somewhat unrealistic.

B2 *Implementation*

Finding 2: The implementation of DEAP points to positive accomplishments overall, with satisfactory progress accomplished in a number of components. Components where substantial progress has been achieved include the following:-

- i. Programme Based Budgeting (PBB) has since extended to all MDAs, following a successful pilot phase; the mainstreaming phase shows substantial promise; however, further capacity building still remains;
- ii. **Performance Contracting** (all MDAs are now submitting performance contracts and service charters). The Performance Evaluation Report for 2015/2016 was endorsed by the President;
- iii. Formulation of the new **National Development Strategy**, with the establishment of the National Planning Commission, and formulation of the new MGDS (now nearly finalized);
- iv. The **Development Cooperation Atlas** was produced which is enhancing coordination and division of labour among cooperating partners in the development process;
- v. The Aid Management Platform was established which is improving transparency and data quality on development cooperating partners interventions;
- vi. The **Integrated Performance Management Information System (IPMIS)** has been designed and installed following comprehensive user consultations and review. IPMIS links data on performance of institutions coming from various sectors through an integrated website.

Finding 3: Organizational and technical challenges continue to be experienced in the implementation of certain components of the programme (for example, the RBM and M & E), attributable to a number of constraints. The successful implementation of RBM, for example, requires substantial mind-set change among public practitioners and commitment to changing ways of doing business at the highest policy making and implementation level – beyond statements of intent.

B3 Efficiency

Finding 4: Largely because of continued inadequate commitment at the highest levels, the development of M & E capacities to ensure adequate performance tracking at both central and decentralized levels remain a challenge, despite efforts to turnaround the situation.

Finding 5: Progress in the implementation of initiatives under the PED has seen positive but insufficient progress, with valuable organizational structures and PED monitoring and supervisory tools developed and implemented with satisfactory accomplishments. However, a higher level of progress and more accelerated achievement of results is constrained by low resource allocation to prioritized performance enforcement measures and inadequate linkages with other key components, namely, IFMIS, M & E capacity development, PBB, which is central for a truly integrated approach.

B4 Effectiveness

Finding 6: Moves to revamp Sector Working Groups (SWGs) has seen some progress being made, with structures in place, clear guidelines developed, and several of the SWGs reportedly revitalized. However, more substantial progress in the medium to long term depends on enforcing compliance and the effectiveness of a results based M & E for the SWG process which is yet to be established.

Finding 7: The strengthening of the Debt and Aid Division (DAD) through capacity development and training has been largely effective in the management of development cooperation, enabling the Division to undertake outreach initiatives that would not have been possible without the support of the DEAP and the participating development partners.

B5 *Sustainability*

Finding 8: Government commitment to implementation of PBB is high and irreversible, with substantial momentum generated. However, progress in the long-term depends on capacity within the public sector to sustain the support to PBB through well focused effort at capacity development at central government level and in the district councils.

Finding 9: Overall, the sustainability of DEAP depends to a large extent on the Government of Malawi (GoM) taking more bold action and in taking ownership of the development agenda, prioritizing the development interventions in a manner that corresponds to the available resource envelope, as well as increasing commitment by Government to finance key development programmes in the medium and long term. There is also need for the GoM to continue to engage development partners in the planning, resource mobilization, implementation and monitoring of key development programmes, at the very least, in the medium term. However, it should be noted that DEAP by its nature should be a long term intervention (beyond four years) to achieve real and lasting change, with the support of cooperating partners still highly valued.

C. *Good Practices and Lessons Learnt*

C.1 *Need to design programmes with a long term perspective*

Notwithstanding the challenges of securing long term financing for programmes, a major lesson from DEAP is the need to design interventions, taking into account the likelihood of follow-up programmes, which consider the long term perspective. The assumptions related to the time and processes required to achieve DEAP outcomes and outputs needed to be tested against reality at practical level. For the programme period, the targets were largely unrealistic for full achievement during the implementation period.

C.2 *Commitment by Government to Public Sector Reforms including Public Financial Management*

DEAP has strong linkages to public sector reforms. Synergies between the Public Sector Reform (PSR) and the Public Finance Management (PFM) programmes to which DEAP contributes, are indeed central for achievement of the outcomes. There has been inadequate articulation at both the design and implementation level, how the DEAP interfaces with the PSR, as a major component of the national public sector reform agenda. Government

commitment to PSR has been documented in recent years, with declarations at the highest level re-affirming support by the GoM. At the practical level, however, things are somewhat different. The Evaluation has concluded that there is need for public policy proclamations to be matched by tangible actions designed to accelerate the implementation of PSRs. This is in view of the slow pace of implementation of the PSR and the PFM, an area of concern of many stakeholders, from DPs, CSOs and within private sector circles.

C3. Leadership, coordination and institutional management arrangements

In view of the lessons learnt by the successes of Treasury in managing its component of DEAP compared to challenges faced by EP&D, there is need to adopt good practice in leadership, coordination and institutional management of the programme, which is sustainable, based on specific conditions and situations within the public sector. Variations in institutional and human resources capacities also need to be considered in determining implementation modalities, together with any other 'dynamics' that may not be evident or lend themselves to public scrutiny.

C4. Strategy to mainstream DEAP activities in the public sector

Within the key Government Divisions, the focus on mentorship and nurturing staff to achieve high level of competencies in key result areas, and broadening of understanding of the DEAP methodology beyond the focal points is pivotal to sustainability in the medium to long term, in view of the high mobility of staff in the public sector. There is need therefore, to ensure that the future DEAP intervention methodology has a stronger focus on capacity development for the Government personnel involved, especially those in strategic departments and units, targeting to fill skills gaps, where they exist. There is also need to ensure more strategic targeting and planning of training and capacity building workshops with a view to delivering, fully, on the objectives for which they are convened.

C5. Development Cooperation Strategy (DCS)

DEAP ought to build on the positive lessons learnt with engagement relating to the DCS and the establishment of the High Level Forum (HLF), which has support structures that have largely been effective in delivering on the development agenda. On this front, the partnership strategy employed is credited for the substantial progress realised in the implementation of the Development Cooperation Strategy and in engaging and sustaining dialogue through the HLF. A critical element that needs to be recognised here is the commitment of officials from both Government and DPs to make collaboration in implementing the DCS to work.

C6. Results based Management, Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance Enforcement

Commitment to RBM, Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance Enforcement by taking practical measures at implementation level is required at the highest level, with accountability linked to existing structures, which include the Executive and Parliament. Government ministries and departments need to first appreciate, especially the role RBM and M&E so that they commit the right personnel and adequate resources, on a sustainable basis, to these functions at the headquarters as well as at decentralized levels.

D. Synthesis of Recommendations

Recommendation 1

To strengthen delivery of results from DEAP, and improve focus on M & E, RBM and performance enforcement, the specific actions recommended are:-

- i. Establish common ground between Government and DPs in developing MGDS III, including the implementation and results framework;
- ii. Government establish a robust system of monitoring linked to rewards for performance and sanctions for non-performance or under-delivery;
- iii. Government in collaboration with the UN, DPs contribute increased financial resources to mainstream PE, monitoring and capacity building, ensure sustainability; improve collaboration, especially between government and DPs, to develop a more functional, decentralized M & E system, RBM and performance enforcement and improved accountability structures.
- iv. OPC, in collaboration with Treasury ensure and guarantee buy-in from senior leadership in government; DEAP engage fully the Legislature, Executive/OPC and Treasury for sustainability and achievement of impacts;
- v. GoM fully integrate or link M & E reporting structures, between OPC, PED, EP & D, RBM, IFMIS, MIS, Budget and Treasury, taking into account the MGDS III and the SDGs.

Recommendation 2

Enhancing the Functionality of SWGs

The specific actions are:-

- i. Senior government management give practical guidance to enhance functionality, including decisive direction and leadership in implementation of SWGs;
- ii. Effective and sustained financial resource mobilization to ensure effectiveness; improved capacity development in priority areas and or sectors;
- iii. Ensure establishment of effective coordination structures of SWGs; tying functionality of the SWG to performance assessment of the public institutions;
- iv. Government, in collaboration with UNDP, DPs ensure full commitment and participation of the private sector and CSOs, especially in TWGs SWGs;
- v. Government link SWGs with predictable financial resources and logistical support for private sector and CSO participation, support strategies to ensure improved financing of key CSO programmes. especially those in areas of potential high impacts.

Recommendation 3

Strengthening Institutionalization of PBB

The specific actions are:

- i. Treasury engage the MDAs more and for longer period to develop capacity in PBB application.

- ii. Government commitment to sustained capacity development in PBB by senior managers to strengthen the momentum for PB; linking PBB to PED, M & E and IFMIS and sectoral strategic plans.
- iii. Treasury ought to link budgeting and resource allocation to strategic direction of the MDAs and to clearly defined performance indicators for prioritized sectors and components.

Recommendation 4

Proposal on no-cost extension and re-prioritization of expenditures

- i. To satisfactorily complete the prioritized DEAP development agenda, the Evaluation recommends **re-prioritization or re-programming of planned expenditures, taking into account the priorities set in the MGDS III and the SDGs**. This is in view of the under-resource mobilization of 30 percent of targeted resources for DEAP implementation.
- ii. The Evaluation recommends a further *no-cost-extension of the DEAP*, with a proposal for the UNDP, other UN agencies, the EU, GoM recommitting themselves to fast-track implementation of priority outstanding activities as per revised workplans;

Recommendation 5

The Evaluation recommends a New Programme Phase (Phase 2)

- i. Programmes such as DEAP require sustained and long-term engagement to change tools, procedures, and mindsets. In addition, considering the strategic importance of DEAP in fostering effective management and monitoring of MGDS III implementation, sound programming for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and quality technical support for the National Planning Commission to assume its role effectively, the evaluation recommends a new programme phase. DEAP will be key for Malawi's arrangements to improve accountability for use of development resources and achievement of results.
- ii. A new phase of DEAP could also be a vehicle for implementing public sector reforms which seek to strengthen the operating environment for enhancing development effectiveness.
- iii. Given the strategic importance of DEAP, the evaluation recommends a new programme phase, focusing on priorities of priorities, as guided by the MGDS III and the SDGs. The UN is still well positioned to continue leading the DEAP process in view of its coordination role, institutional capacity development and responsibility vis a vis other DPs.

Recommendation 6

Prioritizing financial and technical support for implementation of the SDGs

Work related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy III and the National Planning Commission adds to a list of key interventions which require to be prioritized and provided with technical and financial

assistance by cooperating partners. Considerations of Malawi's development effectiveness and accountability agenda need to take into account the efficacy through which the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and MGDS III outcomes will be achieved. The country will need both technical and financial support to facilitate efficient and effective management and monitoring of the SDGs and the MGDS III results. In this regard, it will be necessary for the Government of Malawi and development partners to come up with a technical and financial assistance vehicle similar to DEAP.

Recommendation 7

Development and Implementation of Exit Strategy

UN, EU and Treasury: Consideration of lessons learnt in terms of resources mobilization must be done within the context of a country where the terrain of development programme funding has changed dramatically recently, due to Cashgate, corruption, DP consideration of the country as high risk, political consideration including level of decisiveness at high level to tackle critical development concerns, including corruption, sustaining of Public Sector Reforms, including IFMIS, PE and M & E.

Recommendation 8

Gender Equality and Human Rights Approaches

Overall, there has been limited progress in the realization of gender outcomes in Malawi. There is inadequate capacity for gender mainstreaming and gender analysis with no evidence of substantive engagement on gender equality. Within the national programming context, there is recognition that achieving progress on gender equality and women's empowerment requires networking and collaboration between different stakeholders. The Evaluation concludes that there is still no substantial partnership strategy for advancing gender equality in the country. The specific actions recommended are:-

- i. In view of the challenges that continue to be experienced with respect to gender, the UN/DEAP approach must improve the design, planning process, resource allocation, implementation, with stronger measures for monitoring and disaggregation of benefits and show differences between groups of women, men youth, and other marginalised groups; and,
- ii. In the new programme phase, the GoM and DPs also need to make renewed commitment to partnerships to deliver in key result areas, including on gender equality and human rights.

Recommendation 9

Toward a Stronger Coordination for DEAP and Development Partners

In view of the coordination challenges of DEAP cited in this Evaluation, with three components², UNDP as a lead agency and coordinator for the programme should at each point of reporting check with other UN organizations on their reporting requirements. The other UN organisations should also be pro-active in sharing any information on the implementation of DEAP. *Delivering As One* has an advantage of streamlining processes and also releasing

² The three components can remain under one management structure, with improved communication and linkages, under a reviewed monitoring, evaluation and reporting system.

pressure on the government counterparts on the requirements to produce multiple reports using multiple reporting mechanisms. Considering that there is no stability of personnel in the public service and also the general inadequacy of staff especially at district council level, the Evaluation recommends that for the initial period of say three years, professional UNVs should be deployed to the district councils and line ministries that require human resources support. The UNVs could assist in institutionalization of the RBM in organizations and in line ministries. It is emphasized that the persons involved should be professional UNVs that would support and develop capacity of the organisations to incorporate the RBM principles and practices and develop the architecture for the RBM in organizational planning and implementation of an appropriate M&E system. The UNVs would assist in developing M&E frameworks of the district councils and ministries that are struggling to do so. A good example of where this is working is the Ministry of Gender and Children Affairs where UNICEF placed UNVs to support the development of Child Protection Information Management System and its roll out to the districts.

Furthermore, in view of the frustrations generated on the side of the implementation partners with the procurement process, UNDP also ought to review and adopt measures to, improve communication and dialogue with IP management and focal persons, to ensure that any challenges of constraints linked to procurement requests and disbursement of funds are tackled without delays. This would also build improved trust and confidence of the UN processes with implementing partners and stakeholders.

1. Introduction

Whilst the joint programme started in 2013, the European Union (EU) support to implementing the Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme (DEAP) started in January, 2014. The Joint Programme on Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability is centred on entrenching the culture of accountability for effective use of public resources and achievement of results in public institutions. The programme responded to UNDAF 2012 – 2016 and MGDS 2011 – 2016 that identified improved development effectiveness and improved good governance respectively as areas that needed interventions over the programming periods. The programme focused on enhance development effectiveness through improving systems, tools and mechanisms for national policy formulation, development planning and management, monitoring and evaluation, reporting and accountability for results. The DEAP supports; i) entrenchment of utilization of Results-Based Management in planning, monitoring and evaluation of public development initiatives ii) capacity for aligning policies, programmes and budgets to national strategies for effective allocation of resources, and iii) capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance.

The programme was supposed to end in 2016 but was extended for eleven (11) months to give time for some prioritized activities to be implemented before the closure of the DEAP.

1.1 The Purpose, Scope and Objectives of the Evaluation

1.1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of evaluating the Joint Programme on Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability (DEAP) is to assess the extent to which the programme has achieved the objectives and results for which it was formulated. The evaluation will also assist to identify and isolate lessons and learning points from the implementation of the programme that will be used for reshaping the programme (during its remaining period) and also for programming other similar programmes in future.

This evaluation is both a summative evaluation as well as a formative evaluation considering that the DEAP has been extended by one more year.

1.1.2 Scope of the Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation centres on assessing the extent to which the programme has made progress in the delivery of expected outputs and results in the prioritized strategic areas. The evaluation focuses on the key strategic areas of support, which are stated in the terms of reference (ToR) as follows:

- i. Institutionalizing results based management practices in the public sector;
- ii. Harmonizing and aligning development planning and budgeting tools including the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) and the national budget to support implementation of Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II priorities; and

- iii. Strengthening capacity for development assistance management with a view to contributing to improvements in management, allocation and utilization of public resources for effective development and service delivery.

1.1.3 Specific Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

- i. Assessing the relevance of the outputs to the effective achievement of the outcome;
- ii. Assessing the relevance of the programme to national priorities;
- iii. Assessing and analyse the progress made by the programme to date towards achieving the programme outputs and outcome and the sustainability of these results;
- iv. Examining and analysing factors which have positively and negatively affected achievement of programme outputs and outcome;
- v. Assessing the effectiveness of institutional arrangements and partnership strategies;
- vi. Assessing the sustainability of the programme contribution in the achievement of the outputs and outcome;
- vii. Determining the impact, both positive and negative, from contribution of the programme to the achievement of the outcome;
- viii. Examining the extent to which gender equality and women empowerment and human rights targets as cross-cutting issues were integrated and achieved;
- ix. Distilling recommendations, lessons and best practices for future programming and improvement in planning for the remainder of the programme;
- x. Making recommendations in strategic areas for improving the programme design, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, partnership arrangement and cross-cutting issues.

1.2 Evaluation questions

As described in the ToR, the evaluation questions by evaluation criteria, as listed.

1.2.1 Design and Relevance

- a. Whether the problem the programme addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived;
- b. Whether the target beneficiaries of the programme are clearly identified;
- c. Whether the outcome and outputs of the programme were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with SMART indicators;
- d. Whether the relationship between outcome, outputs, activities and inputs of the programme are logically articulated;
- e. Whether the programme is relevant to the development priorities of the country;
- f. Did the design of the programme take into account scale and scaling up into consideration;
- g. Given the capacity building objectives of the programme, how effective were the programme's capacity building interventions?

1.2.2 Implementation

- a. Whether the management arrangements of the programme were appropriate;
- b. What major factors affected programme delivery and propose appropriate interventions to address them for the remainder of the programme and for any future planned interventions in support of development effectiveness.
- c. Analyse the institutional arrangements put in place including coordination arrangements, financing arrangements, selection of sub-grantees, identification of beneficiaries, scheduling of activities and actual implementation;
- d. The fulfillment of the success criteria as outlined in the programme document;
- e. The responsiveness of the programme management to significant changes in the environment in which the programme functions (both facilitating or impeding project implementation);
- f. Determine whether or not lessons learnt from other relevant programmes/projects were incorporated into the programme;
- g. The monitoring and backstopping of the programme as expected by the Government and UNDP;
- h. The Programme's collaboration with industry, associations, private sector, academia and civil society, if relevant;
- i. The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on programme delivery.

1.2.3 Efficiency

- a. Whether the programme resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality;
- b. Whether the programme resources are used effectively to produce planned results (Are the disbursements and programme expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans)?
- c. Whether the programme is cost-effective compared to similar interventions;
- d. Whether the technologies selected (any innovations adopted, if any) were suitable;
- e. Whether there is evidence to support accountability of the programme (to be used by UNDP in fulfilling its accountability obligations to its development partners); and
- f. The delivery of Government counterpart inputs in terms of personnel, premises and equipment.

1.2.4 Effectiveness

- a. What are the major achievements of the programme vis-à-vis its outcome and outputs, performance indicators and targets.
- b. Whether there is evidence of UN contribution (alone and with the financial support from the EU) to the outcome of the programme.
- c. Whether there is evidence of joint UN contribution to the outcome of the programme.
- d. What are the potential areas for programme success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.
- e. Given an opportunity, what actions the evaluation team members would have recommended to ensure that this potential for success translated into actual success.
- f. Any underlying factors, beyond control, that influenced the outcome of the programme.
- g. Have there been any unplanned effects/results?

1.2.5 Sustainability

- a. Assess whether or not the programme's achievements are sustainable?
- b. Is there an exit strategy for any of the elements of the programme?
- c. What should be done to strengthen sustainability of programme outcomes?
- d. Assess whether or not the UN resource mobilization strategy for the programme was appropriate and effective.
- e. Provide specific recommendations for future potential interventions beyond the current programme with due regard to impact and sustainability of current support.

2. Methodology

2.1 Theory of change

For this evaluation, both qualitative and quantitative methods are used because of the need to link the development challenge being addressed in the results chain, to the outcome areas. The theory of change (TOC)/logic model guided this evaluation with a conceptual framework that mostly leaned toward qualitative analysis and less toward quantitative. The evaluation was used for validating the TOC – to assess the TOC's causal logic the risks and the assumptions. The evaluation took into account new emerging development realities and challenges facing the economy. There were realities and challenges that the programme faced over its implementation period that did not exist when DEAP was designed, yet some have become central to progress toward achievement of the programme results.

The evaluation discusses performance in each indicator area and identifies lessons learnt in the implementation of the programme and also describes the challenges that were encountered in the process. In addition, the evaluation also discusses the funding for the programme – flow and adequacy in relation to the programme scope.

2.2 Data sources

The evaluation sourced data from different sources and the data was both secondary and primary.

2.2.1 Secondary Data

The evaluation reviewed programme documents and all other relevant documents, such as the UN Joint Programme Document, DEAP, MGDS II (2011 – 2016) document, the MGS II Review Report (2015), UNDAF Document and recent reviews, relevant project evaluation and review reports, minutes of the programme management committees, various publications from UNDP, other UN agencies and Government and national policy documents. Other material reviewed included all documents relevant to the outcome evaluation and strategic focus areas, including international development partners, civil society organisations (CSOs) and beneficiaries, all material not in the public domain but availed; work plans, mission and workshop reports, baseline surveys, monitoring data, country data and previous M & E reports, where they existed and quarterly and annual progress reports.

2.2.2 Primary data

The evaluation also collected primary data through Key Informant Interviews, focus group discussions and meetings with the reference group. The evaluation also benefitted from discussions with programme staff both at UNDP and at Ministry of Finance.

2.3 Data collection and analysis

Data and information was collected from relevant sources through desk review and was followed up with individual and focus group interviews, with triangulation where it is necessary to do so. A series of meetings were convened with selected UN management and programme staff. One on one interviews were conducted with representatives of key stakeholders from UN agencies, government ministries, District Councils, academia and CSOs. The information was triangulated with different stakeholders, to validate the data generated.

Focus group discussions were conducted with selected stakeholders and this assisted in collecting information that was already validated by a group of stakeholders present at the discussion. This information was triangulated with information from the other data sources.

Data analysis comprised analysis of all kinds of quantitative information and quantitative data from relevant documents collected from UNDP and implementing agencies. The qualitative information collected through interviews and focus group discussion was coded based on thematic areas and analysed.

2.4 Performance and ethical standards

While efforts were made to make the evaluation participatory, the evaluation team maintained independence and objectivity, in line with the UNDP Evaluation standards, guidelines and ethical standards.

2.5 Limitations

First and foremost, there are substantial data gaps in Malawi, with many of the indicators being not up-to-date for progress tracking. The visibility of DEAP in the various sectors involved in implementation of the Action has tended to be low. Some informants struggled to remember the activities and issues covered by the DEAP either because they had no records or because they were not personally involved with the programme. This was especially true for the people interviewed at the district level whose responses were not pinpointed at the programme interventions level because they did not interact with relevant DEAP components and sub-components to the extent that is desirable.

3. Malawian Context and Programme Background

Malawi Government approaches its development through formulation of mid-term strategies that are enshrined in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategies. The MGDS II was

formulated to spearhead Malawi's development between 2011 – 2016 period. Through the implementation of the MGDS II, Malawi desired to leapfrog into development despite the many challenges that it faces which include weaknesses in the development planning and management.

Malawi was part of Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness at the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. In the defining the agenda for the future, the Busan Cooperation members agreed on a set of principles namely; 1) Ownership of Development priorities by developing countries 2) A focus on results 3) Partnership for Development and 4) Transparency and shared responsibilities.

3.1 Weaknesses of the Programme in addressing critical issues

The DEAP was formulated to address the following weaknesses in the national development planning and programming service delivery:

3.1.1 MGDS II prioritisation

The MGDS II presents a comprehensive picture of the many challenges and issues facing the country and given that the resources are limited, there is need to prioritise and focus on results that will accelerate economic development and address social problems to leapfrog the economy into transformation. This therefore requires that there should be adequate analysis and organization of the Malawi's development focus and programmes in line with the available resource envelope.

3.1.2 Gender, human rights and pro-poor focus in programme planning and implementation

Despite the 2010/11 integrated Household Survey (HIS) reported slight decline in incidence of poverty, from 52.4 per cent to 50.7 per cent, extreme poverty continues to worsen and income remains unevenly distributed reflecting inequalities in the access to assets, services and opportunities across the population. Poverty rates among female-headed households are significantly higher than male-headed households. The current use of tools that bring pro-poor focus and a gender and human rights perspective to programme planning and implementation is limited.

3.1.3 Weaknesses of aligning policies, programmes and budget

The credibility of the budget is undermined by the weak links between the MTEF, Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) and the MGDS planning process. This has led to ineffective use of development resources and non-alignment of programmes and budgets to national priority interventions.

3.1.4 Weak capacities for results oriented planning, M&E and reporting

The planning and policy analysis in Malawi is not straight forward and can be termed as disjointed and weak. The main responsibility for this function lay within the Planning and Development Division of the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development which is now under Ministry of Finance. The following challenges and weaknesses need to be addressed to have a modern and functioning planning and policy analysis:

- i. Strategic planning often is undertaken without linking it to the available resources
- ii. Policy Analysis work is not always undertaken and utilised for decision making
- iii. There is need to improve the quality of public investment through focused and properly appraised public investment based on improved use of investment analysis linked to the medium term budgeting framework
- iv. The capacity to develop improved macroeconomic forecasting is currently weak-strengthening this function is crucial as the Government moves forward with a number of critical reforms.
- v. Non-inclusive and non-participatory planning processes have left out key players and stakeholders in the economy thereby compromising on the ownership and contribution of the larger members of the society.

3.1.5 The UN and GoM response to the development challenges

The DEAP is a joint GoM and UN response to dealing with the endemic challenges facing the Malawian development terrain. There is a presumption that many of the challenges were also in varying ways being tackled within the framework of other previous and or GoM/DP supported programmes. Notable in this respect is the Public Service Reform (PSR) initiative which has been on the cards for several years. Whilst this evaluation does not endeavor to evaluate the PSR, the linkages between DEAP and the PSR are noteworthy. The former complements existing public service reform efforts, which have been supported by a number of DPs, including The World Bank.

The assessment of how the UN and the GoM have faired in tackling identified challenges relating to development effectiveness and accountability is also done. The overall conclusion is that whilst some progress has been achieved in specific areas (stated in appropriate sections in this evaluation), substantial effort is still required for the results to be sustained and in order to realize the desired impacts.

The scope of each of the DEAP outputs are outlined below.

Output 1: National Institutions Utilize the RBM Systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results.

The output is intended to promote and institutionalize RBM systems in the ministries and at district level as a means for enhancing ownership and leadership for achievement of development results. It provides support to establish sustainable training for RBM, MGDS/MDG planning and costing and Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA) in University of Malawi, Bunda College, Malawi Institute of Management (MIM) and Staff Development Institute. Support is also provided for training managers and planning, debt and aid, budget and M&E officers in OPC, ministries and district RBM, HRBA, MGDS/MDG-based planning and costing and links to budgeting.

Output 2: National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and MDGs for efficient achievement of development results.

The support under this output is geared towards improving alignment of policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategy and MDGs on the basis of comprehensive RBM Manual agreed with all stakeholders. The Joint programme planned to support at least 10 districts and 5 sectors to practically apply the RBM practices and undertake sector, respectively district review and planning process. It was envisaged that selected government agencies would receive technical and organizational support during the process of institutionalizing RBM.

Output 3: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate. Manage and account for development assistance

This output intended to implement activities that complement activities that complement the first two outputs but focusing specifically on strengthening the coordination role of the Debt and Aid Division (DAD) under ministry of Finance. The focus is on the provision of capacity building support for strengthening debt and aid management functions, and aid and debt policy and strategy formulation, improved preparations for Common Approach to Budget Support (CABS) group meetings and High Level Forum (HLF) dialogue and stakeholder engagement, sensitization and education activities targeting broad range of actors. Some of the expected results were the finalization and dissemination of debt and aid management policies and development of the development cooperation strategy for the period of 2012 – 2016 and functional Aid Management Platform allows better integration of donor partners flow into the budget and the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF).

3.2 Gender Mainstreaming

The joint plan aimed to ensuring that capacities were built to mainstream gender in planning, implementation and M&E of development services. The joint plan specifically focused at ensuring that participatory and evidence based MGDS/MDG-based planning and reporting is gender sensitive. The programme envisaged to provide guidelines for collection and analysis of gender disaggregated data and for incorporating gender, HIV and AIDS and HR issues in national, sector and district planning processes and in budget preparation process. The guidelines were expected to be incorporated in the RBM manual and informed through a survey of result-based and gender sensitive M&E reporting capacity across all MDAs and district councils. The programme plan was to seek to encourage women's organisations participation in aid and development effectiveness agenda and mechanisms for dialogue.

3.3 Sustainability of Results

The programme was very optimistic that the programme results will be sustainable based on the fact that there was strong commitment from the government given that the DEAP's objectives and strategies were consistent with arrangements for MGDS programming and PFEM RP implementation. Activities under the JP were going to strengthen the capacities of the institutions to fulfill their mandate effectively. The programme was therefore going to develop skills and transfer knowledge to key staff in the beneficiary institutions as well as development of systems, guidelines and tools for effective development service delivery.

The JP was going to develop capacity in the public teaching and learning institutions including Malawi Institute of Management, Mpemba Staff Development Institute and the

University of Malawi to deliver RBM, MGDS/MDG-based planning and costing and HRBA training to ensure many staff from different public sector institutions are trained to perpetuate the systems for results. The JP aimed at promoting development of curriculum for use by learning institutions in their regular training programmes. The programme was also open to come up with innovative arrangements to fully develop capacities of these learning institutions and subsequently engaging them to provide tailor made training services for public sector personnel.

3.4 Theory of Change Overview

The summary theory of change analytical framework shows the causal linkages in the DEAP programme design, between goals, strategies, outputs/outcomes, short, medium and long term objectives through to the critical assumptions. The Evaluation observes that a large number of the assumptions have only been partially realized, creating challenges on the modus operandi for the DEAP. However, from the consultations with a wide variety of stakeholders, from Government, Academia, CSOs and DPs, there is increasing understanding with consensus building which gravitates toward changing the way of doing business, to bring about the much needed national transformation. (Refer to Table 1 for the synthesis of the Theory of Change).

Linkages with the PFM and Public Sector Reforms: At the DEAP conceptualization stage DEAP was designed to support specific components of the PFM Reform Programme. However, during implementation of the two programmes, there was no synergy, no joint implementation, planning or monitoring for the common components, a development which weakened the linkages between DEAP and the PFM Programme. The underlying factors for the weak linkages with the public reform agenda are rooted in the design level challenges, constraints and issues of governance and policy implementation which are not the focus of this Evaluation.

Prudent financial management and accountability: The programme was formulated with an assumption that public officials were accountable and had integrity in as far as accounting for financial resources was concerned. This assumption was put to the test in 2013 when massive amounts of money were looted by public officials in a scandal codenamed 'Cashgate'. The scandal prompted donors to withhold their support and limit their budgetary support. This affected budgets and the amount of resources for many MDAs and led to compromised service delivery in the public sector. In some way, this donor withdrawal also affected DEAP in that many of the sub-components of the programme required follow up actions which required financial resources. The buy-in of key public sector institutions was also pivotal to progress.

Table 1 shows synthesis of Theory of Change/Logic Model Analytical Framework: Development Effectiveness and Accountability (DEAP)

| Table 1: Summary of Theory of Change/Logic Model Analytical Framework, Development Effectiveness and Accountability | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Situation Analysis | Goal | Outputs/Indicators | Outcomes – Impact | Key Assumptions, Risks and Barriers |
| <p><i>Inadequate pro-poor orientation, gender and human rights perspective in programme planning, implementation monitoring and implementation;</i></p> <p><i>Weaknesses of aligning policies, strategies, programmes and budgets;</i></p> <p><i>Lack of results oriented planning, inadequate progress tracking, M & E and reporting;</i></p> <p><i>Withdrawal of development partners' contribution from budget support, making the case for managing more efficiently and effectively limited</i></p> | <p>Development challenge</p> <p>Weak institutional capacity for development effectiveness and accountability management – inaction on critical decisions required to turnaround a 'business as usual' approach to managing change, development programming in more effective manner with a</p> | <p>Outputs – UNDAF (linked, but specific)</p> <p>Use of RBM, performance enforcement, sector working groups for planning and results oriented M & E (with adequately defined indicators and targets, backed up with well designed and executed annual and other periodic reviews)</p> <p>Government capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance under spotlight (<i>refer to indicators template</i>)</p> <p>National institutions capacity to align policies, strategies, programmes and budgets with national strategies and national development strategy (MGDS II) for efficient achievement of development results (<i>refer to indicators template</i>);</p> <p>Capacity of the state (central government) to respond positively to unforeseen developments/events; such as donor withdrawal to budget support, with a</p> | <p>Short, Medium and Long-term</p> <p><u>Short-term</u>: Government able to initiate new urgent turnaround measures to manage and account for effective utilization of resources (human and financial);</p> <p><u>Medium/Long-Term</u></p> <p><u>Improved utilization</u> of RBM by national institutions for planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting to enhance ownership and leadership and strengthen senior management for attainment of development results;</p> <p>Sufficient capacity of government to negotiate, manage and account for development assistance in a manner that is accountable and effective</p> | <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Commitment by Government to Public Sector Reforms, including public financial management reforms (PFM), without which DEAP cannot be sustainable</p> <p>Commitment by government to ownership and leadership to CABS and SWAP process,</p> <p>Government commitment to reporting on utilization of development assistance;</p> <p>Government commitment to efficient achievement of MGDS II priorities, successor national strategy and SDGs;</p> <p>Adherence to good practices in implementation of development programmes by GoM;</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| <i>public resources stronger.</i> | view to generating impact | repositioning for substantial transformation in the way of doing business by the public sector. | Improved capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national strategies and MGDS II, successor strategy and SDGs, to achieve development outcomes | Risks High turnover of skilled staff, at all levels in the public sector; Insufficient resources to implement MGDS II, successor strategy and MDGs/SDGs, and in developing successor strategy, to focus on 'priorities of priorities', lessons learnt in MGDS II taken into account in the development of successor national strategy; Matching of development plans to available financial resource envelope. |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|

4. Evaluation Findings

4.1 Assessment by Evaluation Criteria

The main findings of the evaluation are presented in this section. These findings are based on information generated from broad-based consultations with stakeholders, representatives from Government, Development Partners, Rural District Councils, CSOs, and others as spelt out in the methodology section of this report. The findings are organized and discussed around the programme pillars as laid out in the programme design. Under each pillar there are different interventions and sub-projects that were implemented for achievement of the results on the output. The assessment by evaluation criteria of relevance, implementation, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability is preceded by the overall findings.

Table 2 gives an overview of accomplishment by DEAP component areas at a glance. Overall the picture is positive. However, a deeper analysis of the programme by focus areas point to some shortcomings that need to be addressed. The achievements, challenges and opportunities have been highlighted in this evaluation report. Table 2 gives a summarized analysis by the standard evaluation criteria³.

| Table 2: | | Analysis of DEAP Pillars by Evaluation Criteria: At a Glance | | | |
|-------------|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| DEAP Pillar | | Summary rating by evaluation criteria: overview of the four DEAP pillars | | | |
| | | Relevance | Efficiency | Effectiveness | Sustainability |
| 2. | National institutions utilize RBM systems for planning, monitoring & evaluation to enhance ownership & leadership for achievement of development results | Highly relevant | Moderately accomplished | Moderately accomplished | Lowly accomplished |
| 2. | National institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and (MDGs) | Highly relevant | Moderately accomplished | Moderately accomplished | Moderately accomplished |
| 3. | Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance | Highly relevant | Moderately accomplished | Moderately accomplished | Lowly Accomplished |

³ Performance assessment criteria rating for achievements under each pillar or key result area:

Relevance: The categorization 'highly relevant' means DEAP remains valid to the development priorities and thrust of the country, this being so, regardless of the level of implementation performance, which is assessed in the other criteria.

Highly Accomplished - the programme component has achieved fully all the expected results

Moderately accomplished - achievement of component outputs is average to fair

Lowly accomplished - achievement of component outputs is below expectation

4.2 Relevance

Finding 1: The DEAP is rated highly relevant in many of its aspects, moderately and lowly accomplished in some of the aspects. The DEAP priorities and results-matrix have not been properly revised to reflect the available resource envelop, resulting in the programme being somewhat ambitious. In addition, as an instrument designed to improve government effectiveness, DEAP did not take into account the opportunities for creating synergies which were presented by the Public Sector Reform Programme which has been championed by the Office of the President and Cabinet.

Table 3 gives a summary of rating scores by evaluation criterion of relevance.

| Table 3: Summary Rating Score by Evaluation Criteria- Relevance | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Summary | Select | | |
| | Highly relevant | Moderately relevant | Lowly accomplished |
| | | | |
| DEAP guided by a strategic plan, which takes into account the views of key stakeholders, government, beneficiaries | XXX | | |
| Whether the problem the programme addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived | XXX | | |
| Anchored on National Development Strategy, MGDS II, Vision 2020; other national priorities, e.g., Public Sector Reform | XXX | | |
| Aligned to the UNDAF and UNDP Country Programme Outcomes and Development Cooperation Strategy for the country | XXX | | |
| Outcome and outputs of the programme were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with SMART indicators | XXX | | |
| Relationship between outcome, outputs, activities and inputs of the programme are logically articulated; | | XX | |
| Design of M & E indicator and results framework and targets clearly identified. | | | XX |
| Design of the programme take into account scale and scaling up | | | XX |
| Capacity building objectives of the programme, how effective were the programme's capacity building interventions | | | XX |

The project is aligned to the MGDS II and Vision 2020; it is a fair intervention to the capacitation of Malawi to strengthen development effectiveness in managing development aid and enabling improved accountability. The project is largely relevant to the needs of the country. Although Malawi has made attempts to ensure that annual plans and budget are responsive to MGDS II outcomes with a view to enabling strong implementation, several challenges impede the effectiveness of development programming efforts and utilization of available resources. Weaknesses that the DEAP addresses, include challenges in MGDS II prioritization, which centre on inadequate analysis and organization of the Malawi's development planning which has not corresponded to the available resource envelope; weaknesses of aligning policies, programmes and budget; existing use of tools that bring renewed pro-poor focus and a gender and human rights perspective to programme planning and implementation is limited; weaknesses of capacities for results oriented planning, M&E and reporting; weaknesses with capacities for results oriented planning, M&E and reporting. Although DEAP has sought to address many of these challenges and constraints at the design stage, the M & E indicator and results framework and targets have remained insufficient. Capacity building objectives and approaches have also not been articulated to the extent that is desirable in a country with substantial human resource capacity challenges. Moreover, the Human Resources Development Department of the GoM has not been integrated and linked to DEAP with a view to defining a synergized and more coordinated approach.

The target beneficiaries of the programme have been identified as middle to senior managers in the public sector, those responsible for designing and implementing policies. At the DEAP design stage, not enough effort was made to invest in the development of an adequate M & E indicator and results framework which is critical to track performance of time. However, drawing on lessons from MGDS II implementation and from other public sector initiatives, some efforts were made to enable the DEAP to be anchored on an M & E system with more Specific, Measurable, Accurate, Reliable and Time-bound (SMART) indicators than was the case during much of the implementation period. The efforts were, however, inadequate, being largely quantitative, with less use of qualitative criteria, with a missing link in the indicator tracking. This points to weaknesses in the M & E system and performance tracking of the DEAP.

The capacity development of these key government personnel is central to the DEAP planning process. There has not been an adequate mechanism to benchmark performance assessment of capacity development measures, taking into account the different capacities in the public sector and additional complementary measures to build that capacity in a sustainable manner. The outcome, outputs and activities and inputs were articulated, but not to the required depth. The programme design did not take adequate attention to scaling up opportunities, within the context of the potential sustainability of the DEAP. What has been unclear relates to the absence of a robust resource mobilization strategy of follow up activities to ensure that the momentum generated through the DEAP would be sustained in the medium to long-term.

The programme design recognizes the challenges in institutional, human and financial capacities, of both central and local government structures, as well as those of the other key stakeholders involved, including non-state actors. Institutionalization of Results Based

Management (RBM) is still on-going and the RBM users handbook has been developed to strengthen planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of results both at district and national levels.

The implementation modalities have been that the Director of Debt and Aid is to be the National Coordinator for Joint Programme. The Director has been supported by a technical assistance (TA) expert, P4 Grade, reporting to the Deputy Resident Representative (Programme). The director was supported by a technical assistance (TA) expert, P4 Grade, reporting to the Deputy Resident Representative (Programme). The TA was envisaged to be a top-notch technical expert in development policy, strategy development and implementation, innovations and best practices in RBM, development cooperation and national development goals. The TA would also have management, coordination, monitoring and evaluation capacity, focusing on quality control, full circle of programming from formulation, monitoring, implementation and reviews. The TA would also be pivotal in providing strategic leadership in nurturing and development of partnerships and resource mobilization; advocacy and information, education and communication and contribute to learning and knowledge management. The ET found that at planning stage, there was adequate provision of the key resources to carry forward the programme development agenda.

At the policy and strategic levels of DEAP, the composition of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the Secretary to the Treasury (ST) and comprising the UNDP and the European Union, representing development partners (DPs), involvement of several senior Government representatives was well considered to provide the programme with the required leadership and guidance. At the implementation level, the Programme Management Coordination Committee (PMCC oversees the DEAP implementation), also giving technical advice to the PSC, which is in line with good practice.

In an attempt to build effective public institutions, the Government brought together all capacity development initiatives under a unified Public Financial and Economic Management Reform Program (PFEM RP). The PFEM RP's focus is to achieve fiscal discipline; resource allocation according to a well presented government strategy; and value for money in terms of effective, efficient and regulated use of resources to achieve service delivery. Because of the challenges facing non-state actors, with a weak private sector and fragmented civil society organisations, bottlenecks that have been acknowledged at planning stage, there were plans to ensure that non-state actors get positioned to assume their roles in the development arena through a process of full engagement and dialogue. In an attempt to ensure complementarities and better coordination, DEAP was formulated to contribute to, and collaborate with, PFEM RP in the implementation of its specific components, namely: planning and policy analysis; budgeting and the monitoring and reporting.

While DEAP made the appropriate step to contribute to the PFEM RP which is a large government initiative, no systematic attempts were made to explore linkages and complementarity with the Public Sector Reform Programme which was formulated and implemented by the Office and the President and Cabinet from 2014. The programme introduced and implemented many initiatives which are intended to improve government operational efficiency and effectiveness, some of which have a direct impact on the development effectiveness agenda.

The Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development (MOFEPD), the lead ministry, and the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC), play key roles in the DEAP, the former, hosting the programme, and providing policy and sector level coordination. Though in some

of the areas, progress has not been as expected, the development of the Development Cooperation Strategy (DCS) and a range of other key complementary actions show a fair level of commitment at central government level.

The MGDS II Review (GoM, 2016) made extensive reference to governance challenges, including in terms of coordination on issues of capacity development and other key issues such as monitoring and evaluation, results based management (RBM) and the functionality of sector working groups (SWGs). The analysis of these broader issues, amongst others has implications on the effectiveness of government led system of sector coordination, which involves other stakeholders, including donors. Essentially the analysis points to challenges in sector coordination, which, the DEAP sought to tackle.

The DEAP put in place a two-level structure to over-see the programme implementation. This involved the establishment of a high-level Project Steering Committee (PSC), chaired by the Secretary to Treasury (ST), MOFEPD and comprising key staff from implementing MDA. Below the PSC is the Programme Management Coordination Committee (PMCC), which oversees the management of the DEAP and conducts regular reviews. Ideally, the structure is adequate to deliver the task at hand. Relevant circumstances and risks were considered and the intervention logic has largely been updated. At the policy and strategic level, the PSC is well-constituted, has strategically identified membership, and is technically supported by the PMCC, a structure which is appropriate to deliver the expected development results. DEAP is well designed with a provision for a fair though not totally adequate consideration of the human resources needed to carry out the envisaged mandate. Human resources gaps have been identified at both central, HQ level and at district levels.

Both quantitative and qualitative indicators have been defined. On the basis of baselines, where they exist, indicators for the Joint programme measure the achievement of outputs as stated in this evaluation. Because of financial and capacity challenges in the NSO, baseline data is to a large extent, outdated, some of it dating back 4 to 5 years. In view of the challenges related to the NSO and the national M & E system, there are substantial data gaps at the broader development context. The data gaps are linked to constraints which are beyond the control of DEAP management.

The DEAP priorities and results-matrix have, not been properly revised to reflect the much reduced available resource envelop, resulting in the programme being somewhat ambitious. In the framing of the DEAP, resources allocation pertaining to mandates did not correspond to demands, with an under-resourcing of key activities at planning stage. Examples include mainstreaming of monitoring and evaluation and national statistical capacity and achievement of gender equality outcomes. Other examples include the assumption regarding capacities within Government in term of delivery of outputs are not in keeping with the realities at practical levels. Human resource and organizational leadership staffing gaps are noted in some of the sectors, for example, at the department of EP&D and at the NSO. Within some components, the DEAP had an optimistic scenario in its design and in projected attainment of the programme results which was envisaged to be undertaken on the basis of assumptions of strong commitment from Government. The support can be assessed to be moderate. This is in particular as it pertains to achievement of a turnaround in a relatively short space of time, taking into account the timeframe to achieve the outcomes and the process

required for such interventions. Such change often requires breaking ‘government institutional traditional cultural and practice barriers’. This requires long term engagement, at least twice the period in the DEAP project document.

4.3 Implementation

Finding 2: The implementation of DEAP points to positive accomplishments overall, with satisfactory progress accomplished in some but not all of the components. Components where substantial progress has been achieved include support to Programme Based Budgeting (PBB) and support to development cooperation dialogue structures and forum, including the monitoring of the implementation of aspects of the development cooperation strategy.

Table 4 gives a summary of rating score by implementation criterion.

| Table 4: Summary Rating Score by Evaluation Criteria- Implementation | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Summary of evaluation questions | Select | | |
| | Highly accomplished | Moderately accomplished | Lowly accomplished |
| | | | |
| Were management arrangements of the programme appropriate? | | XXX | |
| Institutional arrangements put in place including coordination arrangements, financing arrangements | | XXX | |
| Responsiveness of the programme management to significant changes in the environment in which the programme functions | | XXX | |
| Whether or not lessons learnt from other relevant programmes/projects were incorporated into the programme | | | XXX |
| Monitoring and backstopping of the programme as expected by the Government and UNDP | | XXX | |
| Collaboration with industry, associations, private sector, academia and civil society | | XXX | |
| Role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on programme delivery | | XXX | |

Overall, implementation is rated largely moderately accomplished, because the Evaluation Team assesses management and institutional arrangements established to be fair, on the basis of available evidence. However, the ET did not get enough evidence that shows that lessons learnt from other programmes were properly incorporated into the DEAP to the extent that is desirable, hence the low score on the criterion.

The implementation of key sub-components prioritized under output 1 is discussed in the following section.

4.3.1 Results-Based Management Institutionalization of RBM in the public sector

DEAP supported capacity building for learning and training institutions for delivery of training in RBM in the public sector. Staff members from Malawi Institute of Management and the Polytechnic Management Centre were trained in training of trainers (ToT) for RBM through workshops and training sessions. These Training Institutions subsequently trained officers in the line ministries and the district councils in RBM.

Training Public Sector Officials in RBM

The Polytechnic through DEAP support organised training for officials in the public sector including the district councils. However, the calibre of the people that attended these RBM trainings was below expectations, a situation which was less desirable than in the case of PBB trainings⁴. Organisations that were invited to attend the RBM trainings sent very junior officers to these training⁵, creating challenges in terms of eventual utilisation of the training with many of those trained not involved in strategic planning and programming. This, therefore, meant that there was going to be very little change regarding institutionalizing RBM in these organisations.

When training was organised for senior managers in the public sector, the training failed to take place with many of the senior managers unable to participate in the trainings for various reasons. However, there are indications that the change in policy on per diem, in favour of one opting for full board was an underlying factor in reduction of numbers senior government officials in the training.

Roll-out of RBM to Ministries and District Councils

The roll-out of RBM application in selected districts and line ministries as part of institutionalizing RBM was undertaken. This involved practical and focused orientation and training on how to incorporate RBM principles in the strategic plans, policies, budgets of institutions engaged. This was supposed to build on the training that already equipped the officers with RBM knowledge, skills and principles which they used to assess their documents

⁴ Because of its strategic importance at management level, the RBM training required the participation of more senior managers in MDAs than in the case of PBB, a situation which required to be fully appreciated, explaining why the participation by senior managers was not so pronounced with respect to PBB training.

⁵ Whilst CSOs had representation on RBM training from persons as high as heads of organisations, executive directors and heads of programmes, government representation tended to be largely by lower ranked staff, with a few Chief Economists, occasionally a few Deputy Directors, and not many key staff in decision making positions within government.

and identify the shortfalls with regards to RBM. Overall the RBM roll-out had not been fully achieved, due to less than planned outreach, apart from implementation of preliminary training and orientation activities done for 12 districts. The full impact of these preparatory activities will be realised after the ministries and districts start to developing their strategic plans and district development plans, respectively, in tandem with the new National Development Strategy.

Progress on the rolling out of RBM in selected ministries and district councils was slow due to slow uptake accounted for by the inability to reach out to all the target groups. However, it should be acknowledged that the ground work has been done for future roll-out plans. Table 5 gives a summary of achievements in capacity development in RBM.

Table 5: Summary Achievements in Capacity Development for RBM and RBM Practice

| Output Indicators | Baseline | 2016 Status | Target 2016 | Project Term Target | Remarks |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| No. of public institutions practicing RBM | 0 (2010); | 4 institutions (Gender, NAO, EPD and MITC) | 12 | 16 | More work needs to be done to change the mind-set and of staff & institution's systems to fully practice RBM. |
| Number of staff in ministries and districts trained in RBM tools | -56 at district level; -25 in line ministries | 110 oriented in RBM 41 trained at sector level | -448 at district level; -200 at central level and in line ministries (2016) | 800 at district level; 260 at central level and in line ministries | |
| Number of staff in learning and training institutions who have RBM skills and knowledge and are delivering RBM training | 4 | 7 officers (3 MIM and 4 Polytechnic) | 30: (2016) | 30 | Unlikely to hit target. Two officers at MIM left |
| Source: GoM/UNDP, 2015 | | | | | |

Finding 3: Organizational and technical capacity challenges continue to be experienced in the implementation of RBM, attributable to a number of constraints. The successful implementation of RBM requires substantial mind-set change among the public development practitioners and commitment to changing ways of doing at the highest policy making and implementation level.

4.3.2 Strengthening M&E System at all Levels

Table 6 gives highlights of outcome indicators, targets and achievements to date

| Table 6: Strengthening of the M&E System | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|--------------------|----------------|---|
| Outcome Indicators | Baseline | 2016 Status | Target 2016 | Project Target | Remarks |
| Percentage of Ministries with functional M&E systems. | 60 percent (2010) | < 30 percent of targeted MDAs | 90 percent (2016) | 90 percent | Likely to achieved the target |
| Percentage of district councils with functional M&E systems | 20 percent (2012) | 40 percent (11 District Councils have M&E frameworks and 16 with working District M&E coordination Committees) | 80 percent (2016); | 80 percent | Not likely to achieve target by the end of the implementation period. The M&E Coordination committees failing to function properly due to lack of financial resources |

Finding 4: Largely because of continued inadequate commitment at the highest levels, the development of M & E capacities to ensure adequate performance tracking at both central and decentralized levels remains a challenge, despite efforts to turnaround the situation

With support from DEAP a series of activities were undertaken by EP&D to strengthen the M&E system in MDAs in Malawi including the district councils. EP&D undertook training for various districts and the training was among others in M&E principles and concepts, data collection and analysis and setting up M&E frameworks. DEAP plans were to strengthen and revamp the M&E structure that was built in the district council through the DEAP predecessor programmes. However, while there is some M&E infrastructure and capacity existing at the district council level, functionality is limited because of financial resources constraints to develop capacity at decentralised level.

4.3.4 National Statistical System Strategic Plan and Use of Statistics

The joint programme supported the implementation of the National Statistical System Strategic Plan. DEAP supported the implementation of selected periodic surveys that were planned under the NSO Strategic Plan for 2012 – 2016 and it was used as a means for

mobilising financial resources and technical assistance from development partners for periodic surveys as well. UNICEF was mentioned to have been very instrumental in supporting the various activities that were off programme and off budget for NSO. The NSO with support from DEAP was also able to roll out quality assurance framework for statistics in 11 ministries. Another milestone for DEAP has been the support that was given to the development of a diploma in statistics at Chancellor College in Zomba⁶ where DEAP resources were used to develop the curriculum and the teaching and learning materials initially for the 3-year diploma programme in statistics.

It is anticipated that the diploma course will assist address capacity gaps in various ministries since training the lower cadres has proved to be more beneficial as they deliver for longer than the higher cadres, who are highly mobile since they become attracted to other organisations within the country and outside after they get qualified and acquire experience.

The NSO has a large vacancy rate reaching 50 per cent in the professional staff category. It was only in 2016 that the NSO was given a go ahead to recruit about 18 officers in the professional category. The high vacancy rate means that the NSO is not able to adequately fulfil its mandate and function which in a way has affected or watered down the efforts of the DEAP programme as there are no adequate bodies to undertake the function of collecting and processing data and provide quality statistics for decision making and programming in the public sector.

A parallel activity facilitated by UNICEF was support to review and upgrade MASEDA. There is an impression that there was a lot of emphasis on development, review and upgrading MASEDA as a platform for M&E at the district level. The NSO is of the view that the effort that has gone into developing, reviewing and upgrading the MASEDA have not yielded much because of problems with the user. The interest in MASEDA is not what was expected due to low statistical literacy in the public sector – even among the top officials. Overall, the culture of using statistics for decision making and programming in the public sector and Malawi in general is not developed. However, there is an exception with respect to key ministries and departments such as Treasury, Finance, Education and Health, where there is evidence of substantial use of statistical information as exemplified in tracking of achievement of MDG goals and targets. More efforts should go to developing the basic capacity to use statistics across the board in the public sector for people to appreciate and demand statistics in the public sector and Malawi in general.

In order to strengthen data analysis and reporting skills, DEAP supported the training of government officials in statistical analysis and data management at Chancellor College. The training was expected to develop skills and capacity for improved policy analysis and impact evaluations by public officers. It is also expected that the work on MDG End-line, MGDS Annual Reviews and Sector Policy and development of successor national strategy will directly benefit from these skills.

4.3.5 MGDS II annual - mid-term and end of term review processes supported

The DEAP supported the annualised and end of term MGDS II reviews. EP&D has conducted annual MGDS II reviews from since the NDS was developed. However, the MGDS annual reviews were not aligned to the annual budgetary process, well not well timed with review of sectors, with a tendency to rely on ‘administrative data’ generated within the different

⁶ It is noteworthy that this course was not part of the original plan. Hence, it is commendable that DEAP has been so flexible to accommodate support to mounting this important diploma programme on the basis of demand laid upon the NSO.

sectors, which was assessed by independent reviews, including the comprehensive 2015 MGDS II review to be somewhat removed from reality. It was removed from reality because the data was not scientifically grounded, being in the main, based on unverifiable sources. There was also no real demand for the MGDS review reports, with little or no evidence of effective delivery of the outputs. The annual review reports were undertaken internally, which was an opportunity as well as a challenge. Evidence from analysis of the different annual MGDS review reports point to insufficient quality because of internal human resources capacity gaps. The M & E capacity gaps have been highlighted in different reviews and evaluations in recent years.

The DEAP supported the public sector expenditure tracking surveys for Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education to establish if government funds and materials do indeed reach the intended beneficiaries and assess the proportion of the public funds that actually reach the frontline service provider.

The PETs results were planned to inform the implementing agencies and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning on how the resources allocated to MDAs are transmitted to the frontline service providers and how much or what proportion of resources that are budgeted and funded are actually used for the intended purpose. Evidence generated from this evaluation point to a situation whereby there has been substantial gaps in that the envisaged reports have not been produced as originally planned. In cases where there have been produced, they have been of insufficient quality. Moreover, recommendations relating to PETs have largely not been implemented due to a number of reasons, some that are to do with lack of commitment at institutional level, a development that is rooted in the absence of a culture that DEAP seeks to strengthen.

4.3.6 Performance Enforcement Department Strengthened for Results Assessment

Table 7 gives a brief on stated achievements under the PED component

| Table 7: Outcome Indicators and Achievements for PED | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Output Indicators | Baseline | 2013 Status | Target 2016 | Project Target | Remarks |
| Number of institutions reviewed for performance and provided with feedback. | 0 (2013); | Evaluation was done and a report on OPAs was issued in June 2013 presided by the Vice President | 38 (2016) | 38 | More effort in progress |
| Number of MDAs that have implemented at least 70 % of OPA recommendations | 0 | 40 MDAs provided feedback on performance between 2013 and 2014 | 25 (2016) | 25 | More effort in progress |
| Source: GoM/UNDP, 2016 | | | | | |

Finding 5: Progress in the implementation of initiatives under the PED has seen positive but insufficient progress, with valuable organizational structures and PED monitoring and supervisory tools developed and implemented with satisfactory accomplishments. However, a higher level of progress and more accelerated achievement of results is constrained by low resource allocation to prioritized performance enforcement measures and inadequate linkages with other key components (IFMIS), M & E capacity development, PBB, which is central for a truly integrated approach.

The DEAP supported the development of the performance contracts and development of the performance systems and tools for MDAs. Training on the same was undertaken. However, planned take-off was affected due to resource constraints. The PED planned to have a big take-off and requested for \$400,000 for the activities but obtained a very small proportion of the request and therefore PED could only concentrate at central level and unable to go downstream to the district councils and statutory bodies. By the 2015/16 financial year, 25 Ministries were reported to have signed performance contracts. In order to consolidate performance enforcement, plans were underway to re-train all MDAs on the performance management framework before the 2016/17. An Integrated Performance Management Information System (IPMIS) has been designed and installed following comprehensive user consultations and review. IPMIS is intended to link data on performance of institutions coming from various sectors through an integrated website.

Overall the experience with the PED component points to the need to have a robust M & E system capable of identifying binding constraints early on during the implementation of key programme components and sub-components, and identifying options to deal with the constraints, through the implementation partners of jointly with the support of the UN and or other development partners. Issues of ownerships and sustainability in terms of financing of sub-projects arise, as well as the question whether the UNDP should provide operational support beyond establishing systems. Alternatively, UNDP could invest in systems which the government could later on operate, manage or sustain.

4.3.7 Support to Programme Based Budgeting

Several activities were implemented to develop capacity of public sector institutions for them to be able to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies. Table 8 gives indicators, targets and quantitative achievements for the PBB component

| Table 8: Outcome indicators, targets and achievements for PBB | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|---|
| Outcome Indicators | Baseline | 2016 Status | Target 2016 | Project Target | Remarks |
| Indicator 1: Programme based budgeting piloted in institutions. | Baseline: None (2012); | 13 | 33 | 46 | Will be rolled out to all Ministries for 2016/2017 budget |
| Indicator 2: Number of functional SWGs | Baseline: 6 (2012); | 11 | 16 | 16 | The SWG guidelines are in place. Working at the 5 that are not functional |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Indicator 3: National development strategy formulated through a participatory process by Dec 2015 | Baseline: 0 | No document. But drafting team and issues paper for successor strategy in place | 1 | 1 | The issue of Establishing the Economic Commission delayed the process. Now work is progressing consultations have been undertaken |
| Indicator 4: Sector and district plans aligned with MGDS priorities and linked to MTEF process | Baseline: 0 (2011); | 11 sectors have Strategic Plans though most do not synchronise with MGDS II calendar | Target: 5 sectors and 10 districts | Target: 5 sectors and 10 districts | |
| Source: GoM/UNDP, 2016 | | | | | |

Finding 6: Government commitment to implementation of PBB is high and, with substantial momentum generated during the DEAP implementation period. However, progress in the long-term depends on capacity within the public sector to sustain the support to PBB through well focused effort at capacity development at central government level and in the district councils.

Several activities were implemented to develop capacity of public sector institutions to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies. DEAP supported the PBB in various ways to ensure adoption of the PBB budgeting framework by the MDAs. The activities for PBB adoption were implemented by the Budget Division of Ministry of Finance and they involved the training of MDAs on PBB structures, templates and performance indicators; (ii) Developing the PBB manual, templates and budget guidelines; (iii) Modification of budget preparation software to ensure it is compatible with PBB; (iv) Sensitizing, briefing and training on PBB, gender responsive budgeting and changes to the PFM Act for key stakeholders. The RBM process needs to be informed from the lessons and good practice of the PBB, whereby different target audiences such as Senior Government Officials, Budget committees in MDA, Parliamentary committees, Civil society, Local Councils have been accessed. The question, ‘what was done in the PBB approach which was not done with the RBM’ needs to be interrogated to inform the latter.

The MDAs that have piloted the PBB are of the view that the framework is good and will improve focus of public interventions and improve service delivery. Representatives of MDAs contacted during the Evaluation were of the view that the PBB is the right direction to go although there was resistance at the beginning because of negative perceptions about the added value of the PBB. An effort was being made to address capacity gaps in the PBB, with Heads of Departments being positioned to give clearer direction and guidance regarding programming and allocation of resources to priority areas for their ministries. Ministries and their senior managers were also expected to lead the process of developing performance indicators for their programmes. However, there were cases where Accountants, and not Heads of Departments continued to wield substantial power in resource allocation. Without stronger involvement of the heads of the departments it remained difficult for those developing the budgets to effectively come up with quality budgets with all the PBB ingredients.

The Ministries engaged also pointed out that the PBB was not being adequately integrated with the performance management system being implemented by PED. It would make more sense if the contracts signed with PED were linked to PBB then assessment would be linked to implementation of the allocated budget and corresponding programme results which is not the case at the moment where the MDAs are assessed based on a different criteria rather than the implementation of the budget and attainment of the programme results therein. PED needed to coordinate more with Treasury and EP&D to design and implement assessment that would focus on performance and results.

Another issue that require attention is lack of joint planning by the MDAs that are working in related areas for them to forge synergy which is key to generate impact. For example, the Health Sector would ride on the efforts of the Ministry of Water and Sanitation and Agriculture if there was joint planning and this would increase development effectiveness. While this might not have been envisaged in the current programme it is a good idea to explore this further in future. This is in keeping with the spirit of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

4.3.8 Strengthening of the Sector Working Group Process

Finding 7: Moves to revamp SWGs has seen some progress being made, with structures in place and clear guidelines developed, several of the SWGs reportedly revitalized. However, more substantial progress in the medium to long term depends on enforcing compliance and the effectiveness of a results based M & E for the SWG process which is yet to be established.

The DEAP support for the strengthening of the SWGs culminated in positive moves to re-launch 11 of the 16 SWGs that were formalized by Government in 2008. The SWG process provides a coordination mechanism and window of opportunity for private sector and participation of CSOs in public service planning, implementation and M&E for inclusiveness and development effectiveness.

In 2014, DEAP funded a study to review the functionality of SWGs and at that time about 4 to 5 SWGs were found to be functional at different levels, with 10 to 12 found not functional. The report made far-ranging recommendations regarding the revamping and strengthening of the functionality of SWGs in Malawi.

Revised Sector Working Group guidelines have since been developed and directors of planning in 11 SWG coordinating ministries were oriented in the SWG guidelines. More than half of the existing SWGs have reportedly been re-launched and with guidelines developed. However, the situation of the SWGs remained delicate because of the challenges still facing their functionality and effectiveness. It is still too early to gauge their practical functionality in promoting joint sector planning and undertaking their rightful role as a mechanism for development and aid coordination for their sectors. Evidence points to uneven and less than convincing functionality and effectiveness amongst the 11 SWGs deemed to be functioning. Clearly, all the sectors will have to work hard and invest more time to ensure the functionality

of their SWGs and consequential TWGs. One area that will need to be worked on is to inject new vigour in the private sector NGOs so that their representatives get committed and take ownership in the SWGs. New financing windows ought to be created to enable the private sector and CSOs to get required financial and logistical support to participate in the SWG otherwise expecting them to prioritise the SWG activities over their private operations will continue to remain a challenge. Where it is feasible, the financial and logistical support could be sourced initially from development partners and other innovative financing arrangements in support of this.

For the accompanying TWGs, it would be very important that the government and development partners also support the participation of the private sector and the NGOs. The GoM will need to take the TWG more seriously as this structure is central to the efficient and effective functioning of the SWGs. Related to this, the SWG and the TWG meetings should be seen to be effective in conduction of their meetings to sustain interest and continued participation by the stakeholders. In this regard, the meetings should always have clear agenda and the meetings should be conducted professionally and effectively to achieve the meeting objectives set otherwise the meetings will be seen as time wasters and lead to ebbing interest among the private sector and NGOs.

The DEAP supported the development of the successor strategy to the new NDS to succeed MGDS II. The Government has instituted a core drafting team comprising of key sectors that will spearhead the process. Sector consultations through SWGs have to a larger extent been done and the inputs from the sectors culminated into production of a draft issues paper that has been submitted to the Chief Secretary. The draft issues paper was to guide the discussions and formulation of priorities for the new NDS in addition to MGDS II review report.

Although the DEAP has as one of its focus support to the formulation of the new NDS, the process of developing the new National Development Strategy has been affected/delayed by the Malawi Government with plans to institute a National Planning Commission (NPC). The expectation has been that when the NPC is established, it would spearhead the formulation of the NDS.

4.3.9 Support to Effective Development Cooperation

Finding 8: The strengthening of the DAD through capacity development and training has been highly effective in the management of development cooperation, enabling the Division to undertake outreach initiatives that would not have been possible without the support of the DEAP and the participating development partners.

DEAP supported the strengthening of the aid management functions through financing a number of activities in the Debt and Aid Division (DAD). The programme supported training of the DAD officers in monitoring and evaluation and debt management. Support was also given to production of the development cooperation atlas covering years 2012/2013 to 2014/2015; and later the 2016 development cooperation calendar and its dissemination was undertaken. The programme also funded procurement of ICT equipment for National Treasury.

The DEAP has been found to be very useful and relevant to the DAD and has assisted the Division to undertake activities that in the absence of the programme the Division would not have done. The Evaluation Team quotes:

“DEAP actually supported the activities that we as a division are supposed to undertake and the support assisted us and ensured that the activities were actually done which has been a big plus for the programme”. Deputy Director, DAD.

The focus of the DEAP to contribute to the improved quality and effectiveness of development cooperation and ensure support to all development partners and other stakeholders is coordinated, harmonized focused on results and aligned to national priorities, institutions and systems⁷. Since its development, the Strategy has been guiding and will continue to guide development cooperation in Malawi up to 2018, and well beyond the DEAP period.

The DEAP supported development and management of the Aid Management Platform (AMP) web-based platform and all development partners have since been able to enter their support in the platform – self reporting. The system is very essential because it gives information on all aid that each development partner is investing into the Malawi economy including all aid beyond the government and off-budget. The information is used by the Government for publishing Aid Atlas for Malawi and budgeting purpose as the government is made aware of the donor commitments and by sector.

The AMP portal was launched in 2013 and can be accessed by anyone anywhere. This is a milestone as far as issues of transparency in development financing and management are concerned. The AMP is supposed to provide support to the pursuit of development effectiveness by giving information that other stakeholders like the CSOs and private sector and in general the citizenry can be able to monitor and follow development financing and hold government accountable. What is remaining now is to generate interest among the citizens and the other development partners like CSOs so that they should be able to log into the AMP and start following developments in the aid management arena and then be able to hold government accountable.

4.3.10 Development Cooperation Monitoring

The Busan agreement on Development effectiveness created structures for ensuring continued dialogue and for monitoring country development efforts. DEAP supported monitoring the Global Partnership through supporting the Malawi Ministerial chairmanship on the global partnership on effective development cooperation representing aid recipients.

Furthermore, the development cooperation defined dialogue structures are largely effective. One such structure is the High-Level Forum (HLF) on development effectiveness that focuses on ensuring that the development cooperation makes a difference in the country's context. DEAP has supported inclusive dialogue structures including the Development Cooperation Group (DCG) and HLF. These structures have proved useful as they have led to discussion of national strategic issues such as resilience building and population, with the ultimate aim of breaking the cycle of poverty and food insecurity in Malawi.

4.4 Efficiency

⁷ Development Cooperation Strategy for Malawi 2014-2018

The identification of focal points in various MDAs to champion the implementation of specific activities under each priority area was appropriate and a step in the right direction. This was in some way, cost effective and reduced the need to create another layer of project staff, which would not have been sustainable. However, such an arrangement required a stronger networking arrangement to facilitate with a view to developing required synergies in the DEAP action.

The PSC and PMCC was well conceived, with the PSC focusing on policy and strategic issues; the PMCC focusing on project management and implementation of the activities. However, there was a lack of commitment on the part of senior management to adequate evidence based tracking of progress, including budget and human resources performance and adoption of results-oriented approaches which are key to 'diagnosing challenges from afar', and taking appropriate and timely remedial action.

Assessment of appropriateness of implementation, coordination and management arrangements: Strategically, DEAP opted for a lean structured arrangement, which is good for sustainability, with dependence of government officers as key resource persons. The department of EPD has ICT, procurement and M & E services which supported DEAP implementation. ICT personnel in the department work on the IFMIS, which is being supported by the DEAP – as a deliberate strategy.

Although the GoM has made a tremendous effort in DEAP implementation, with a number of achievements made under difficult circumstances, the components managed at EP&D faced many challenges in their organisational and management, facing some financial and procurement challenges, which slowed down implementation of activities. However, components managed from Treasury have not faced the challenges faced at EP&D. There are important lessons learnt between the project managed at EP&D and those managed at Treasury.

Whilst the original project document estimated DEAP budget for 4 years of US\$18,482,500; only US\$7 million, (approximately 38 percent of the original budget estimated at project design was secured). As at 25 April 2016, there was a 56 percent utilization of the budgetary allocation, a year before the project closure. In the on-going internal Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Programme Management Coordination Committee (PMCC) reviews, there was not enough attention to reviewing priorities to adequately match revised and recast priorities as these related to the available resource envelop and to reflect emerging realities linked to the funding of DEAP. There were some gaps between financial resources anticipated at planning stage with those availed during implementation.

A number of short-term consultants were engaged for specific assignments, which on the whole, were done to satisfactory levels. These included commissioned work designed to enhance the effectiveness of SWGs, the Study of the State of M & E, and the comprehensive review of the MGDS II, capacity development and training in RBM, PBB, amongst other areas. Some of the interventions included central government staff, district council staff, and personnel employed by government departments and NGOs, not necessarily at HQ and sub-components of the work supported by the DEAP. GoM MDAs, deployed some resources, staff time, (including in-kind contributions), participation and contributing to PSC strategic meetings and PMCC meetings, deliberating on key issues facing the DEAP, including those related to implementation of specific activities. A pivotal government contribution has been in the GoM commitment to RBM, PBB and AMP, PFM, IFMIS, MGDS II reviews and formulation of the successor national strategy.

Furthermore, the creation of an enabling environment by GoM remains work in progress. Government financial contribution to DEAP has been in terms of infrastructure support, payment of staff salaries involved in DEAP activities. These have been provided on time. The project experienced substantial delays, with certain key activities delayed for more than 12 months, others failing to take off completely. Procurement delays have been cited as major constraints to implementation of key DEAP activities in priority areas, in a number of MDAs, including the following, MOFEPD (for example, support to formulation of successor national development strategy), Local Government, support to M & E activities, the National Statistical Office NSO) roll-out of MASEDA, roll-out of M & E, RBM and PBB capacity building with district councils, review of the DCS (which was never undertaken). The delays have also been caused by lack of due diligence in understanding procurement procedures by the implementing partners, exacerbated by poor communication, at both ends.

The delays resultant upon inadequate handling of procurement issues, misunderstandings between UNDP and the DEAP hosting institution, has created a situation of despondency in the latter, with capacity and bureaucratic bottlenecks in the procurement system cited as major reason for the delays in implementation of workplans. The delays stated were rooted in constraints in coordination and supervisory arrangements of development partner support at national level.

There are conflicting signals on the underlying factors behind the delays, both from the UN side and the national government side. The bottlenecks associated with UNDP procedures have been cited to be the cause of the delays. The bottom line, however, is that the real issues are also linked to challenges in managing the delivery of development results at national level, results based management and accountability in management of development resources.

Annual workplans have also been developed, and annual reports prepared and shared with stakeholders. The workplans have also been revised taking into account financial and implementation reality on the ground, in terms of time-frames. The workplans have also considered the available human resources, both in terms of quality and quantity and the existence of complementary inputs from different stakeholders.

4.4.1 Assessment of Efficiency for Different Components

Pillar 1: National Institutions, RBM systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results:

Institutionalization of RBM in the public sector

This is rated **Moderately Accomplished** in terms of efficiency, because not all the key targeted beneficiaries were capacitated and trained and the expected roll-out of RBM did not take place; the score with respect to efficiency is because the engagement mechanism was not forceful enough to ensure that senior officers were adequately covered; the grade for sustainability, is because once established the potential for the RBM being sustained is high within the government machinery, though currently limited by the level of commitment within the state institutions.

Strengthening M&E system at all levels

Whilst the sub-component is highly relevant, the sub-component has been moderately accomplished, largely because despite efforts being made through the DEAP implementation

mechanism, M & E has remained a weak area at both central government level and at district council level. The establishment and strengthening of M & E has remained a largely unfinished business. Efficiency of implementation under pillar 1 has been met with challenges, with a not as strong engagement mechanism than would be desirable. Challenges have been encountered also with respect to effectiveness and sustainability, the latter largely because of lack of commitment at high levels of government manifested in what has been described as lack of demand of results-based M & E.

National Statistical System Strategic Plan and Use of Statistics

Despite being highly relevant, the performance rating in the sub-component is moderately accomplished. Despite efforts made at developing the national statistical system, there remains substantial unfinished business because of financial, technical and human resources constraints within the NSO, which in turn is rooted to national level financial resource constraints. However, in recent years, the GoM has made a significant positive shift to resource allocation, with substantial budgetary allocations to the NSO, in the last two financial years⁸.

Performance Enforcement Department Strengthened for Results Assessment

The scoring for efficiency and effectiveness is moderately accomplished because the PED has developed the necessary tools and systems for performance assessment. There remains substantial work required to implement the tools with a view to establishing and implementing a fully-fledged system for performance enforcement. However, sustainability of this sub-component is high, in view of the structures already developed, which demonstrate a level of commitment by the GoM.

Pillar 2: National institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and (MDGs)

Support to Programme Based Budgeting

This component is rated **moderately accomplished** for efficiency, on the basis of progress made to date and the incompleteness of Treasury roll-out of the PBB to all district councils. The PBB intervention came somewhat late into the DEAP implementation and yet has made substantial mileage, largely due to the commitment shown by the GoM, combined with the partnership arrangement with DPs.

Strengthening of the SWG process

Efficiency has been moderate, following the adoption of new measures and reaffirmation of government commitment to making the SWG functional, there remains more effort to strengthen the SWGs, to enable all sector working groups to be functional and effective in carrying forward the development agenda. The recently developed and approved SWG guidelines are set to assist revamp the mechanism to make it more functional.

⁸ The national budgetary allocation to the NSO rose from K50 million in the 2014/15 financial year to K600 million in the 2015/16 financial year; K800 million during 2016/17; and projected to rise to K3 billion for the period 2017/18. The dramatic increase in allocation for 2017/18 of K3 billion is largely explained by the national census planned for the period.

Pillar 3: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance

Strengthened aid and debt management functions and support to effective development cooperation: Efficiency for both aid and debt management and the DCS is **highly accomplished**, with a number of milestones noted, despite challenges observed in limited capacity to influence the global aid management architecture. This is the case despite the positioning of Malawi in the global aid management forum. For the DCS sub-component, the national dialogue structures established, in the form of the HLF and other support structures such as Technical Committees have been developed and are working well, with effectiveness assessed as **highly accomplished**.

4.5 Effectiveness

Pillar 1: National Institutions utilize RBM systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results.

4.5.1 RBM capacity and practice enhanced in public sector

RBM was pilot tested initially with training targeting 3 government ministries and 4 districts (Mchinji, Dedza, Karonga and Mwanza). And further opened for other MDAs. The RBM manual has been updated and awaiting further review to make sure that it satisfies HRBA, programme based budgeting and gender mainstreaming; RBM manual introduced in 10 – 12 districts, plans to train MDAs in RBMs done but not targeting right senior staff; c) Over 60 line ministry of district staff from all three regions of the country have been trained in RBM concepts and practice. However, some challenges have emerged.

Although substantial capacity development on RBM was organizational learning and training institutions (on the supply side), at the demand side, there was a low up-take. RBM training was done and was meant to incorporate senior government officials (PSs, Planning Directors, DCs, and others), ended up accessing only junior government staff in non-influential positions; with low uptake at senior levels despite repeated appeals by trainers. The new GoM policy that covers full accommodation costs for workshop participants with abolition of payment of daily subsistence allowances (DSA), in an environment that staff often consider this to be a benefit or incentive for them to get out of their work stations is blamed for poor participation by senior government officers.

Non-participation of senior staff from IP institutions and the general lack of commitment to change made it difficult for participants to apply knowledge gained in their day to day work, especially where a major change was required, e.g., moving to a results based planning and reporting system. Lack of support and enforcement at the highest level, the absence of monitoring frameworks to ensure that training received benefited the institutions involved⁹. Against this background, the piloting of RBM application in selected line ministries and selected districts did not have scaling up impact which was expected.

Institutionalization of RBM in the public sector

This is rated **Moderately Accomplished** with respect to effectiveness is because the engagement mechanism was not forceful enough to ensure that senior officers were

⁹ This point is amply demonstrated by the record of who participated (by designation and institution) in the RBM training availed to the evaluation team by the trainers.

adequately covered; the grade for sustainability, is because once established the potential for the RBM being sustained is high within the government machinery, though currently limited by the level of commitment within the state institutions.

4.5.2 Strengthening of the National Statistical Office (NSO)¹⁰

Although the NSO Strategic Plan was developed, with a 50 percent of professional staff compliment, there have been limited resources to carry forward the MASEDA. Limited progress was achieved due low capacity within the NSO, both in terms of human resources, equipment including data management software. A major area of support by DEAP to the NSO has been TA support in the development of course materials and modules for a Diploma in Statistics and Chancellor College, University of Malawi, with financial support to 20 initial batch of students, for the two-year Diploma. The supported recruits comprise lower level cadre working in statistics units such as statistics clerk, data management assistants. This is expected to strengthen the human resource capacity of the NSO, in the long-term.

4.5.3 Government M & E System Strengthened

As part of the contribution to the implementation of the MGDS II, DEAP was instrumental in the development of the MGDS II linked monitoring indicator framework, which formed the basis for Annual MGDS II reviews; facilitated the Annual MGDS II reviews, and facilitated the comprehensive MGDS II Review (2015), which identified achievements, opportunities, bottlenecks and recommendations for action by the GoM and other stakeholders, including development partners.

With facilitation from the DEAP, a comprehensive, a review of the M & E architecture was undertaken with critical issues in M & E development, binding constraints identified at policy and institutional level analysed through the Study of State of M & E in Malawi (2015). Follow up work resulted in substantial awareness raising on M & E development, nationally and the need to establish a robust M & E system in Malawi, with a view to strengthening development effectiveness and accountability systems.

The establishment of management information system (MIS) to monitor development results, down to district levels remains, with district databanks still non-functional, with the M & E system at district level remaining problematic because it is not accompanied by the right instruments. Fragmentation and overlapping of activities with those implemented in different projects is still an issue of concern. A good example is the proliferation of M&E of projects in the central ministries and Government as a whole. Going forward, M&E systems in Government should be harmonized and linked to each other in a supplementary manner.

With a lack of institutionalisation of data management linking central and decentralised district structures, sectors continued to use different indicators, which were difficult to synchronise. In the absence of a centralised system of data management, substantial coordination challenges have been encountered, including in reporting and reviews at sector level and in linking up with the MASEDA. However, the development of M & E capabilities and the implementation of a functional system linking the Centre with decentralised local government structures remained at a critical stage, where further momentum, in terms of financing and human resource capacity development was key to attainment of rapid progress.

¹⁰ Other parallel interventions supporting the NSOs from other DPs and UN agencies are noted. These are not being ascribed to the DEAP.

Amongst other measures, the establishment of a National M & E Committee to drive the M & E agenda is noted, if it functions well. This move should enable tackling of the most binding constraints cited in this evaluation and on the basis of the previous reviews. A key challenge relating to improving M&E at district level relates to the fact that for close to 10 years, M&E personnel were recruited on non-established positions in the districts, a situation which has created instability in establishment of M & E capacity in the districts. District Monitoring and Evaluation Committees (DMEC) have not developed as structures with the capacity to function as effectively as they were planned to function because most members of DMECs are not conversant with M & E principles. Whilst there were some exceptions, relating to Ministries of Agriculture, Health and Education, the functionality of the DMEC was affected because representation of most of the sectors at district level was with people who lacked the requisite skills.

Pillar 2: National Institutions have capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and MDGs for efficient achievement of development results

4.5.4 Programme Based Budgeting

DEAP engaged an international expert to pilot test the Programme Based Budget (PBB), starting off with 6 ministries. The pilot work involved awareness and preliminary capacity development and training, which has been continued and been extended and culminated in the production of an integrated PBB manual in 2015. Since then, more than 46 MDAs have been trained and all Central Government MDAs are in the process of implementing PBB, with different levels of uptake. In order to strengthen awareness on PBB, DEAP has also broadened outreach, training and awareness to Members of Parliament (MPs), engaging 60 MP; all members of Budget and Finance Committees, all members of Public Accounts Committee. Plans were in place to reach out and secure awareness raising with all MPs as a way of strengthening and consolidating the roll out of the PBB. PBB structures have been established in MDAs at central level. Challenges were encountered linking performance enforcement indicators, PBB, IFMIS and overall MGDS M & E Indicators and sectoral indicators, resulting in need to assess how linkages between the PED, Treasury, Budget Department, EP & D, MGDS II indicators and sectoral indicators, could be strengthened for a more integrated and harmonized system.

However, more awareness raising was pending at senior levels within the government structures, with awareness planned for Permanent Secretaries (PSs), and induction in district councils and roll out of PBB to local government structures, district councils, and to statutory bodies. A results-based M & E system to monitor progress of PBB was also required to ensure trouble-shooting measures, where these encountered with a view to attainment of more rapid progress.

Despite the constraints noted related to slow take-off of the PBB approach by MDAs, which is not abnormal for most major transformational process, the process of engagement in support to the development of the PBB was progressive. However, a key observation is that the development of the PBB had not been very rigorous, in particular pertaining extra strategic planning and analysis in developing the targets and outputs. The traditional tendency amongst the public MDAs to leave the budgeting exercise to accounts and finance personnel and clerks persisted without ensuring conformity and applying substantial objective analysis. Nevertheless, the PBB continued to offer high transformational possibilities for the public sector and in terms of improvement of service delivery. The positive feedback from the MDAs

that had piloted the PBB is acknowledged and demonstrates in-roads made by the DEAP supported initiative.

The Evaluation notes that much ground has been covered on the PBB, especially during the pilot phase. The MDAs still harbouring reservations on PBB ought to take a leaf from the MDAs involved in pilot phase and explore mechanisms of tackling whatever reservations that may exist, avoiding waiting for the PBB to be self-driven process, which will not happen.

However, Treasury in collaboration with EP&D and MDAs should ensure that most of the basic issues associated with PBB (capacity is developed for those actually developing the budget, ensure that the Departments Heads are involved) are address before the MDAs can implement objective and sound PBBs.

4.5.5 Strengthened SWG Process

DEAP also facilitated a comprehensive review of Sector Working Groups (SWGs), which showed a less than desirable performance of SWGs, with only five or six functional SWGs, out of about 16 to 17. Follow up work which involved a review of the 2008 SWG guidelines and subsequent development of new SWG guidelines, which were adopted by the Office of the President and Cabinet, following a validation workshop. Focal points placed in strategic MDAs have since been identified with a view to strengthening the agenda of SWGs tracking of sector level progress. At least 5 SWGs were understood to have generated momentum that would see them being more functional than in the past; for the rest of the SWGs, noticeable progress was yet to be achieved.

The establishment of a new management structure for the SWGs and subsequent effort at orientation of staff of the coordinating ministry is applauded. The revamped SWG structures that were being established, if followed through with agreed actions should enable improved performance of SWGs. Though it is still early days, at the time of this Evaluation, the number of what are understood to be 'functional' SWGs had reportedly increased. What functionality means in this case is, is however, not clear in both qualitative and quantitative terms. The complexity of the situation with SWG was analysed in the UNDAF Mid-term Evaluation of Outcome 4.2 in 2015, with further internal reviews being done.

The following is noteworthy:

- i) Central to the future of SWG and the level of their functionality, progress depends on how far senior management in Government are prepared to follow up the key actions required through; (a) decisive leadership and guidance, (b) effective and sustained financial resource mobilization to ensure the SWG programme of activities is undertaken in a timely manner, and (c) capacity development in priority areas.
- ii) Apart from establishing coordination structures that actually deliver on their mandates, accompanying measures include adoption compliance guidelines, results-based monitoring which ought to be linked to development of measures for performance enforcement in the public sector.
- iii) Practical forms of support to develop value adding partnerships, beyond casual collaboration between Government Agencies, with other stakeholders in the private sector, academia, CSO is of paramount importance for effectiveness.

4.5.6 Strengthening of Performance Enforcement

There has been a commendable initial start, with performance contracts designed, accompanied with some performance assessment systems and tools, training and awareness raising undertaken in all MDAs. Independent evaluators were also being deployed to the MDAs to carry out assessments, with promising results. However, the huge budget short-fall of nearly 80 percent, extending to the 2015/16 financial year, meant that a substantial number of key activities could not be undertaken, negatively affecting progress. The 25 MDAs which have signed performance contracts should pave the path for the outstanding MDAs to follow.

Pillar 3: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance

Finding 9: The development cooperation dialogue structures have been strengthened and are effective, to a large extent, and this has improved the dialogue between Government and the development partners, a positive development linked to the DEAP.

4.5.7 Strengthening Aid and Debt Management

Has there been strengthening of aid and debt management functions ?

The DEAP is acknowledged by the DAD as an effective engagement mechanism targeted at strengthening the improvement of approaches to managing and accounting for development assistance. Notable is support given to the training of DAD officers in monitoring and evaluating and debt management. The production of the first development cooperation atlas covering years 2012/2013 to 2014/2015 is also attributed to the support that came through DEAP. Subsequently, the 2016 development cooperation calendar and its dissemination was undertaken with the input packaged through DEAP. Although there remains more work to be undertaken, with a greater focus on results, the programme is understood by the ET to be a strategic move to enhancing capacity to negotiate effectively, manage and account for development assistance.

Box 1

Malawi and the development cooperation architecture

Malawi is a very active member of global networks and partnerships in development cooperation strategy making and review processes, including monitoring processes for implementation of the Paris Declaration, several regional and global post-Busan processes, including the post-Busan Building Blocks, the Africa Action Plan on Development Effectiveness. Malawi co-Chairs, together with Mexico of the High Level Forum of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. However, there has been an inability by Malawi to effectively use the global networks and partnerships to influence the development cooperation and aid architecture in a manner that enables the country and developing countries in a similar status to directly benefit from the global platforms.

Source: Government of Malawi, 2014, DCS for Malawi, 2014 – 2018

Despite the notable success in development cooperation engagement, because of lack of national capacity and clout to influence the global aid management agenda, Malawi has been unable to leverage its positioning in the Global Development Partnership Forum to influence the development aid architecture. Malawi has lacked a strategy to drive the global development agenda, in the absence of evidence based analysis to input into the process.

4.5.8 Strengthening quality of the outputs produced

The DEAP has had a multi-faceted approach, seeking to address capacity development of the public sector across a range of areas. The CD has focused on priority issues, seeking to increase technical knowledge and organizational skills within the various intervention areas, starting from awareness raising, training, using carefully selected resource persons, often drawn internationally, commissioned a number of assignments which are undertaken based on transparent competitive bidding processes. Quality measurement processes were established and many of the outputs were subjected to quality control, apart from also being reviewed by a wide range of stakeholders at validation workshops, with recommendations made to improve the outputs, as far as was possible. Most of the work undertaken to date has fed into additional follow-up work to improve the DEAP implementation processes, in key strategic areas.

4.5.9 Are the outputs still likely to lead to the expected outcomes ?

It is observed that substantial progress has been made, under difficult circumstances, within the Malawian socio-economic, political development context. What this evaluation can categorically state is that, indeed challenges have been encountered with the DEAP, which are in many ways rooted to programme design challenges, which have also led to constraints at implementation level in capacitating and enabling the programme to deliver in the key result areas. At the same time, substantial progress has been made in laying building blocks which if given a chance could result in the achievement of the expected outcomes, to a large extent.

The DEAP does support the MGDS II, Vision 2020, public sector reforms, PFM, IFMIS, RBM, and other key components, which are central to turning around the country from its low international human development ranking to an improved status. Malawi is seeking to adopt the recommendations made from a number of key DEAP linked reviews and assessments, including those made through recent HLF engagements, the DCS framework, the comprehensive MGDS II review (2015) and others.

However, there remains some gaps in that the national government partners are still perceived within the DP and some development circles as not taking adequate decisive leadership in implementing the country's own national policies and strategies, by following them through with practical action. There has continued to be half-hearted attempts at the level of implementation of national policies and national development strategies (*notable is the Decentralisation Policy and measures to empower Decentralised Local Government*), with weak national resources. From various interviews with stakeholders, the ET assesses that appropriate actions to implement the policies are lacking, including some of the key actions agreed at the level of the DEAP Project Steering Committee.

Malawi continues to have substantial weaknesses in implementing her own national policies, creating some gaps between the policies and the reality on the ground. At the surface, these challenges can be attributable to the DEAP, but in reality there are bigger challenges beyond what the DEAP as a programme can handle. Many of the challenges are routed to the area of governance, which this Evaluation is not mandated to explore in any substantial manner.

4.6 Sustainability

Finding 10: Overall, the sustainability of DEAP depends to a large extent on the Government of Malawi (GoM) taking stronger leadership ownership of the development agenda,

prioritizing development interventions in a manner that corresponds to the available resource envelope; increased commitment by Government to finance key development programmes in the medium to long term. There is also need for continued engagement of development partners, at the very least, in the medium term. However, it should be noted that DEAP by its nature should be a long term intervention (beyond four years) to achieve real and lasting change, with the support of cooperating partners still highly valued.

4.6.1 Institutionalization of RBM in the public sector

This is rated **Lowly Accomplished** with respect to sustainability on the basis of developments to date. However, once established the potential for the RBM being sustained is high within the government machinery, though currently limited by the level of commitment in the public sector based on issues discussed in the foregoing analysis. The evaluation also notes that there were no adequate sustainability measures put in place to strengthen national institutional capacity in RBM. However, on a positive note, the production of the RBM manual was a step in the right direction which, if followed up with appropriate action at all levels is potentially instrumental to the achievement of sustainability in the medium to long-term.

4.6.2 Strengthening M&E system, National Statistical System and other components

M & E shows less than desirable, (**low accomplishment**) with challenges encountered with respect to sustainability largely because of lack of commitment at high levels of government in terms of financing M & E work and also manifested in what has been described as lack of demand for monitoring and evaluation, in general.

Despite efforts made at developing the national statistical system, work in this area remains substantially as unfinished business because of financial, technical and human resources constraints within the NSO, which in turn is rooted to national level financial resource constraints¹¹.

On the PED initiatives, sustainability is assessed to be high, in view of the structures already developed, which demonstrate a level of commitment by the GoM. With respect to other sub-components such as PET, sustainability depends to a large extent on government commitment, which still required demonstrable commitment from the State through resource mobilization.

Pillar 2: National institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and (MDGs)

4.6.3 Support to Programme Based Budgeting

As discussed, given the assessed level of buy-in by the GoM, the PBB is assessed to be highly sustainable overall, despite challenges within a number of MDAs and at District level. This is linked to the level of implementation of this component.

¹¹ Recent moves by the Malawian Government to improve funding to the NSO have been noted and documented in this Evaluation as a step in the right direction for the country.

4.6.4 Strengthening of the SWG process

Sustainability overall will depend on the level of commitment by the State in resource allocation to ensure the established operational structures are functional and effective in the medium to long term. However, the efforts made to date through the engagement of the OPC are commendable and are favourable to the sustainability of the SWG process should the agreed actions be enforced.

Pillar 3: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance

Strengthened aid and debt management functions and support to effective development cooperation: The institutional mechanisms established are **highly sustainable** to the extent that these are based on already established human resource capacity in government. In the meantime, this is an area where government commitment during the DEAP implementation period has been demonstrated to be high, a positive indicator for sustainability. The interventions have been mainstreamed in the 'normal' operations of Treasury and this is one of the building blocks for sustainability. Unlike in EP&D, the Treasury has managed to use the existing staff in the organization and the DEAP supported activities have been absorbed in the workplans.

4.7 Cross-Cutting Issues

Is there necessary and adequate human and institutional capacities to sustain flow of benefits ?

Key stakeholders, in their various forms, especially, within government are positioned to acquire the necessary institutional and human capacities to sustain the flow of the DEAP benefits as they would begin to show. To varying extents, staff from MDAs, and some at district levels efforts have been made build necessary human resources capacities and know-how to coordinate and manage complex organizational arrangements, especially at middle and lower management. However, there is no evidence available to show the extent previous and current efforts have delivered in the key area of capacity development and training in the public sector as linked to DEAP initiatives. This is against the background of lack of proper organization tracking measures in the public sector and inadequate progress tracking at both central and decentralized levels, including sectoral level.

Have relevant authorities taken the measures needed to ensure continuation of the services after the end of the DEAP ?

Key structures have been established, which should further the capacity development and training agenda for the Malawian public sector. These include the Performance Enforcement Department under the OPC, the new SWG coordination structure and the new National M&E coordination committee, spearheaded through EP & D and plans for the establishment of a new Planning Commission, amongst other developments. What might be missing is the policy and legal framework to guarantee enforcement of many of these structures, especially relating to cases where critical decisions and actions have to be made. The absence of such key enforcement instruments is what leads to a tendency in the eyes of many of reverting to usual practices which do not result in the completion of the required actions. Also notable is the

lack of involvement of the Human Resources Department as a key stakeholder in the implementation of DEAP, especially as this pertains to long term sustainability. The ET also observes that many of these issues are linked to high level governance and policy issues which this evaluation has not been mandated to analyse and yet are so crucial to the implementation of DEAP.

The existing policy and strategic framework, including the legal framework are vital ingredients for successful resources mobilization. However, tangible coordinated action at central level is missing, resulting in a situation tending toward an uncertain future, in view of the previous heavy dependence of Malawi on DP support, including the financial contribution of the EU and other development partners. There is the major challenge of financing of the DEAP activities at the end of the DP supported phase.

Clearly the GoM has provided substantial in-kind support to the DEAP through payment of staff salaries, with many of the government officers acting as strategic focal points. What is clear from the lessons learnt is that in order to achieve far reaching results, targeting and direct financing of certain key capacity development and training activities, which ought to be sustained over time is required. Through the application of the UN system, DEAP has benefitted greatly from largely short-term TA support given to various programme pillars. At this stage, given the work-in-progress type of many of the activities and outputs in most key result areas, including the M & E system, SWGs, Performance Enforcement, IFMIS, MIS, PBB, RBM, and others, it is clear that without DP support for DEAP, the GoM would not be in a position to sustain the efforts begun with the programme to a significant – apart from possibly reverting to the business as usual mode. From the foregoing, it seems clear that relevant authorities, specifically the GoM needs to take more adequate financial measures to ensure continuation of the services after the end of the Action. Clearly substantial support (human, financial and material) would still be required to deepen and consolidate work begun with DEAP support.

Work related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy III and the National Planning Commission adds to a list of interventions which require assistance. Considerations of Malawi's development effectiveness and accountability agenda need to take into account the efficacy through which the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and MGDS III outcomes will be achieved. The country will need both technical and financial support to facilitate efficient and effective management and monitoring of the SDGs and the MGDS III results. In this regard, it will be necessary for the government and development partners to come up with a technical and financial assistance vehicle similar to DEAP.

Measures to ensure gender equality and adoption of a human rights based approaches

In principle, within the DEAP approach, with GoM commitment to advancing gender equality has led to the prioritization of the following:

- Support to development and implementation of a gender equality mainstreaming policy;
- Support to gender sensitization in the design of the MGDS III, and the successor national strategy, in line with the recommendations of the recent comprehensive

- MGDS II review and other recent reviews; with staff in the public sector; including in gender budgeting; and
- Gathering of gender disaggregated data for purposes of monitoring and evaluation and reporting.

A recent UNDP evaluation of the outcome that deals with gender mainstreaming, indicates establishment of positive context for advancing gender equality (UNDP, 2015). This is demonstrated in the various policy and framework documents and establishment of national mechanisms on gender equality. However, it is noted that at practical levels, there has been limited progress in the realization of gender outcomes. There remains inadequate capacity for gender mainstreaming and gender analysis with no evidence of substantive engagement on gender overall. Within the national programming context, whilst there is recognition that achieving progress on gender equality and women's empowerment requires working collaboratively with other actors, the Evaluation Team finds no substantial partnership strategy for advancing gender equality.

5. Gaps and Challenges

DEAP has met several challenges in its implementation and as linked to various evaluation criteria. The following are some of the gaps and challenges.

5.1 Coordination

The DEAP is a reform programme aimed at redefining and refocusing development effectiveness and making the whole public sector machinery account for the development results based on implementation of the budget. The programme ultimately aims at improving service delivery of all public institutions in Malawi. While there are the coordination meetings and the steering committee meetings aimed at coordinating the implementation of the programme, there is limited engagement to unravel issues requiring working together and delivering as one. For example, the PED and the EPD would achieve more in the performance enforcement area if they jointly planned and implemented the performance monitoring and enforcement for the MDAs.

Some development partners are of the view that they have been left out on planning and reporting of the DEAP. Specifically some UN agencies argue that their contributions are not adequately reported on under the DEAP due to coordination challenges. There is a perception that there are operational and management challenges that lead to this situation whereby at times the UN agencies miss out on some meetings, worsened with gaps in sharing information between the UN agencies¹². This sometimes leads to reporting that does not fully cover the reality and key issues pertaining to programme implementation, within the context of Delivering as One.

5.2 Implementation of workplans

Whilst progress has been made with implementation of some activities spelt out in the workplans of some components and sub-components have faced challenges in financial

¹²One of the reasons cited is the short notice given for programme management meetings, as well as inadequate sharing of information between agencies after the meetings, especially on key issues.

resourcing of key activities, partly because of delays linked to bureaucracy in procurement processes and in part due to external factors. Challenges in resource planning and inadequate human resources provision in the implementation arrangements have been faced in a number of areas. Commitment on the part of the GoM has also, in some cases not been backed up with adequate financial and human resource deployment, this being both in terms of number and quality¹³. Overall, the financial resources available for DEAP implementation fell short of the needs stated at the initial planning stage, being roughly one-third of the original budget projected for the period of the programme.

5.3 Staff turnover and availability of human resources

In order to entrench a culture of results in Malawi, there is need for staff to understand the concepts of RBM and principles and practice. There is also a requirement for staff that can understand and catch onto the principles and be able to practice the same at ministry and district levels. However, the situation in the human resource area is currently so fluid that some people that the programme has engaged and developed their capacity have moved on leaving replacements that do not have knowledge of the programme. In the district councils, the M&E officers are not on established positions. In the statistics office, the vacancy rate is about 50 percent. In most of the sector ministries there are no qualified people that can take on the M&E function at the district level. The government transfers people from place to place without considering the investment that the ministry or programmes like DEAP have made in the said officer to implement the programme activities. The new person replacing such officers are sometimes so new that the training process has to start all over again.

5.4 Delays in implementing activities due to procurement challenges

There were indications of delays in implementation of key programme activities due to procurement delays, which could have been resolved faster with improved communication and dialogue between the implementing partners and the UNDP. Because of financial challenges which culminated in audit queries earlier during programme implementation (a situation which has since been resolved), the component of the work coordinated through EP&D was particularly negatively affected, with the need to restore trust and confidence which had been negatively affected in the earlier programme period. The generation of renewed trust, confidence and improved understanding between the parties involved is central to resolving procurement delays which in turn delayed implementation of some of the programme activities.

5.5 Changes to policy on off-duty allowances

At the time the DEAP was planned, there was a tacit assumption that government staff will be getting allowances as was the case at the time. However, things changed along the way, when the system of full board on official off-station duties was introduced – meaning that the public officers were supposed to be given full board (accommodation and food) when they go out of their duty station. This affected the attendance and participation to trainings and workshops as public officials have been protesting the system of giving them full board. As a result the implementation of the DEAP activities was also affected, to some extent.

¹³ This situation is against the background of financial challenges facing the GoM and the public sector as a whole, and in more recent years, largely due to changes in funding relations with key development partners (donors).

Information from different stakeholders, generated during the DEAP Evaluation, especially within the public sector made it very clear that the change of policy on daily subsistence allowances had the negative effect on participation in many different activities. Moreover, senior public officers had ways of ‘wriggling out of important workshops and training meetings’, without giving the impression that they were in fact boycotting the meetings. The Evaluation Team has been reliably informed during stakeholder consultations that the new policy shift on off-duty allowances, in favour of the ‘full-board’ system has affected many capacity development and training meetings convened under the auspices of DEAP and several other programmes in recent times.

5.6 Lack of trust for mutual accountability

In the case of the component of the programme managed through EP & D, the UNDP is understood to be providing accounting services to EP&D which is not in line with the aspect of mutual accountability. The Evaluation Team understands the underlying challenges and reasons that led to UNDP taking over the accounting functions from EP&D. However, after deliberating on the concerns raised from both parties, the UNDP and EP&D needed to reach a common understanding, with a handover of the programme accounting function back to EP&D in the spirit of fostering national ownership and use of national systems – under certain agreed conditions. The handover process needed to be effected and be subjected to monitoring over time, to assess if procurement and financial management rules were being fully adhered to by the implementing partners.

6. Good Practices And Lessons Learnt

6.1 The case for designing programmes with long term perspective

Notwithstanding the challenges of securing long term financing for programmes, an important lesson from the DEAP is the need to design interventions, taking into account the likelihood of follow-up programmes, with consideration of the long-term perspective. The underlying assumptions related to the time and processes required to achieve DEAP outcomes and outputs needed to be tested against reality at practical level. For the programme period, the targets were largely unrealistic for full achievement during the implementation period.

6.2 Commitment by Government to Public Sector Reforms including Public Financial Management

A major point to DEAP relates to linkages to public sector reforms. Synergies between the PSR, the PFM and DEAP, are indeed central for achievement of programme outcomes. At both the design and implementation level, there has been inadequate articulation of how the DEAP interfaces with the PSR, as a major component of the latter, to which other DPs have contributed immensely over the years. In principle Government commitment to the PSR, which has been documented in recent years, has been declared at the highest level and remains a pre-requisite to the sustainability of DEAP. At the practical level, how the policy declaration is executed is a different issue. The Evaluation concludes that there is need for public policy proclamations on the PSR and PFM to be matched a great deal more with realities of tangible actions on the ground. This is in view of the slow pace of implementation of the PSR and the PFM, which has been a concern of many stakeholders, from DPs, CSOs and from the private sector circles for a long time.

6.3 Leadership, coordination and institutional management arrangements

In view of the lessons learnt between the successes of Treasury in managing its component of DEAP in relation to the challenges faced by EPD, there is need to adopt good practices in leadership, coordination and institutional management of the programme, which are sustainable, based on specific conditions and situations within the public sector. Variations in institutional and human resources capacities also need to be considered in determining implementation modalities, together with any other 'dynamics' that may not be evident or lend themselves to public scrutiny.

Relating to this differential performance of the two departments of the same Ministry, the key lessons learnt can be stated as follows:-

- a) *Leadership, management and coordination:* EPD has been without a substantive head for a long, first with an Acting Permanent Secretary, Acting Principal Director; the M & E Director has been in acting capacity for more than 3 years. Whereas, Treasury has had stable leadership and better direction, the same cannot be said for EP & D, where the effects of a leadership vacuum has been evident.
- b) The coordination structures of DEAP have been structured differently between the two departments, with Treasury using the staff of the department, almost entirely, in coordinating and managing relevant programme components, with the support of an external TA. On the other hand, EP & D has opted to hire a full-time programme coordinator for the component managed by the department. However, for reasons that cannot be ascribed to individual ineptitude, programme coordination within the EP & D has been less than smooth, with communication challenges encountered with different key stakeholders. These challenges have contributed to slowing down progress in implementation of key components and sub-components of the programme.
- c) Commitment to capacity development of staff has also been variable between the two departments, and in particular as it pertains to DEAP; with Treasury showing more interest in staff capacity development than EP&D as evidenced by the programmes that Treasury staff have participated in.
- d) *Leadership Buy-In:* Management and leadership buy in is very crucial when there are strategic and operational changes with potential far reaching results in the public sector. The DEAP needs to ensure the relevant public sector department or unit leaders understand fully the rationale for any significant changes, have a buy-in at the beginning of each initiative to enable smooth integration and institutionalisation of new systems and changes.

6.4 *Development Cooperation Strategy*

There is need to consider the positive lessons learnt with the DCS and the establishment of the HLF, with support structures that have largely been effective in delivering on the development agenda. The partnership strategy employed between the DPs, led by the UNDP, in collaboration of other stakeholders has largely been effective and is credited for the substantial progress made in the implementation of the Development Cooperation Strategy and in engaging and sustaining dialogue through the HLF, keeping hopes for a turnaround of the country's aid management strategy. In the event that current efforts are sustained and scaled up, accompanied with complementary activities, there is potential for built-up of renewed trust and confidence between the DPs and the GoM, following a challenging situation in the management of relationships.

6.5 *Results based Management, Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance Enforcement*

A major lesson learnt is that commitment to RBM, Monitoring and Evaluation and Performance Enforcement through taking of practical measures at implementation level is required at the highest level, with accountability linked to existing structures, which include the Executive and Parliament. Government Ministries and Departments need to be conscientized to appreciate, especially the role RBM and M&E so that they commit the right personnel and adequate human and financial resources, on a sustainable basis, to these functions at the headquarters as well as at decentralized levels.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Main Conclusions and Recommendations

This section gives a synthesis of conclusions and recommendations from the Evaluation.

Conclusion 1

Overall, substantial progress has been made, specifically, in the following components:-

- i. Programme Based Budgeting (PBB) has now been extended to all MDAs, following a successful pilot phase; however, further capacity building still remains;
- ii. Performance Contracting (all MDAs are now submitting performance contracts and service charters). The Performance Evaluation Report for 2015/2016 was endorsed by the President of the Republic of Malawi;
- iii. Formulation of the new National Development Strategy, with the establishment of the National Planning Commission, and formulation of the new MGDS (now nearly finalized);
- iv. The Development Cooperation Atlas was produced, which is enhancing coordination and division of labour among cooperating partners in the development process;
- v. The Aid Management Platform was established; this is improving transparency and data quality on cooperating partners interventions; and
- vi. The Integrated Performance Management Information System (IPMIS) has been designed and installed following comprehensive user consultations and review. IPMIS links data on performance of institutions coming from various sectors through an integrated website.

Whilst substantial progress has been made with processes and steps taken to strengthen the M & E, RBM and Performance Enforcement, gaps still remained in the achievement of the same as set in the DEAP output and outcome indicators.

Recommendation 1

Overall

There is need to strengthen delivery of results from national development processes and key interventions with improved focus on M & E, RBM and PE.

Specific

- i. Establish common ground between Government and DPs in development of the successor strategy, implementation and results framework of MGDS III;
- ii. Government establish a robust system of monitoring that is linked to rewards for performance and sanctions for non-performance;
- iii. Government in collaboration with the UN, DPs contribute more financial resources to mainstream PE, monitoring and capacity building, ensuring sustainability; establish and adopt more concrete steps (with a focus on innovative financing and capacity building), through collaboration, especially between government and DPs, to develop a more functional, decentralized M & E system, RBM and performance enforcement with improved accountability structures.
- iv. OPC, with support of Treasury ensure and guarantee buy-in from senior leadership in government; DEAP engage fully the Legislature, Executive/OPC and Treasury for sustainability and achievement of impacts;
- v. GoM fully integrate M & E reporting structures, between OPC, PED, EP & D, RBM, IFMIS, MIS, Budget, Treasury, National Statistical Office; different sectors, and District Councils, taking into account the MGDS III and the SDGs; OPC ensure Government Ministries appreciate drive on RBM and M&E capacity building; including development of harmonized functional district level systems;

Conclusion 2

Notable but not sufficient progress has been made with the steps taken on the SWGs. More substantial practical action is required to turnaround the situation of SWGs, including at the policy level.

Recommendation 2

Overall: Enhancing the Functionality of SWGs

Specific

- i. Senior government management give practical guidance to enhance functionality, including decisive direction and leadership;
- ii. Effective and sustained financial resource mobilization to ensure effectiveness; improved capacity development in priority areas and or sectors;
- iii. Ensure establishment of effective coordination structures of SWGs; tying functionality of the SWG to performance assessment of the public institutions;
- iv. Government, in collaboration with UNDP, DPs ensure full commitment and participation of the private sector and CSOs, especially in TWGs SWGs; linking this to predictable financial resources and logistical support for private sector and CSO participation; support strategies to ensure improved financing of key CSO

programmes. especially those in areas of potential high impacts in national programme implementation;

Conclusion 3

Considerable progress has been made in the strengthening of institutionalization of PBB in the public sector. However, more effort is needed in capacity building, especially at middle and senior management level to enable increased and more widespread application of the PBB.

Recommendation 3

Overall: Strengthening Institutionalization of PBB

Specific

- i. Treasury engage the MDAs more and for longer period to develop capacity in PBB application.
- ii. Government commitment to sustained capacity development in PBB by senior managers to strengthen the momentum for PB; linking PBB to PED, M & E and IFMIS and sectoral strategic plans.
- iii. Treasury ought to take more bold steps to link budgeting and resource allocation to defined strategic direction of the MDAs and to clearly define performance indicators for prioritized sectors and programme components.

Conclusion 4

Because the DEAP managed to secure 30 percent of the planned financial resource requirement, programme implementation has resulted in reduction of the breath and scope of activities implemented, with a number of outstanding ones, reducing the sustainability and potential impacts of the programme.

Recommendation 4

Recommendation on no-cost extension and re-prioritization of expenditures

- i. To satisfactorily complete the prioritized DEAP development agenda, the Evaluation recommends **re-prioritization or re-programming of planned expenditures, taking into account the priorities set in the MGDS III and the SDGs**. This is in view of the under-resource mobilization of 30 percent of targeted resources for DEAP implementation.
- ii. The Evaluation recommends a no-cost-extension of the DEAP, with a proposal for the UNDP, other UN agencies, the EU, GoM recommitting themselves to fast-track implementation of priority outstanding activities as per revised workplans;

Conclusion 5

Work related to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy III and the National Planning Commission adds to a list of key interventions which require to be prioritized and provided with technical and financial assistance by cooperating partners.

Recommendation 5

GoM/Cooperating Partners: Considerations of Malawi's development effectiveness and accountability agenda need to take into account the efficacy through which the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and MGDS III outcomes will be achieved. The country will need both technical and financial support to facilitate efficient and effective management and monitoring of the SDGs and the MGDS III results. In this regard, it will be necessary for the government and development partners to come up with a technical and financial assistance vehicle similar to DEAP.

Conclusion 6:

A major lesson from the DEAP is the need to design interventions, taking into account the likelihood of follow-up programmes, which take into account more long term perspective. The assumptions related to the time and processes required to achieve DEAP outcomes and outputs also need to be tested against reality. For the programme period, the targets were too ambitious for full achievement during the implementation period.

Programming for SDGs coupled with the need for effective management and accountability in MGDS III implementation exert additional financial and technical support.

Recommendation 6

The Evaluation recommends a New Programme Phase (Phase 2)

- i. Programmes such as DEAP require sustained and long-term engagement to change tools, procedures, and mindsets. In addition, considering the strategic importance of DEAP in fostering effective management and monitoring of MGDS III implementation, sound programming for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and quality technical support for the National Planning Commission to assume its role effectively, the evaluation recommends a new programme phase. DEAP will be key for Malawi's arrangements to improve accountability for use of development resources and achievement of results.
- ii. A new phase of DEAP could also be a vehicle for implementing public sector reforms which seek to strengthen the operating environment for enhancing development effectiveness.

- iii. In view of the fore-going conclusions and the strategic importance of DEAP, the evaluation recommends a new programme phase, focusing on priorities of priorities, as guided by the MGDS III and the SDGs. The UN is still well positioned to continue leading the DEAP process in view of its coordination role, institutional capacity development and responsibility vis a vis other DPs.

Conclusion 7

The DEAP lacks an exit strategy. Most of the programme activities have remained heavily reliant on donor funding, with less than desirable direct financial contribution from the GoM, a situation which is not conducive to its sustainability.

Recommendation 7

Development and Implementation of Exit Strategy

UN, EU and Treasury: Consideration of lessons learnt in terms of resources mobilization must be done within the context of a country where the terrain of development programme funding has changed dramatically recently, due to Cashgate, corruption, DP consideration of the country as high risk, political consideration including level of decisiveness at high level to tackle critical development concerns, including corruption, sustaining of Public Sector Reforms, including IFMIS, PE and M & E.

Conclusion 8

Overall, there has been limited progress in the realization of gender outcomes in Malawi. There is inadequate capacity for gender mainstreaming and gender analysis with no evidence of substantive engagement on gender equality. Within the national programming context, there is recognition that achieving progress on gender equality and women's empowerment requires networking and collaboration between different stakeholders. The Evaluation concludes that there is still no substantial partnership strategy for advancing gender equality in the country.

Recommendation 8

Gender Equality and Human Rights Approaches

- i. In view of the challenges that continue to be experienced with respect to gender, the UN/DEAP approach must improve the design, planning process, resource allocation, implementation, with stronger measures for monitoring and disaggregation of benefits and show differences between groups of women, men youth, and other marginalised groups; and,
- ii. In the new programme phase, the GoM and DPs also need to make renewed commitment to partnerships to deliver in key result areas, including on gender equality and human rights.

Recommendation 9

Toward a Stronger Coordination for DEAP and Development Partners

In view of the coordination challenges of DEAP cited in this Evaluation, with three components¹⁴, UNDP as a lead agency and coordinator for the programme should at each point or reporting check with other UN organizations on their reporting requirements. The other UN organisations should also be pro-active in sharing any information on the implementation of DEAP. *Delivering As One* has an advantage of streamlining processes and also releasing pressure on the government counterparts on the requirements to produce multiple reports using multiple reporting mechanisms. Considering that there is no stability of personnel in the public service and also the general inadequacy of staff especially at district council level, the Evaluation recommends that for the initial period of say three years, professional UNVs should be deployed to the district councils and line ministries that require human resources support. The UNVs could assist in institutionalization of the RBM in organizations and in line ministries. It is emphasized that the persons involved should be professional UNVs that would support and develop capacity of the organisations to incorporate the RBM principles and practices and develop the architecture for the RBM in organizational planning and implementation of an appropriate M&E system. The UNVs would assist in developing M&E frameworks of the district councils and ministries that are struggling to do so. A good example of where this is working is the Ministry of Gender and Children Affairs where UNICEF placed UNVs to support the development of Child Protection Information Management System and its roll out to the districts.

Furthermore, in view of the frustrations generated on the side of the implementation partners with the procurement process, UNDP also ought to review and adopt measures to improve procurement, improve communication and dialogue with IP management and focal persons, to ensure that any challenges of constraints linked to procurement requests and disbursement of funds are tackled without delays. This would also build improved trust and confidence of the UN processes with implementing partners and stakeholders.

¹⁴ The three components can remain under one management structure, with improved communication and linkages, under a reviewed monitoring, evaluation and reporting system.

7.2 Synthesis of Key Recommended Actions from the Evaluation of the DEAP

| Table 9: Key Recommendations, Roles and Responsibilities and Scheduling of Actions | | | Type of action required | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Objectives of the actions | Recommended actions | Role and Responsibility | Immediate term June – Sept. 2017 | Medium term Oct. 2017- June 2018 | Long term July 2018 – 2020 |
| 1. Strengthening development effectiveness and accountability through improved monitoring and evaluation, implementation of results-based management and performance enforcement measures | DEAP management foster establishment of common ground between Government and DPs in development and finalization of MGDS III, development of appropriate implementation and results frameworks; ensuring stronger and clearer synergies with the PSR and the PFM programmes. | National Planning Commission, UN, MFEPD, OPC | | | |
| | Government establish a robust system of monitoring and performance enforcement tracking that is linked to rewards for good accomplishments and sanctions for non-performance | OPC, Treasury, enforced by Legislature, Act of Parliament | | | |
| | Government in collaboration with the UN, DPs contribute more financial resources to mainstream PE, monitoring and capacity building, ensuring sustainability; establish and adopt more concrete steps (with a focus on innovative financing and capacity building), through collaboration, especially between government and DPs, to develop a more functional, decentralized M & E system, RBM and performance enforcement with improved accountability structures. | OPC, Legislature, Treasury, with UN support | | | |
| | OPC, with support of Treasury ensure and guarantee buy-in from senior leadership in government; OPC ensure Government Ministries appreciate drive on RBM and M&E capacity building and linkages with the PSR and PFM; including development of harmonized functional district level systems; DEAP engage fully the Legislature, Executive/OPC and Treasury for sustainability and achievement of impacts; | OPC, Treasury, National Planning Commission | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | GoM fully integrate and or link M & E reporting structures, between OPC, PED, EP & D, (relating to RBM, PBB, IFMIS, MIS, taking into account the MGDS III and the SDGs; | National Planning Commission, OPC | | | |
| 2. To enhance the functionality of sector working groups (SWGs) | Senior government management give practical guidance to enhance functionality, including decisive direction and leadership; | | | | |
| | Reality grounded restructuring of Sectors in view of Public Sector Reform agenda, based on best practice and lessons learnt and gaps identified in previous reviews (internal and external) | OPC | | | |
| | DEAP/MoFEPD management ensure effective and sustained financial resource mobilization to ensure effectiveness; improved capacity development in priority areas and or sectors; | OPC, MFEPD | | | |
| | OPC/MoFEPD ensure establishment of effective coordination structures and networking fora of SWGs; tying functionality of the SWG to performance assessment of the public institutions and delivery of results | OPC, National Planning Commission, MoFEPD | | | |
| | Government, in collaboration with UNDP, DPs ensure full commitment and participation of the private sector and CSOs, especially in TWGs SWGs; linking this to predictable financial resources and logistical support for private sector and CSO participation; support strategies to ensure improved financing of key CSO programmes. especially those in areas of potential high impacts in national programme implementation; | OPC, MoFEPD, National Planning Commission, UNDP | | | |
| 3. Strengthening institutionalization of PBB | Treasury engage the MDAs more and for longer period to develop capacity in PBB application, sustain effort of mainstreaming PBB in MDAs through enhanced capacity building to decentralized levels. | Treasury, MoF | | | |
| | Government commitment to sustained capacity development in PBB by senior managers to strengthen the momentum for PB; linking PBB to PED, M & E and IFMIS and the PFM programme. | Treasury, MoF | | | |
| 4a. To satisfactorily complete prioritized DEAP development agenda | No-cost extension <i>Evaluation recommends a cost-extension of the DEAP, with a proposal for the</i> UNDP, other UN agencies, the EU, GoM recommitting to fast-track implementation of priority outstanding activities, refer to revised workplans and new priorities; | UN, EU, Treasury, MoF | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Re-prioritization or re-programming of planned expenditures: This is in view of the under-resource mobilization of 30 percent of targeted resources for DEAP implementation. | | | | |
| 4b. The future of DEAP in relation to sustainability and impact and exit strategy | <p>New programme phase: In view of the strategic importance of DEAP, the evaluation recommends a new programme phase, minimum 4 years, (focusing on priorities of priorities, as guided by the MGDS III and the SDGs).</p> <p>Proposal for reviewed DEAP thrust: stronger focus on targeted capacity development (human technical and organizational skills, institutional (software and hardware), sustainability measures and delivery of results). The UN is still well positioned to continue leading the DEAP process in view of its coordination role and responsibility vis a vis DPs.</p> <p>Exit Strategy: DEAP should consider lessons learnt in terms of resources mobilization in a country where the terrain of development programme funding has changed dramatically recently, due to Cashgate, corruption, DP consideration of the country as high risk, political consideration including level of decisiveness at high level to tackle critical development concerns, including corruption, sustaining of Public Sector Reforms, including IFMIS, PE and M & E.</p> | <p>UN, EU, Treasury, MoF</p> <p>UN, EU, Treasury</p> | | | |
| 5. Improvement of achievement of gender equality and human rights outcomes | UNDP/GoM: Improve the design, planning process, resource allocation, implementation, monitoring of gender equality and human rights outcomes and disaggregating benefits and showing clearly differences between groups of women, men youth, and other marginalised groups | UN, MoFEPD, DPs | | | |
| 6. Financial and technical support for SDGs and MGDS III implementation | GoM/Cooperating Partners: Take into account the efficacy of support to achieve SDGs and MGDS II outcomes; the technical and financial inputs required; effective management and performance monitoring of the SDGs and MGDS III results. | OPC, National Planning Commission, MoFEPD, UN, DPs | | | |

Selected References

- AfDB, 2011. Climate Adaptation for Livelihoods and Agriculture, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- AfDB, 2013. Malawi Country Strategy Paper, 2013 – 2017, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- AUC, 2014. Agenda 2063, The Africa We Want.
- Busan Partnership, 2012. Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, Busan, Korea.
- Development Partners' Forum, 2015. Development Partners' Statement for High Level Forum, Lilongwe.
- GoM (MFEPPD), various years. Malawi Growth Development Strategy, Various Annual Review Reports, An Assessment of Annual Achievements for the 2009, 2010, 2012/13, 2013/14, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 1998. Malawi Local Government Act, 42, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2012. Malawi Development Assistance Strategy (2006-11).
- GoM, et al, 2015. MDG Endline Survey, Multi Indicator Cluster Survey, Main Report, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2000. Vision 2020. The National Long-Term Development Perspective for Malawi, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2011. Malawi Growth Development Strategy II, 2011 – 2016.
- GoM, 2011. Public Financial and Economic Management Reform Programme (PFEM), July 2011 - June 2014.
- GoM, 2012 - 2015. Joint Sector Performance Reviews, Various, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2014. Public Financial Management Review Report, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- GoM, 2014. Sector Working Group Planning and Management Guidelines, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2014. Trade , Industry and Private Sector Development (TIP), SWAp Joint Sector Plan, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2014. Development Cooperation Strategy for Malawi, Making Development Cooperation Work for Results, 2014 - 2018, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2014. Malawi: Review of the Public Service Reform, Final Report, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- GoM, 2015. Challenges Affecting Economic Growth and Development in Malawi, Issues Paper, 2015, High Level Forum, Lilongwe.
- GoM, 2015. Integrated Rural Development Strategy, Lilongwe.
- GoM, Various Years. TIP, SWAp Joint Sector Working Group Reviews, 2012 – 2014, Lilongwe.
- GoM/UN, 2014. Localization of the Post-2015 Development Agenda, Malawi Report on Second Phase of Post 2015 Consultations, The World We Want, Lilongwe.
- GoM/UNDP, 2014. Malawi MDG Progress Report, Lilongwe.
- GoM/UNDP, 2014. Review of Functionality of Sector Working Groups in Malawi, Lilongwe.
- GoM/UNDP, 2014. State of M & E in Malawi, Final Report, Lilongwe.
- GoM/UNDP, 2015. Report on the Review of the Second National Decentralisation Programme (NDP II), Lilongwe.
- GoM/UNDP, 2015. Malawi National Human Development Report, Inclusive Growth in Malawi, Lilongwe.
- Government of Malawi, 2010. Malawi Constitution, Government Printer, Lilongwe.
- Government of Malawi, 2010. Malawi Health Sector Strategic Plan, 2011-2016; Ministry of Health and Population; Lilongwe.
- Government of Malawi, 2012. 2010/11 Integrated Household Survey, National Statistical Office (NSO), Zomba.
- Government of Malawi, 2013. Building Accountable and Transparent Institutions Democratic Governance Sector Strategy 2013 – 2017; Lilongwe.

- Government of Malawi, 2013. The Gender, Children, Youth & Sports Sector Working Group Joint Sector Strategic Plan 2013-2017; Lilongwe.
- Government of Malawi, 2014. Education Statistics 2014; Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST), EMIS; Lilongwe.
- Government of Malawi, 2015. National Human Rights Action Plan (Draft 2016 - 2020); Lilongwe.
- Government of Malawi, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, Economic Reports, Various issues; Lilongwe.
- Government of Malawi/UNDP, 2015. Issues Paper for the Development of the National Human Rights Action Plan (2016 -2020); Lilongwe.
- Malawi National Statistical Office and ICF Macro. 2011. 2010 Malawi Demographic and Health Survey: Key Findings. Calverton, Maryland, USA: NSO and ICF Macro.
- MGDS Review Reports: various. 2006/07 Annual Review, 2009 Annual Review, 2010 Annual Review, 2011 Annual Review, Lilongwe.
- National Statistics Office [Malawi], 2014. Malawi MDG Endline Survey 2014, Key Findings. Zomba: National Statistical Office.
- Public Sector Reforms Commission, 2015. Making Malawi Work, Final Report, Lilongwe, Malawi.
- RBM Training List of Participants, 2015, Victoria Hotel, Blantyre, 21 – 25 September, 2015.
- Saasa, O.S., and Chingaipe, H., 2015, Mid-term Evaluation, UNDAF Outcome 4.2, Improving Capacity of Public Institutions in Malawi to Manage, Allocate and Utilise Resources for Effective Development and service Delivery, Lilongwe, July, 2015.
- The World Bank, 2013. Malawi Public Expenditure Review, Africa Region.
- UN Women, 2015. National Gender Budget Analysis for Selected National Line Ministries & Departments; Financial Year 2015/16; Lilongwe.
- United Nations/GoM, 2013, Strengthening Institutional Capacity Development Effectiveness and Accountability, Project Document, Lilongwe, Malawi
- UNDP, 2014. Assessment of Democratic Governance in Malawi Political Participation, Civic Education and Democratic Accountability (Final Draft); Lilongwe.
- United Nations Malawi, 2015. Evaluation of Outcome 4.3 and Gender Mainstreaming in All Outcomes, United Nation Development Assistance Framework (2012-2016); Lilongwe.
- United Nations, 2014. Malawi Human Development Report 2014, Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience Explanatory note on the 2014 Human Development Report composite indices, UN; New York.
- UN, 2016, Impact Evaluation of Past HACT Training Workshops in Malawi, Final Evaluation Report, Lilongwe.

Biodata of Consultants – Stephen Chipika

Holder of a PhD in Policy and Practice, focusing on Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) within the African context, a Masters Degree in Applied Social Sciences, a BSc Economics Degree; more than 25 years of experience with international development programmes, and more than 20 years direct experience with monitoring and evaluation, evaluation of national development projects, including aid and development effectiveness, national development and strategic planning, capacity building for development planning, including budgeting, results-based management (RBM) for the UN, governments and international organisations, policy development, research and practice, poverty reducing and pro-poor development strategies, United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), support to multi-disciplinary programmes, partnerships, inclusive growth; cross-cutting issues: experience in gender equality and mainstreaming gender in development, gender sensitive qualitative and quantitative data collection. Am familiar with the human rights-based approach, national and local government structures, governance and accountability, institutional development, economic growth and development strategies and sustainable livelihoods. Have substantial knowledge of the Malawian policy and development frameworks, MGDS II, political, socio-cultural and policy context, knowledge of African development issues, including the SDGs, other UN and global development assistance frameworks. Have more than 8 years of in-depth experience as International Monitor Expert under the EU supported Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) System which covers application of the EU standard monitoring and evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, partnership strategy and impact, amongst other issues. Have been engaged in various programmes supported by the UNDP, other UN agencies, international cooperation partners and national programmes. I have conducted myself with consistency and exceptionally well throughout all the international and national assignments, working as Senior Expert and in numerous cases as Team Leader. Examples of programmes I have worked on include those of the following organisations: UN Country Teams (UNCT), UNDP, IFAD, ILO, FAO, WFP, WHO, UNICEF, UN Women, UNFPA, UNIDO, UNCDF, UNCTAD, UNESCO, EU, DANIDA, DFID, COMESA, World Bank, and others, demonstrating strong leadership of multi-disciplinary teams in complex organisational arrangements. I have a proven track record of producing high quality and providing valuable support to a wide variety of development programmes with practical recommendations and strategic directions which are easy to follow and can be acted upon by different international clients. *(Refer to detailed CV attached).*

ANNEXES

Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme

Project ID: 00071958

Evaluation Draft Terms of Reference

International Consultant – Team Leader

1. CONTEXT

1.1 Background

The Joint Programme on Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability (DEAP) is the UN response to enhance development effectiveness by improving systems, tools and mechanisms for national policy and strategic planning, management, monitoring, evaluation, reporting and accountability. The programme seeks to entrench the culture of accountability for effective use of resources and achievement of results in public institutions. Key strategic areas of support include: 1) institutionalizing Results-Based Management practices in the public sector; 2) harmonization and alignment of development planning and budgeting tools including the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) and the national budget to support implementation of MGDS priorities; and 3) strengthening capacity for development assistance management. Ultimately, the programme contributes to the improvements in the management, allocation and utilization of public resources for effective development and service delivery.

1.2 Programme Outcome

DEAP is aligned to UNDAF (2012-2016) outcome 4.2. *“Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate, and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016”*. The scope of the outcome is consistent with objectives of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (2011-2016) Theme 5, namely: Improved Governance - Sub-theme 1: Economic Governance. DEAP is contributing to the following MGDS strategies: 1) harmonizing the national budget and priorities in the national development strategy; 2) ensuring that external support is aligned to the national development strategy; 3) ensuring that sectoral and local plans are aligned to the national development strategy; 4) strengthening the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the national development strategies and programmes; 5) improving national procurement, audit and reporting systems at all levels; and 6) developing capacity for negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements.

1.3 Expected Programme Outputs:

Output 1. National Institutions utilize Results-Based Management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results.

Output 2: National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and MDGs for efficient achievement of development results.

Output 3: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance.

The Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development (MOFEPD) is the Implementing Partner (IP) for the Joint Programme and is responsible for the overall planning and management of the programme and achievement of its objectives. The Debt and Aid Division of MOFEPD, the Economic Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation Divisions of the Economic Planning and Development Department of MOFEPD and the Department of Performance Enforcement in the Office of the President and Cabinet are Responsible Parties for the activities of the JP. The MOFEPD's Budget Division and the National Statistics Office are responsible for implementation of individual activities supported by the programme.

DEAP is a four year programme (2013-2016) with financial contributions from the EU, UNICEF, UNFPA and UNDP, while other UN agencies such as UN WOMEN contribute to some activities as well. UNDP and the EU have signed a contribution agreement and comingle their resources while UNICEF and the UNFPA provide parallel financing. The EU/UNDP contribution agreement covers the period 2014-2016.

1.4 2012-2016 UNDAF and UNDAF Outcome 4.2 Evaluations

The UNDAF (2012-2016) was evaluated in May, 2015. The evaluation included an assessment of the progress towards achieving Outcome 4.2. In addition to the UNDAF evaluation Outcome 4.2, UNDP outcome 30 was evaluated in June, 2015. This included a specific focus on DEAP which is a major part of the support under Outcome 4.2.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purposes of the end of term evaluation are to:

- 5 Determine the extent to which the outcome and outputs of the programme have been achieved;
- 6 Assess UNDP and other participating UN's contribution to outcome;
- 7 Document the achievements and lessons learnt during the course of implementation to inform future decisions in design, implementation and management of similar interventions.

The independent evaluation is to be conducted before the end of August, 2016.

The main users of the evaluation results include:

- Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development
- OPC: Performance Enforcement Department
- OPC: Department of Human Resources Management and Development
- Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
- National Statistical Office (NSO)
- UNDP

- The European Union
- UNICEF
- UNFPA
- UN AIDS
- UN Women
- World Bank
- International Monetary Fund
- African Development Bank
- JICA

3. THE SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will be conducted during the period July-August, 2016, with a view to providing the status of progress towards the programme outcome and outputs and providing lessons learnt and recommendations for improving programme effectiveness. The evaluation will assess:

- 1) The relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the joint programme.
- 2) The progress made towards achieving the outcome and outputs and what can be derived in terms of good practices, lessons learned and recommendations for future joint UN interventions and support together with other development partners, in the field of development effectiveness.
- 3) The evaluation will consider the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation under UNDAF Outcome 4.2/CPD Outcome 30. Annex 4 provides a list of further documents to be consulted by the evaluators.

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess and analyse the progress made by the programme to date towards achieving the programme outcome and outputs and the sustainability of these results;
- Determine the impact, both positive and negative, from contribution of the programme to the achievement of the outcome;
- Examine and analyse factors which have positively and negatively impacted on achievement of programme outputs and outcome;
- Assess the relevance of the outputs to the effective achievement of the outcome;
- Assess the relevance of the programme to national priorities;
- Assess the effectiveness of institutional arrangements and partnership strategies;
- Examine the extent to which gender equality and women empowerment and human rights targets as cross-cutting issues were integrated and achieved;
- Distil recommendations, lessons and best practices for future programming and improvement in planning for the remainder of the programme;
- Make recommendations in strategic areas for improving the programme design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, partnership arrangement, and cross-cutting issues.

4 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

4.1 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will use standard evaluation criteria to assess performance, viz: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

4.2 Evaluation questions:

In order to meet the objectives and purpose of the evaluation, the evaluators will among other tasks answer the following questions:

4.2.1 Design and Relevance:

1. Whether the problem the programme addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived;
2. Whether the target beneficiaries of the programme are clearly identified;
3. Whether the outcome and outputs of the programme were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with SMART indicators;
4. Whether the relationship between outcome, outputs, activities and inputs of the programme are logically articulated;
5. Whether the programme is relevant to the development priorities of the country;
6. Did the design of the programme take into account scale and scaling up into consideration;
7. Given the capacity building objectives of the programme, how effective were the programme's capacity building interventions?

4.2.2 Implementation:

1. Whether the management arrangements of the programme were appropriate;
2. What major factors affected programme delivery and propose appropriate interventions to address them for the remainder of the programme and for any future planned interventions in support of development effectiveness.
3. Analyse the institutional arrangements put in place including coordination arrangements, financing arrangements, selection of sub-grantees, identification of beneficiaries, scheduling of activities and actual implementation;
4. The fulfillment of the success criteria as outlined in the programme document;
5. The responsiveness of the programme management to significant changes in the environment in which the programme functions (both facilitating or impeding project implementation);
6. Determine whether or not lessons learnt from other relevant programmes/projects were incorporated into the programme;
7. The monitoring and backstopping of the programme as expected by the Government and UNDP;
8. The Programme's collaboration with industry, associations, private sector, academia and civil society, if relevant;

9. The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on programme delivery.

4.2.3 Efficiency:

1. Whether the programme resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality;
2. Whether the programme resources are used effectively to produce planned results (Are the disbursements and programme expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans)?
3. Whether the programme is cost-effective compared to similar interventions;
4. Whether the technologies selected (any innovations adopted, if any) were suitable;
10. Whether there is evidence to support accountability of the programme (to be used by UNDP in fulfilling its accountability obligations to its development partners); and
11. The delivery of Government counterpart inputs in terms of personnel, premises and equipment.

4.2.4 Effectiveness:

1. What are the major achievements of the programme vis-à-vis its outcome and outputs, performance indicators and targets.
2. Whether there is evidence of UN contribution (alone and with the financial support from the EU) to the outcome of the programme.
3. Whether there is evidence of joint UN contribution to the outcome of the programme.
4. What are the potential areas for programme success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.
5. Given an opportunity, what actions the evaluation team members would have recommended to ensure that this potential for success translated into actual success.
6. Any underlying factors, beyond control, that influenced the outcome of the programme.
7. Have there been any unplanned effects/results?

4.2.5 Sustainability

- Assess whether or not the programme's achievements are sustainable?
- Is there an exit strategy for any of the elements of the programme?
- What should be done to strengthen sustainability of programme outcomes?
- Assess whether or not the UN resource mobilization strategy for the programme was appropriate and effective.
- Provide specific recommendations for future potential interventions beyond the current programme with due regard to impact and sustainability of current support.

5. EVALUATION METHODS

The evaluation team should provide details in respect of:

- a) **Review of programme documentation.** Review of key programme documents such as approved programme document, recent studies, reviews, project monitoring documents, disbursement reports, progress reports and other information available with implementing partners.
- b) **Construct a theory of change, identify detailed evaluation questions, methods (mixed methods) and instruments,** stakeholder mapping, etc.
- c) **Data collection:** (i) visits to selected stakeholders to carry out in depth interviews, inspection, and analysis of programme activities; (ii) phone interviews and performance data surveys of institutions not visited in person; (iii) interviews with implementing partners. For each of these interviews, the consultants should first develop and present their ideas for the content and format of the interview forms that will be applied to capture the information required, as well as the method to be used in administering them and tabulating the results.
- d) **Analysis:** Data triangulation and analysis triangulation to validate evidence and arrive at findings.

The evaluators will be expected to develop and present detailed statement of evaluations methods/approaches in an inception report to show how each objective, evaluation question and criterion will be answered.

6. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

- a) The Head of the Development Impact Advisory Team (DIAT) will provide the overall oversight to the programme evaluation and ensure timely delivery and satisfactory final product, with support by the programme specialist DIAT and under the guidance by the UNDP DRR-Programme and overall direction by the UN RC and UNDP RR.
- b) A reference group will be established to assist in key aspects of the evaluation process including reviewing evaluation Terms of Reference, providing documents, providing detailed comments on the inception and draft evaluation reports and dissemination of evaluation findings, lessons learnt and recommendations.
- c) The DEAP Programme Analyst will support the Evaluation Team on a daily basis with respect to providing background information and progress reports and other documentation, setting up stakeholder meetings and interviews, arrange field visits and coordinating with the IP, grantees, beneficiaries and DPs. The Programme Analyst will be supported by the UNDP M&E Specialist to ensure that the evaluation meets the expected UNEG standards.
- d) The evaluation will be conducted by two evaluators: an international evaluator who will be the team leader and one national evaluator, team member. Evaluation Team leader will have the overall responsibility for the conduct of the evaluation exercise as well as quality and timely submission of reports (inception, draft, final etc).
- e) The Evaluation Team will be expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of office equipment and supplies, communication and accommodation. Furthermore, the evaluators will be expected to familiarise themselves with the United Nations Evaluation Group's standards and norms for conducting project evaluations.

7. DELIVERABLES

- **Inception report** – within 5 days of the start of the assignment. The report will include a detailed approach and methodology, schedule, draft data collection protocols and an evaluation matrix. Annex 5 gives a template of the evaluation matrix. The work plan should also include an outline of the evaluation report as set out in Annex 2 of these TORs. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.
- **Key emerging issues paper** – a presentation of preliminary findings to key stakeholders orally and in writing will be made after the data collection and analysis exercise, i.e. within 4 weeks after presentation of the inception report. The purpose of this session is to provide opportunity for initial validation and elaboration of the evaluator's observations and analysis.
- **Draft evaluation report** – The Evaluator will present a Draft Report within 5 weeks after presentation of the inception report.
- **Lessons learnt report**
- **Final Evaluation Report.** The evaluators will present a Final Evaluation Report 5 days after receiving feedback and comments on the draft report from key stakeholders. The Evaluation Report shall be compliant with the UNEG standards and should include the following components:
 - Executive Summary.
 - Description of the DEAP programme (including theory of change and relevant information)
 - Purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope and evaluation criteria
 - Description of the evaluation methodology (including evaluability assessment, limitations and ethical issues)
 - Findings broken down by evaluation criteria
 - Conclusions and lessons learned
 - Recommendations
 - Appendices, including the Terms of Reference, data collection tools, people contacted and other relevant information

8. EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

The Evaluation Team Leader will work with a national consultant who will be employed by UNDP Malawi.

8.1 Qualifications

The Evaluation Team Leader must satisfy the following qualifications:

- Minimum of Master's degree in economics, business administration, political science, development studies, international relations or any other related social sciences.

8.2 Experience and other requirements

- Proven experience in leading consultancy teams;
- Track record of conducting evaluation of national development projects in any of the following areas: 1) aid and development effectiveness; 2) national development strategy planning; 3) capacity building for development planning, budgeting, M&E or Results Based Management for the UN, governments and international aid organizations;
- Experience in and knowledge of gender mainstreaming
- Excellent communication skills for report writing.
- Availability between 10 July and 31 August, 2016

8.3 Team leader competencies:

- Team work and leadership skills
- Strategic thinking
- Strong analytical, reporting and communication skills
- Team work skills and experience in leading teams
- Result oriented
- Excellent drafting skills in English language

9. TIME AND DURATION:

The evaluator will be hired for a maximum total of 35 man/ days.

Contract Start Date: 10 July, 2016. Contract End Date: 31 August, 2016.

10. TIME TABLE

| Activity | Weeks | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Contract and Entry meeting | x | | | | | | |
| Inception report, draft revised | x | | | | | | |
| Data collection and analysis | | X | x | x | | | |
| Drafting and submission of Evaluation Report | | | | | X | | |
| Receipt of comments from stakeholders and reference group members | | | | | | x | |
| Revision and submission of Final Report | | | | | | | X |

11. EVALUATION ETHICS and Ethical Considerations

Responsibility of the CO to ensure credibility and independence of evaluation; responsibility of TL to provide impartial, evidence-based, report adhering to international evaluation standards, etc.

The evaluation will follow UNEG guidelines on the ethical participation of human participants, including children and other vulnerable groups. All participants in the study will be fully informed about the nature and purpose of the evaluation and their requested involvement. Only participants who have given their written or verbal consent (documented) will be included in the evaluation.

As part of the inception report, the prospective consultant is expected to provide a detailed plan on how the following principles will be ensured throughout the study: 1) respect for dignity and diversity; 2) fair representation; 3) compliance with codes for vulnerable groups (e.g., ethics of research involving young children or vulnerable groups); 4) redress; 5) confidentiality; and 6) avoidance of harm.

Specific safeguards must be put in place to protect the safety (both physical and psychological) of both respondents and those collecting the data. These should include:

- A plan is in place to protect the rights of the respondent, including privacy and confidentiality
- The interviewer or data collector is trained in collecting sensitive information, and if the topic of the study is focused on violence against women and children, they should have previous experience in this area
- Data collection tools are designed in a way that are culturally appropriate and do not create distress for respondents
- Data collection visits are organized at the appropriate time and place so as to minimize risk to respondents
- The interviewer or data collector is able to provide information on how individuals in situations of risk can seek support.

Ethical approval for this study should be sought, as appropriate, from the Malawi National Committee on Research in Social Sciences and Humanities.

List of Stakeholders and Persons Contacted

| LIST OF KEY PARTNERS | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------|--|--|
| | Name of Focal Person (Government) | Title | Institution/ Organization | Status | | Contacts |
| | Walusungu Kayira | Deputy Director, Planning | Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development | Done | | |
| | Emma Mabvumbe | Director, Planning | Ministry of Health | Done | | |
| | Petersen Ponderani | Deputy Director, M & E | EP & D | Done | | |
| | Jimmy Kawaye | Programme Coordinator | EP&D | Done | | |
| | Simon Namagonya | Dircetor | Performance Enforcement Dept (PED) | Done | | |
| | Mr Kamlongera | Deputy Director | PED | Done | | |
| | Mercy Safarawo | Deputy Director | PED | Done | | |
| | Betty Ngoma | Assistant Director | Debt and AID, Treasury, MOF | Done | | Phone: 0888898309 Email: betngoma@yahoo.com |
| | Jane Mbughi | Project Officer, Economist | DAD | Done | | |
| | Chinsisi | Economist | DAD | Done | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|------|--|--|
| | Tithokoze Samuel | TBA | Treasury, Budget | Done | | |
| | Chosomo Tsonga | Economist | Treasury Budget | Done | | |
| | Yusuf Edward | Economist | Treasury Budget | Done | | |
| | Mrs Victoria Geresomo | Acting Director, M & E | EP&D | Done | | Phone: 0999186861 Email: vcgeresomo@yahoo.com |
| | Richard Chakhame | Director of Planning | Ministry of Gender and Children's Affairs | Done | | Phone: 0999800280 Email: richardchakhame@gmail.com |
| | Mercy Kanyunda | Commissioner of Statistics | National Statistical Office (NSO) | Done | | |
| | Ali Mphonda | Principal Statistician & Project Manager | NSO | Done | | |
| | James Changadeya | Planning Officer | Ministry of Education | Done | | |
| | John Chizonga | Planning Officer | Ministry of Education | Done | | |
| | Evans | SWAP focal point | Ministry of Education | Done | | |
| | Jean | SWAP focal point | Ministry of Education | Done | | |
| | Ali Phiri | District Commissioner | Chiradzulu District Council | Done | | |
| | TBA | Director of Planning & Development | Chiradzulu District Council | Done | | |
| | Kondwani Ghambi | District M&E Officer | Nkhatabay District Council | Done | | Phone: 0999192099 Email: kwghambi@yahoo.com |
| | Charles Makanga | District Commissioner | Lilongwe District Council | Done | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------|
| | TBA | Director Planning and Development | Lilongwe District Council | Done | | |
| | TBA | DEV | Lilongwe District Council | Done | | |
| | TBA | Acting M & E Officer | Lilongwe District Council | | | |
| | Name of NGOs/CSOs/Youth/Women | Title | Institution/ Organization | Status | | Contacts |
| | Kondwani Kaunda | Director | MEJN | Done | | |
| | TBA | Programme Manager | MEJN | Done | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | International Development/Donors | Title | Institution/ Organization | Status | | |
| | TBA | UNFPA Representative | UNFPA | Done | | |
| | Mia Seppo | UNDP RC & UNDP RR | UN & UNDP | Done | | |
| | Chipso Msowoya | Programme Manager | European Union | Done | | |
| | Jose Navaro | Senior Programme Manager | European Union | Done | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | Peter Kulemeka | M & E Specialist | UNDP | Done | | |
| | Agnes Chimbiri | Assistant RR & Programme Manager | UNDP | TBA | | |
| | Sarar Ahmed | Deputy Representative | UNICEF | Done | | |
| | Ms. Pamela Mkwamba | Representative | UN Women | Not done | | |
| | Richard Record | Chief Economist | The World Bank | Done | | Skype: Richard.Record |
| | Others | Title | Institution/Organisation | Proposed Date of Meeting | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |