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**Brief Description** the National Disaster Risk Management (NDRM) policy lists the main priorities of the government of Malawi (GoM) on disaster preparedness, response mitigation and recovery. Broadly, multi-sector preparedness and planning and response capacity will be developed at national, district and community levels to reduce disaster risks and shocks to vulnerable people. Specifically, the following are the main pillars of the Program Support Document (PSD[[1]](#endnote-2)): 1. mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning processes at all levels of government; 2. establishment of an effective system to identify, assess and monitor disaster risks under data and information knowledge, including early warning systems (EWS); and 3. strengthening coordination. The Malawi DRM system is in a transition phase from a disaster management-reactive approach to a more comprehensive disaster risk management approach. Although progress has been made to establish supporting strategic frameworks and institutional mechanisms, several needs and challenges remain, with the main ones to be addressed by this PSD, to assist the Government of Malawi on key issues of disaster risk management aimed to reduce damage and losses caused by disasters.
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# Executive Summary

UNDP has continued to support the Malawi (GoM) through the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcomes focusing on environment and energy for sustainable economic development. The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II 2011/12-2015/16 is the overarching operational medium-term strategy for Malawi. Its main objective remains to reduce poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It is organized into six thematic areas: i) Sustainable Economic Growth; ii) Social Development iii) Social Support and Disaster Risk Management (DRM); iv) Infrastructure Development; v) Improved Governance and; vi) Cross-cutting issues of gender and capacity development. Under MGDS I, Malawi has achieved macro-economic stability, economic growth, unprecedented poverty reduction, national food security and a 50 % reduction in HIV prevalence rates.

During the 2012 -2016 cycle, under the MGDS theme 1 on sustainable economic empowerment, UNDP's support has focused on improved coordination, investment planning, mainstreaming and knowledge management at the national and district levels to ensure a low emission and climate-resilient development. These objectives had been expected to be achieved by strengthening the policy environment, improving data and information management, and enhancing capacities for resource mobilization, coordination and monitoring of institutions responsible for climate change mitigation and adaptation, environment and natural resources management, disaster risk management and energy planning. UNDP support to government under this theme was through four main Program Supports, namely: National Climate Change (NCCP), Disaster Risk Management (DRM), Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM); Sustainable Energy Management (SEM) and Poverty and Environment (PEI); in this evaluation, **the Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Program Support will be evaluated.**

The purposes of the evaluation are to:

1. Determine the extent to which the outcome and outputs of DRM Program Supports have been achieved;
2. Assess UNDP’s contribution to the outcome;
3. Document the achievements, best practices and lessons learnt during the course of implementation of the three Program Supports to inform future decisions in design, implementation and management of similar Program Supports.
4. Provide recommendations for future programming based on the results from the three Program Supports while taking into account the aspirations of the Country Office to rationalize its portfolio to have few, large and more coherent Program Supports during the period 2017 -2018.

**RELEVANCE (*RATING*[[2]](#endnote-3) *- RELEVANT)***

* **Demand Based** The DRM support addresses issues of critical importance for Malawi’s inclusive and sustainable development. The support is embedded in key strategies, policies and frameworks: the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy 2011–2016 (MGDS II), the Disaster Preparedness and Relief (DPR) Act of 1991 and currently the 2015 National Disaster Risk Management (NDRM) policy (supported—key result of this Program Support). Building the institutional capacity for a national DRM system[[3]](#endnote-4) and providing DoDMA with financial resources and implementation capacity will thus be a critical progression toward the effective implementation of Malawi’s overall DRM strategy, as well as the drought-focused and flood risk reduction measures proposed in recent Program Support supported assessments.
* **Design Issues.** The Program Support document reflected a good understanding of the DRM sector and issues impacting it in context. However, neither the Program Support document nor any further documents reflect a strong joint results monitoring plan. The Log Frame and strategies were not fleshed out with a proper capacity assessment and baseline and or roadmap for change. Normally this would include a coherent theory of change TOC and monitoring plan with mechanisms spelt out for strategic upstream/downstream DRM practice and or demonstration. It was designed two broad for the finances and had no partnership strategy.

**EFFECTIVENESS (*RATING - SATISFACTORY)***

The Program Support has achieved most of its stated outputs-level results, but it has not yet triggered changes at the outcome level. A chronology of all PSD activities, developed by evaluation is prepared to show the full roadmap of implementation, and is included in the Annex. DRM results will take time, institutional reforms and growth strategies take time. Building system level capacities and mechanism for cross sector coordination is a long-term affair, and more of a challenge in an emergency prone context. A major enabling result of this PSD has been the development of the DRM policy and the review of legislation. The key findings and summary of the main achievements and shortfalls are presented below:

* **Excellent upstream results and lesson learned.** This experience will serve great to inform the next program and partnership for impacts. The program expressed impressive upstream results as follows.
* *Output 1: disaster risk management mainstreamed in policies and development plans significant* achievements have been recorded and validated, including the complete review of the *Disaster Preparedness and Relief Act,* 1991 and a strategic public expenditure review jointly with Ministry of Finance and Poverty Environment Initiative. The most notable achievements include, the DPR act review and the DRM 2015 policy.
* *Output 2: data and knowledge on the impact of natural disasters collected and made accessible to decision-makers in government, private sector, civil society and community’s*  Significant support has advanced and has contributed to promote informed decision-making and a culture of safety and resilience among disaster risk management stakeholders, through targeted database, information management and knowledge/learning/training activities. While there has been challenges in identifying the most qualified person/firm to develop a key output-the information management database, the time spent designing a suitable roadmap for developing the system was appropriate given the political economy and as a good way to advance with greater likelihood of sustainability. Considerable DRM knowledge sharing and learning work was advanced through partnering with the formal education system.
* *0utput 3: coordination of mechanisms and implementation arrangements for drm/drm established and used at national level and in the 15 disaster-prone districts.*  Key results included having a DRM Platform set up, reviving the sector working group, harmonizing data collection tools, and reviving civil protection committees in some districts. Some key areas have not been achieved, including linking different assessments like MVAC, mapping, social protection, etc. The sector working group has been operationalized but need more support for coordination and resource mobilization. The support strengthened coordination mechanisms at district, area and village levels through a number of training sessions focusing on coordination and general DRM issues.
* *0utput 4: monitoring and evaluation* While planned, a comprehensive baseline study to assess the current situation of community and household vulnerability and resilience to disasters, this important planning exercise was not completed at onset as planned. Evaluation found that in relation to a results focus, this impacted negatively on the overall program monitoring .In addition, no Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) was conducted of the thematic DRM work. The support required more attention to results based monitoring system and plan.
* **Comparative advantages of UNDP**. Value added of UNDP. The program is expressing UNDP technical contributions speaking to its comparative advantages including: technical design with upstream and downstream linkages: capacity building, policy development, partnership with NGOs and working through a NIM learning by doing modality. It did this in the context of promoting an integrated vertical and horizontal planning and management approach to DRM institutional strengthening. UNDP is not found to be tapping into regional and or global repository of cutting edge DRM expertise as best it could. This was not found to be just a country office issue but an overall UNDP issue. No catalytic funds and recent change in the BDP/ BCPR support framework.
* **Linkages between CC and DRR.** While this work is being bridged at UNDP under its environmental thematic work, the government program on CC and DRR are separated. There is a need to provide a coherent overarching framework and solid coordination mechanisms for bringing this linked work at the national level. It could be the resilience theme as mechanism for monitoring expected goal.
* **Portfolio has been reactive not proactive.** UNDP and GOM have not been capitalizing on UNDPs comparative advantages to carry forward this program results. The portfolio and management were very reactive rather than proactive. For example, during disaster events, while engaging in PDNA exercises, UNDP/GOM has not been able to convene the humanitarian and or development partners for **further contributions** to the Program. I.e. scale up emergency funding’s to DODMA CB needs.
* **Joint program monitoring was ad hoc**. The UNDP /GOM monitoring was ad hoc. This was not ideal for monitoring for results. It needed a strong theory of change and smart logical framework with a good partnership monitoring mechanism defined. The log frame was not employed a smart joint program monitoring tool and regular mechanism for technical results monitoring i.e. board meetings were at a higher oversight level. Needed an inter-sectoral level technical committee that bring all stakeholders to the sector for monitoring results i.e. MTE is a case in point... Monitoring needs improvement
* **Human Resources**. The program can be much more efficient and effective with stable human resources. UNDP and GOM must invest in a stable staff to monitor the DRM Program implementation. In part this problem has been attributed to DODMA and UNDP staff movements /departures /study tours. Many staff had benefitted from study leave supported by Irish Aid during the PSD period. In addition many UNDP managers have changed place. While this was supportive towards the PSD capacity building goals, without coordination, it also put at risk the PSD results based as the changes and gaps in staff responsible for PSD who were absent. Such inputs can be conducted in a coordinated way for optimal results in the future through partnership with Irish Aid. UNDP can provide *extra support* for NIM implementation and monitoring i.e. Contingency plan for emergency response, in-house procurement support can help in delivery and in capacity building of DODMA.
* **Partnerships** While UNDP and GOM have been innovative and brought in the local NGOs for support with implementation. The idea of partnership need strategy- partner for what aspect of the implementation and against what expected results. The portfolio needs a partnership approach. NGO can be also service providers at the local level with clear tasks. Currently NGO are reported benefiting from capacity building more than local governments who need to be managing this work. The strtegatey need to be redirected around a program through partnership. Local government need to be engaged as key beneficiaries for systems strengthening. THz capacity building of NGO is important but not the sole focus.

**EFFICIENCY (*RATING - SATISFACTORY)***

* **High Value for Money.** This support was high value for money based on its upstream - enabling results per overall resource input, i.e. policy change, especially considering the political economy of Malawi and compounding small–and medium-sized disasters. Support expressed Value for money i.e. upstream result on policy. Greater per local policy level results could have been much greater i.e. Sustainable local level impacts and more concentrated work with the local governments. It was a small financial investment. While this was true, the funds were not enough for the scope of the expected results across 14 districts. It was stretched to far over 14 districts.
* **NIM modality.** While NIM is optimal for capacity building results, DODMA with its responsibility and the nature of its mandate with staff in emergency mode a lot of the time requires contingency and support for NIM - emergency plan, procurement and results based management. While the program is executed as NIM, DODMA may need extra administrative and technical monitoring support to NIM (national execution modality) for procedural work i.e. results monitoring and reporting, financial procurements and augmenting DODMAs capabilities for results based monitoring.

# **SUSTAINABILITY (*RATING - LIKELY)***

* **Investment insufficient** The overall investment was insufficient for scale of DRM institutional strengthening and governance Program Support necessary.
* **Sector wide approach needed.** UNDP and GOM can do better to convene the development partners to work together for greater impacts and coordinated responses.
* **Resilience.** There is a natural move in Malawi by development parts and government to resilience programming for sustainable impact on response and recovery, preparedness and building the capacity of DoDMA for that. UNDP and GOM can build on this movement with learning and insights based on the DRM Program support.

# **RECOMMENDATIONS[[4]](#endnote-5)**

1. For next cycle, UNDP - GOM continue the DRM support and integrate Program work on Environment, Climate Change and DRR under the overarching Resilience banner for greater impacts. Designate stable programming staff to support the new portfolio.
2. UNDP - GOM conduct as a priority a scoping of baseline line for institutional capacity building support in districts to DRM.
3. UNDP - GOM provide support in the DRM programming context for preparing for early recovery i.e. funding, coordination etc.
4. UNDP - GOM convene a multi -stakeholder donor forum and development partners group around the resilience portfolio and sector wide approach.
5. UNDP explore UN joint programming modalities for next cycle DRM (RESILEINCE programming) i.e. urban design, national volunteerism movement and social protection UNICEF, UN- Habitat and UNV.
6. UNDP explore on behalf of GOM financing partnerships with Irish Aid, DfID, WB for next phase (financing and programming linkages);
7. UNDP explore alternative mechanisms for pooling development partners fund AND innovative financing for DRM ;
8. UNDP develop a robust full sized proposal that expresses capacity building support to GOM for next cycle DRM - NIM implementation and monitoring and knowledge sharing /networking for broader sector and partners, provinces learning for results.
9. UNDP - GOM design a pilot project covering a few districts demonstrating DODMA functionality and the implementation of the new DRM policy. Ensure the pilot has a focus on CBDRM linking community to district level planning and action and also include volunteerism and learning centers.
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# 1. INTRODUCTION

# 1.1. Background

UNDP has continued to support the Malawi (GoM) through the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcomes focusing on environment and energy for sustainable economic development. The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II 2011/12–2015/16 is the overarching operational medium-term strategy for Malawi. Its main objective remains to reduce poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It is organized into six thematic areas: i) Sustainable Economic Growth; ii) Social Development iii) Social Support and Disaster Risk Management (DRM); IV) Infrastructure Development; v) Improved Governance and vi) Cross-cutting issues of gender and capacity development. Under MGDS I, Malawi has achieved macro-economic stability, economic growth, unprecedented poverty reduction, national food security and a 50% reduction in HIV prevalence rates.

**Links to the National Development Plan**

During the 2012–2016 cycle, under the MGDS theme 1 on sustainable economic empowerment, UNDP's support has focused on improved coordination, investment planning, mainstreaming and knowledge management at the national and district levels to ensure a low emission and climate-resilient development. These objectives will be achieved by strengthening the policy environment, improving data and information management and enhancing capacities for resource mobilization, coordination and monitoring of institutions responsible for climate change mitigation and adaptation, environment and natural resources management, disaster risk management and energy planning. UNDP support to government under this theme was through four main Program Supports: National Climate Change (NCCP), Disaster Risk Management (DRM), Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM), Sustainable Energy Management (SEM) and Poverty and Environment (PEI), but in this evaluation only the Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Program Support will be evaluated.

**Disaster Risk Management DRM**

With 15% of the population living in or on the fringes of flood-prone areas, and with the frequency and severity of natural disaster increased under the influence of climate change, UNDP expanded its efforts in DRM by leveraging its relationships with the Government at central and district level, civil society and UN agencies. [[5]](#endnote-6)The Malawi DRM system is in a transition phase from a disaster management-reactive approach to a more comprehensive disaster risk management approach. The new National Disaster Risk Management (NDRM) policy lists the main priorities of the Government of Malawi (GoM) on disaster mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. The following were the pillars of the UNDP support to Disaster Risk Management: 1. mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning processes at all levels of government; 2. establishment of an effective system to identify, assess and monitor disaster risks under data and information knowledge, including early warning systems (EWSs); 3. and strengthening coordination. Through this phase of support, DRM was intended to be mainstreamed in 14 disaster-prone districts. The flooding of 2015 saw this number increase as districts which had not been considered disaster prone experienced flooding.

# *1.2. Purpose, objectives and scope*

The purposes of the independent end of term evaluation of the PSD have been:

* To determine the extent to which the outcome and outputs of the UNDP Program support have been achieved;
* To assess UNDP’s contribution to the outcome;
* To document the achievements, best practices and lessons learned during the course of implementation of the Program Supports to inform future decisions in design, implementation and management of similar Program Supports;
* To provide recommendations for future programming based on the results from the three Program Supports, while taking into account the aspirations of the Country Office to rationalize its portfolio to have few, large and more coherent Program Supports during the period 2017–2018.

# *Objectives*

* Assess whether, and to what extent, the PSD’s expected outcome and outputs have been achieved;
* Determine the impact, both positive and negative, as well as intended and unintended, of the contribution of the Program Support to the achievement of the outcome;
* Examine and analyze factors which have positively and negatively impacted achievement of Program Support outputs and outcome;
* Assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of institutional arrangements and partnership strategies of each Program Support;
* Assess the role of the DoDMA as implementer of the financing for results ;
* Assess the extent to which the UNDP-supported Program Support outputs and non-Program Support assistance contributed to the respective UNDAF and Country Program outcome;
* Examine the extent to which gender equality and women’s empowerment and human rights targets as cross-cutting issues were integrated and achieved;
* Document lessons learned and best practices during the course of implementation to inform future decisions in Program Support design, implementation and management of similar interventions;
* Provide a framework for a large and coherent PSD encompassing priority interventions in the areas of disaster risk management, climate change, energy and environment.

# Scope

Time period: January 2012–October 2016

Geographical coverage: national

Thematic coverage: environment, climate change, disaster risk management and energy

The audience/users of the evaluation results include:

* + The Program Steering Committees for DRM, NCCP, Environment & Natural Resources Management, Poverty & Environment Initiative, Energy and Early Warning and Disaster Risk Management;
  + Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining;
  + Office of the President and Cabinet;
  + DODMA
  + Environmental Affairs Department;
  + Department of Energy Affairs;
  + Department of Climate Changes Services and Meteorological Services;
  + Department of Water Services;
  + UNDP.

# *1.3. Evaluation Methodology*

The evaluation has assessed the performance of the Program Support using the Office of Evaluation OECD evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. This evaluation followed a collaborative and participatory approach, ensuring close engagement with the Program Support implementation and support team based at UNDP and DoDMA government offices, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office and all key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders during the terminal evaluation is vital to a successful execution. It has included conducting interviews, including those with financing partners, i.e. focal points and other donors, the Program Support team, national and provincial Emergency Management Departments, local governments, UN and international agencies. The evaluator has also conducted a field survey of selected pilot target areas. Based on the design consideration and implementation experience, the evaluation has identified priority interventions to be considered during the 2017–2018 period, and how they should be packaged.

*Data collection methods*

1. Monitoring and Evaluation systems: Evaluator used Log Frame performance indicators to measure progress, particularly actual results against expected results.
2. Extend Reports and Documents: Evaluator reviewed all existing Program Support documentation, including quantitative and descriptive information about the Program Support, its outputs and outcomes, such as documentation from capacity development activities, donor reports, and other evidences.
3. Questionnaires: Evaluator created a standardized approach (Question Protocols, Evaluation Matrix) in order to obtain information on a wide range of topics from a large number or diversity of stakeholders (employing sampling techniques) to obtain information on their attitudes, beliefs, opinions, perceptions, level of satisfaction, etc. concerning the operations, inputs, outputs and contextual factors of the Program Support.
4. Interviews: Evaluator conducted person-to-person interviews (see persons interviewed in program attached) to predetermined targeted questions (evaluation matrix adapted and prepared in advance of each meeting by the team and designed to obtain in-depth information about a *person’s impressions or experiences*, or to learn more about their answers to questionnaires or surveys.
5. On-Site Observation: Evaluator entailed use of a detailed observation form (noted as recorded after every meeting) to record accurate information on-site about how a program operates (ongoing activities, processes, discussions, social interactions and observable results as directly observed during the course of an initiative).
6. Group Interviews: Evaluator held small group (6–14 people) focus groups with stakeholders, including UNDP, Government department, donors, district- and community-level committees, NGOs, to explore in-depth stakeholder opinions, similar or divergent points of view (focus on UNDP and partners, Village Community Development Committee in Salima and the District DRM committees) or judgments about a development initiative or policy, as well as information about their behavior, understanding and perceptions of an initiative or to collect information around tangible and intangible changes resulting from an initiative.

* Inception report and evaluation matrix were developed.

# *1.4. Limitations.*

The first limitation concerns the attribution of results in the absence of smart targets and indicators, theory of change and joint monitoring mechanisms and strategy. In the absence of a strong and observed ME framework (originally planned to be developed as the PSD output four), and an absence of theory of change and in a context of NIM implementation, it has been difficult to determine exactly all this PSDs support results i.e. unintended or real results. A second limitation was to visit all sites/districts due to time and scope. This has been compensated by including questionnaires and working closely with all the national partners to assess the results in those districts. The evaluation also mitigated this limitation through reference to Program Support reports and materials and in consultation with external partners.

…………………………………………………..

# 2. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGE

# *2.1. GOM DRM Development context (ProDoc)*

Overall, the disaster risk profile of Malawi, based on the ProDoc situational analysis, needed to be analyzed in the context of the poverty level of 39%, and the main risk drivers contributing to socio economic vulnerability.[[6]](#endnote-7) The physical exposure to hazards (physical vulnerability) and the socio-economic vulnerability associated with environmental risk drivers contributed to the overall vulnerability of the country in coping with disaster events. Within the agriculture sector, for example, the rural population (85% of the total) had been dependent on rain-fed agriculture (maize cultivation), which represented52% of the total agricultural crop area. This represented 36% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and generated 85% of employment. Crop resistance to floods (and droughts) is an urgent issue to be addressed by authorities to sustain already limited rural livelihoods (leading to food insecurity). Furthermore, Malawi faced low levels of economic and social development, with a GDP of USD 4.3 billion and a per capita income of USD 288 in 2010, and was ranked 171 out of 187 countries by the UNDP Human Development Index in 2011. Finally, the country suffered from environmental degradation due to a combination of agricultural expansion into marginal lands due to population pressure and rapid deforestation.

In relation to the PSD’s key aims, to strengthen enabling environment and institutional capacity, a Disaster Preparedness Response and Relief Act had been in place, albeit outdated (1991); the Act was to be reviewed and this was consistent with the country program in 2012, in line with the NDRM policy. The National DRM policy was drafted and listed the main priorities of the GoM, approved in 2015. Key activities needed to be aligned with the international standards and guidelines of ISDR, including relation to the planned Malawi National Platform and taking into account UNDP’s comparative advantage as a donor and holding a UN mandate in DRM issues. The Malawi DRM system was assessed to be in a transition phase from *a disaster management-reactive approach to a more comprehensive disaster risk management approac*h. Although progress has been made to establish supporting strategic frameworks and institutional mechanisms, several needs and challenges remain, and these will be addressed in the UNDP PSD. The Government of Malawi through DoDMA had decided that the Disaster Risk Management Policy would support activities on broad disaster risk management, including emphasis on risk reduction. In addition, through this PSD, disaster risk management in Malawi would benefit enormously from international best practices, in relation to the cycle of integrated risk management. This model assumed that all types of measures for natural disaster reduction are considered across the disaster cycle.

Although disaster risk management is embedded as a subtheme in the MDGs, the integration of disaster risk reduction into all sustainable development policy and planning processes at all levels, cuts across all the themes. Design level stakeholder consultations highlighted five key challenge areas including 1. The need for strong linkages between poverty and population vulnerability to disaster shocks, 2. Disaster shocks, damage and losses, 3. Institutional and policy landscape, 4. UN Coordination Mechanism in DRM and DRR and 5. Preparedness activities at community level.

*Current Situation: Institutional Capacity (Drought PDNA WB, GFDRR, UNDP 2016)*

DRM capacities and coordination functions needed to be improved at the national and sub district levels. According to the PDNA[[7]](#endnote-8) Drought section on institutional assessment, the main challenge for DoDMA in carrying out its mandate is the inadequacy of human resources. Each of the two divisions has five technical personnel based at the department’s headquarters in Lilongwe. At the local authority level, only 11 out of the 28 districts in the country have DRM officers who are directly responsible to DoDMA, whereas the other districts have only desk officers on delegated authority from other sectors. Furthermore, the positions for the local officers are non-established and not permanent. DRM capacity is skewed towards technical personnel at the national level. DRM knowledge and skills are lacking at the district and sub district levels, and there have been inconsistent capacity building programs. The district and sub district level institutions experience the following challenges in the provision of DRM support: (i) limited knowledge and skills to integrate and execute DRM in programs; (ii) limited operational resources for DRM; (iii) limited availability of DRM personnel delegated from other line ministries at the district level rather than specialized DRM staff; and (iv) the contractual nature of the ADRM positions leading to discontinuity and frequent staff rotation.

The intention of Program Support according to the ProDoc was to provide focused support for the coordination of initiatives that directly impact on the identified vulnerable community’s. Thus, a deliberate attempt was made through support to include downstream activities through disaster risk reduction initiatives utilizing existing mechanisms targeting community based DRM initiatives. Additionally, the implementation of activities under this PSD also takes cognizance of the need to establish strong synergies with climate change adaptation and environmental and natural resources management initiatives at various levels. In all these processes, PSD was expected to be closely collaborating with other UN and development agencies, taking cognizance of their comparative advantages in some aspects of disaster risk management.

# *2.2. Government policies and strategies*

Based on lessons learned from earlier Program support[[8]](#endnote-9), the Government of Malawi had developed a strategic approach to further strengthen the DRM system. These include short-, medium- and long-term interventions in the areas of (i) strengthening the EWSs, promoting risk identification and assessments; (ii) strengthening emergency preparedness, response and recovery; (iii) mainstreaming risk reduction; (iv) strengthening institutional capacity; and (v) risk financing. DoDMA will lead the coordination of the implementation of sector recovery interventions. The magnitude of the response and recovery interventions to the drought and flooding (essentially now a protracted crisis mode) will require increased oversight responsibility and coordinating capacity for DoDMA. DoDMA will use existing institutional arrangements to coordinate the implementation of the drought recovery interventions. Overall, the following principles have guided the identification of recovery strategies and will further guide the implementation of recovery interventions. These include: (i) alignment with existing policies; (ii) building back better and smarter; (iii) a multi-sectoral approach; (iv) focus on resilience; (v) community participation; (vi) decentralized approach; (vii) multi-stakeholder engagement and coordination; and (viii) integration of gender and other cross-cutting issues.

……………………………………………………………………………..

# 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE DRM PROGRAM SUPPORT.

# *3.1. Program support strategy and logic model*

The Program Support Document (PSD) 2012–2016 falls within the framework for UNDP’s assistance to the Government of Malawi for a disaster risk management assistance program, following the MGDS-II, United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and CPD priorities. Following the UNDP CPD 2012–20161 and the UNDAF2 for 2012–2016, the five-year program support document on disaster risk management (DRM) in Malawi was aligned to the Hyogo framework for Action (HFA) and its 2009 and 2011 revisions comprised in the Global Assessment Reports (www.isdr.org/gar) and MGDS-II (2011–2016). Under UNDP’s Country Program Action Plan (CPAP), UNDP aimed to support Malawi, through the Department of Disaster Management Affairs (DoDMA), with the following: (i) Finalization of a national DRM strategy and the DRM policy; and (ii) Integration and mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRM) into an integrated disaster risk management cycle, in government policies, planning, programs and capacity development. The program had four main outputs. The DRM Program Support thus included four main expected outputs, 19 activities and 15 indicators as follows:[[9]](#endnote-10)

**OUTPUT 1: Disaster Risk Management mainstreamed in policies and development plans DRM Mainstreaming**

Purpose: to facilitate the mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning processes at national, sector and district level.

Planned actions include:

 Review the Disaster Preparedness and Relief Act;

 Conduct a Public Expenditure Review for DRM and policy reviews;

 Introduce DRM into school curricula at primary, secondary and tertiary level;

 Develop and introduce budget guidelines integrating DRM concerns in government (national and district) annual budgeting;

 Implement revised policies and plans at national and local levels in 15 disaster-prone districts;

 Incorporate DRM/DRM concerns Draft MGDS III for 2017–2022.

Indicators:

1. Number of key sector policies, development plans at national and district levels reflecting DRM: evaluation reports, sector plans, sector budgets, sector policies, survey reports, District Development Plans;
2. Increase in budget allocation on DRM: sector budgets, Public Expenditure Reviews, District Development Plans;
3. Percent of reduction in economic and social losses after a disaster occurs: post-disaster assessment reports, Public Expenditure Reviews, survey reports, social economic profiles;
4. Number of households adopting mitigation and risk reduction initiatives in progress reports, survey reports, social economic profiles, evaluation reports.

**OUTPUT 2: Data and knowledge on the impact of natural disasters collected and made accessible to decision makers in government, private sector, civil society and communities**

Purpose: to promote informed decision-making and a culture of safety and resilience among disaster risk management stakeholders and targeted communities

Planned actions include:

 Establishment of a disaster database;

 Review the national early warning systems and identify overlaps, gaps and needs in the existing systems;

 Procure EWS equipment that is necessary for effective EWS;

 Formulate and operationalize a national risk communication strategy on DRM/DRM;

 Establish district disaster risk reduction information centers;

 Provide training and equipment for effective dissemination of early warning information in 15 disaster prone districts;

 Set up mechanism for community based DRMactivities at local level;

 Support community based mitigation and risk reduction initiatives in the disaster-prone districts through implementation of a small grants facility.

Indicators:

* Number of strategies implemented from the communication strategy: survey reports, policy briefs, workshops and policy dialogue proceedings, reports from government agencies, private companies, CSOs;
* Proportion of DRM principles incorporated in school curricula: school curricula, survey reports, progress reports;
* Number of districts with resource centers: reports from government agencies, private companies, CSOs;
* Number of DRM-related databases that are linked and periodically updated: reports from government agencies, private companies and CSOs, DRM databases.

**OUTPUT 3: Coordination of mechanisms and implementation arrangements for DRM; DRM established and used at national level and in the 15 disaster-prone districts.**

Purpose: to develop an efficient and effective coordination system for comprehensive disaster risk reduction at all levels

Planned actions include:

 establishing a Malawi National Platform NP as a coordination mechanism for DRM/DRM under UNISDR guidelines;

 developing review and operationalizing national, district, area and village multi-sector emergency preparedness plans;

 Developing and supporting linkages between DRM-related information databases, such as MVAC, UNFPA Vulnerability Profiling, DoDMA disaster database, hazard and vulnerability maps, social protection and agricultural and food security databases;

 Reviewing DoDMA’s damage assessment methods and protocols and its practical use to improve decision-making toward damage and losses;

 operationalizing the Sector Working Group SWG on Vulnerability and Disaster and Risk Management and addressing capacity gaps through training of line ministries’ focal points;

 reviewing institutional arrangements for DRM/DRM in selected disaster prone districts and strengthening coordination mechanisms CPCs at district, area and village levels;

 establishing a donor coordination mechanism on DRM.

Indicators:

* Number of targeted DCPC, ACPs and VCPCs established, trained and functional reports, Means of Verification MOV District council reports, MGDS II monitoring reports and sector reports;
* Number of Sector Working Groups, Steering Committee SC and Technical Committee TC and DRM platform meetings, minutes of DRM platform and SWG meetings, MOV, DoDMA reports and steering and technical committee minutes;
* Number of simulation exercises and updated contingency plans, DoDMA reports, MOV, district council reports and sector reports;
* Number of partners compliant to the Operational Guidelines on DRM, MOV, DoDMA reports and sector reports.

**OUTPUT 4: Monitoring and Evaluation Activity**

Purpose: to monitor progress towards intended outcome

Planned actions include:

 conducting a **comprehensive baseline study in the 15 target** districts to assess the current situation of community and household vulnerability and resilience to disasters;

 carrying out a Mid-Term Review of the program;

 conducting an end of program Impact Evaluation.

Indicators:

* Number of sector ministries and assemblies that have established M&E systems that are operational, baseline study report, Mid-Term Review report and Impact Evaluation Report;
* Percentage of trained sector staff using M&E skills in their work; number of assemblies that have gender disaggregated information reflected in selected sector reports, such as for education, health, gender and agriculture, MOV; baseline study report; Mid-Term Review report; and Impact Evaluation Report.

# ………………………………………………………….

# 4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

# *4.1. Relevance*

# 4.1.1. Highly relevant to context

*Increasing Natural Disasters*

The cyclical and increasing nature of disaster require a normative/organizational framework for dealing holistically with *cycles of preparedness, response and recovery*. Disaster Risk Management is perceived by respondents as the number one priority for Malawi’s national development, linked to growth strategy (interview with the vice president’s office, December 15, 2016). The economic growth rate was being negatively affected by the cyclical nature of humanitarian assistance, climate change and DRM. The growth was reversed from 5.1 to 3.1 due to two recent major natural disasters: flooding in 2015 and drought in 2016[[10]](#endnote-11). Crop yields are reported as reduced from 2.3 to 1.7 due to disaster (PDNA drought 2016). The 2015 floods caused severe damage and great loss. They affected 15 districts, and the whole country suffered interruption of water and electricity and damage to roads and bridges, which disrupted business. An estimated 1,101,364 people were affected, 230,000 were displaced, 106 were killed and 172 were reported missing. Economic losses were experienced at many levels: damage to infrastructure, crops and livestock; reduced production caused by water and electricity shortage; disruption of the economic system in communities where people were displaced; and by fiscal transfer to disaster response, crowding out other functions due to concentration of manpower more on disaster response for weeks than on other activities. The 2015 Flood PDNA (an exercise supported jointly by UNDP, EU and WB) has shown that total damage and loss is USD 365.9 million, while total cost of recovery and reconstruction is USD 494 million.[[11]](#endnote-12) [[12]](#endnote-13) Of the $494 million required for recovery in the PDNA, agriculture makes up $78 million, 16% of the total (Stan Kita). Central to recovery and response are the institutional arrangements for managing disasters.

The President of Malawi declared **a state of** **disaster** on April 11, 2016, for drought assistance. Recent disasters, floods in 2015 and drought in 2016, are reported by respondents as having created greater awareness for focused attention on the institutional building and cross-sectoral DRM and resilience agendas (interviews with development partner and UN stakeholders). Learning based in part emergency support has been of significant help to DODMA to coordinate the development partners for risk assessment methodologies that considers the root causes to the disaster, and a longer-term perspective (PDNA assessments reviewed). The dramatic increase in the frequency, intensity and impact of natural disasters in recent decades has been well documented, but few could have predicted what has befallen Malawi in the last two years. The Government of Malawi (GoM) has taken immediate steps to provide emergency relief to millions of its citizens in collaboration with its domestic and international partners. And with an eye toward building future resilience, the GoM asked the World Bank, United Nations (led by UNDP support efforts) and the European Union to support a comprehensive Post-Disaster Needs Assessment PDNA, which assessed the impact of the drought and identified a *multi-sectoral recovery strategy* aimed at building long-term resilience to future risks. Malawi is thus one of the most vulnerable and least prepared countries for natural disaster in Africa (Also see RIASCO Action Plan for Southern Africa: Response Plan for the El Niño-induced Drought in Southern Africa (May 2016 - April 2017) analysis on Malawi).[[13]](#endnote-14)

Since the program support was agreed/designed in 2011–2012, the natural and development landscape has continued to see climate change effects which are having enormous negative impact on the Malawian economy and lives. The Projections of the Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committee released in June 2016 are overwhelming. A minimum of *6.5 million Malawians, 39 percent of the population*, will not have enough food in the 2016–17 consumption period because of the ongoing drought provoked by an unusually strong El Niño effect.

4.1.2. Design Log Frame and Strategies

*Program outcome and outputs (Logical Framework Annex) analysis[[14]](#endnote-15)*

The PSD design outlines four outputs and one includes setting up a monitoring mechanism for program support - (output four is monitoring). All components fully aligned with the UNDAF and country program strategy. All four outcomes are targeting gap areas in the DRM governance system and mutually reinforcing for expected results toward disaster risk management outcomes. Although the design was robust and interlinked, the strategies and targets were not complemented by a strong road map, partnership, a capacity development strategy and theory of change based on a joint results based monitoring approach. The Program Support was however, designed with a focus on the enabling environment for a comprehensive systems approach and to engage in key areas, focus for example on: community level preparedness for highly disaster prone areas, policies, improving data and information management systems and promoting coordination and preparedness for DRM. During implementation, the explicit needs for DODMA institutional capacity strengthening and functionality (at scale) to coordinate and manage new trends of continuous cycles of small and medium disaster were to be mapped and acted on. The baseline capacity assessment however was not completed as planned.

Demand and interest in CBDRM and civil protection work was found to be high and an increasing amount of global funding for climate change adaptation and mitigation work is available to country. DoDMA work has been augmented with successful access to the green climate fund, GCF Program Support, supporting climate information and cross sector early warning system development. The Program Support would be nationally implemented (NIM) at DoDMA. It was support and co-financed by UNDP USD 730,000. The USD16 million PSD would support information management and strengthen EWS in line with the DRM approach. Access to the global climate finance and UNDPs role was in part due to the great relationships and knowledge gained during implementation.

# 4.1.3. Stakeholders/ Beneficiaries

This Program Support’s key stakeholders included national- and subnational level sectors and development agencies: DoDMA, MoF, MoEPD, MoECC, MoLHUD, MoLGRD and CSOs/NGOs, UN, IASC system, INGOs. The implementing stakeholders consisted of the UNDP - management organization, the DoDMA at national level and local government with local offices in the districts, the community members to be empowered in learning by doing and risk reduction practices, the civil society and other local and international NGOs working in disaster risk management and the Government of Malawi. The ultimate beneficiaries of this Program Support were the populations of the target districts, i.e. Karonga, Salima, Nkhotakota, Rumphi, Nkhata-bay, Mangochi, Dedza, Ntcheu, Balaka, Zomba, Phalombe, Machinga, Blantyre, Chikhwawa and Nsanje. They were to be trained through learning by doing in management of environment, natural resources, and climate change and disaster risk. Similarly, Program Support went to strengthening coordination mechanisms of the district councils, which were to have received capacity building to effectively add value to and collaborate with Non-Governmental Organizations and other stakeholders operating in the disaster prone districts who interface directly with vulnerable communities. Although the full scope of the beneficiaries was not fully fleshed out in the Program Support document, these are DoDMA, districts or affected communities also served by the UN and the IASC system. Local key beneficiary committees were Civil Protection Committees (CPC), and District Executive Committees DEC and the Village Development Committees.

**Roles and Responsibilities of Implementing Partners**

The two main institutions heavily involved in the running of the Program Support were UNDP Malawi and DoDMA. The roles of these institutions are as follows:

UNDP Malawi was designated as responsible for:

* Facilitating the development and approval of annual work plans (AWPs);
* Making timely disbursements of quarterly advances to the implementing partners (Department of Disaster Management Affairs and other agencies that will be involved in the implementation with direct funding);
* Checking accuracy of financial reports and reviewing requests for advances jointly with DoDMA;
* Ensuring quality control in program implementation, including meeting technical and financial reporting requirements of all implementing partners in the program;
* Providing overall technical advice;
* Support government in mobilizing more resources for the program;
* Organizing program audits as required.
* Monitoring progress in implementation of Annual Work Plans

Government (DoDMA) was to be responsible for:

* Developing annual work plans together with the District Councils of the 14 target districts;
* Ensuring overall coordination of the program, following the agreed annual work plan including joint supervision with UNDP of activities implemented through NGOs;
* Supervision of the activities coordinated by the District Councils of the 14 target districts;
* Appropriate use of funds, which will be advanced to DoDMA on a quarterly basis in line with the approved budget and annual work plan;
* Accurate accounting and timely reporting of the use of program funds;
* Monitoring the achievement of results and providing timely progress reports as indicated in the program document.

# 4.1.4. Replicability

Scaling up the good practices is the ultimate aim of longer term UNDP /GOM program support. During the period, several practices were noted with scale up potential. For instance, the Small Grants Scheme SGS piloted in a few districts, was already scaled up to more districts. The community based mapping and contingency planning were elements of a scale up package that demonstrate the inclusive participatory approach to DRM planning at the community local level. The disaster risk management handbook was reported as a key intervention for further dissemination and capacity building . The construction of evacuation centers standards and lesson learned can be reviewed for scale up. The DRM guidelines are excellent for scaling. The local level resource mobilization efforts including a local bank account for financing DRM resource mobilization efforts and planning efforts, the constructive working with local NGOs, the approach to community organizing and supporting community volunteer efforts all can be consolidated and packaged for scale up. In other countries, such a package for example, might include, volunteerism, lesson on creation of user groups, community and local movement planning using the policy guidelines, resource mobilization and innovative local DRM financing among other features. All the noteworthy practices might be consolidated and documented as integrated package of services, a scalable CBDRM approach for further demonstration and scaling..

# *4.2. Effectiveness*

# 4.2.1. Expected Results (Log Frame in Annex)

This section describes the major achievements of the PSD vis-à-vis its objectives, activities, performance indicators and targets. In general, the PSD inputs - activities were delivered (see status of inputs - activities- annex logframe), That said, important processes were strengthened through national implementation i.e. learning by doing and. In the absence of a joint results monitoring practices however, (expected output 4), attribution of the UNDPs support to outcome level change was difficult to measure especially considering the district and community level linkages. Without a strong monitoring mechanism, the results were difficult to identity as adaptive management was employed as implementation approach. The evaluator found the DoDMA annual work plans were sound and contributed to the delivery of outputs level activities as agreed in annual board meetings.

**OUTPUT 1: Disaster Risk Management mainstreamed in policies and development plans**

**Key findings**

The main purpose of this output work was to facilitate the mainstreaming*[[15]](#endnote-16)* of disaster risk reduction and management into sustainable development policies and planning processes at national, sector and district level. During implementation, significant progress towards mainstreaming goal was recorded and validated: key interventions and accomplishments include the upstream DRM policy work, the review of the disaster preparedness and relief act; a relevant and strategic public expenditure review jointly with ministry of finance and poverty environment work that showed environment, CC and DRM sectors are generally underfunded and provide a case for further investments.

Evaluator found that during the PSD, DODMA implementation unit also contributed to the development of a devolution plan as part of the DRM policy development process. Once this devolution plan is approved, local councils will receive funds for implementation of DRM activities. Key work has been completed towards the integration of DRM into the district development plans and in the curriculum and these are clearly major milestones in the mainstreaming work. The work also include the establishment and capacity building of focal points across ministries, departments and NGOs , these are all verified as significant achievements under this PSD. For the next phase it will be important to continue to support the cross sector operationalization of the new policy and legal arrangements at national and subnational level as a demonstration of a system with links to community level.

*Advances in the DRM Enabling Environment*

The PSD has successfully supported the enabling environment for longer term DRM implementation, including the development of the national DRM policy, approved in 2015. Evaluator has learned that the government has approved recruitment of local DODMA officers in all the 28 districts of the country that now need training and learning support to engage with community and to effectively support and protect communities from disasters.

Major results included important enabling and institutional inputs towards a functioning DRM system, including the development of the new policy (2015) and drafting of a new DRM bill (2016), emphasizing cross-sectoral nature integrated of risk reduction, response and recovery preparedness cycle. The PSD strategy included a focus on institutionalizing preparedness, protection and response at the national, district and village/community levels. Evaluator made not that advancing the legal work (reviewed) will however require further support including advocacy. The draft DRM bill is expected to go to parliament for approval (confirmed by interview with DoDMA). Respondents say cconsultations on the bill are almost complete. Two consultations are remaining—one with Principal Secretaries as members of the National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Committee and the other with Parliamentary Committee on Natural Resources and Climate Change jointly with the Parliamentary Women Caucus. Work on the DRM bill was also found to be an important step to legitimize DRM across sectors, agencies and NGOs and to set clear lines of responsibility for emergency response-currently a gap. In line with the institutional strengthening goals for national DRM, DoDMA recently finalized its development of its national devolution plan as already mentioned.

The evaluator noted the work on institutional strengthening is aligned with a renewed interest in a nationwide resilience program (UNDP and WB, IASC system-supported). National stakeholders interviewed were knowledgeable about the new resilience policy and welcomed it.

*Other pertinent findings*

*Risk Assessment: Instilling DRM Planning Approaches*

A key question that arose was whether DoDMA had been capacitated to facilitate/perform a national level risk assessment. The DoDMA respondents stated that they have not undertaken a national level risk assessment Evaluator learned however that the policy work has aimed to reduce barriers to a more systematic national risk assessment process. This work will need to be coordinated with the work of the climate change sector work group. A good outcome of the recent flood and drought PDNAs was that it was a catalyst supporting longer-term DRM mainstreaming work. Several sectoral respondents now see the national agreement for the legal arrangements providing more clear direction in terms of the DRM mandate and budgets. The proposed law (reviewed) is balanced for response, recovery and preparedness as well as mitigation and DRM.

*Mainstreaming DRM and Early Recovery [[16]](#endnote-17)*

Momentum has been mounting for urgent work on DRM mainstreaming post-2015 flood and 2016 drought.. The disaster work has been entrusted to DoDMAs leadership for the intersectoral and development partner coordination during the responses. While DoDMA is doing very good work and admirable taking forward its new role, the consensus is that there is still need for support to deal with the early recovery and compounding cycles of disaster and also to continue the planning, and convening around the root causes of the disaster, i.e. poverty, unsustainable environmental practices, unsustainable farming and development practices, promoting the national risk mind-set with education and instilling knowledge on how to conduct integrated risk-informed development assessments, including at the local level i.e. Community planning /mapping for DRM, and localizing the PDNA.

*Investment case for DRM activities is central to support financial resources for mainstreaming DRR*

In addition to the enabling upstream legal and policy work, DRM mainstreaming and cross-sectoral planning, focus was required on the cost/investment case to support implementation of the new policy and draft DRM law and its budgeting process. Through the PEI Program Support, support was advanced for a strategic public expenditure review (PER) on climate and disaster risk. oing work on SDG planning for the next phase.

*Resilience Plan 2016 (vice president’s office)*

The National Resilience Plan is broadly viewed by stakeholders interviewed as an opportunity; it is currently focused on food insecurity. It is a great opportunity to broaden in line with the risk informed development approach. The resilience plan is getting further advocacy, financial and technical support, including incorporating comments of all sectors in support of policy and cross-sectoral institutional coherence for risk reduction, preparedness, recovery and response. This is an opportunity for GOM, UNDP and WB to join up and support DRM institutional strengthening work as a system for scale-up. Resilience planning is a good opportunity toward DRM institutional strengthening—DRM systems that can transform Malawi’s development trajectory. UNDP has been leading on this in the donor consortium led by the RC office and is moving ahead. DoDMA needs more UNDP technical assistance to lead a high level technical integration process, i.e. put in place a technically sound expected results and M&E resilience program framework. This is urgent. UNDP can provide technical support.

**OUTPUT 2: Data and knowledge on the impact of natural disasters collected and made accessible to decision makers in government, private sector, civil society and communities**

***Key findings***

The main purpose of Output II was to promote informed decision-making and to advance a culture of safety and resilience among disaster risk management stakeholders including communities and public at large through targeted information management, knowledge management and learning. The work should reinforce a movement towards a culture of risk reduction/management and a whole of society mind-set change around disaster risk for local sustainable development. This component was a mixture of Information Management IM and of activities contributing to a broader learning process. The work on Information Management while not implemented directly is advancing. The work on knowledge management and learning has been advanced. Having good strategies for both these areas is essential to DRM systems results.

Key successes are the completion of the DRM communication strategy, the climate information centers, which are operational in several districts for planning and learning activities, including one visited by consultant and support to schools. These efforts are reported by respondents to be of great value for improving local level participatory planning, empowering local communities and governments, NGOs, CBOs for DRM actions and learning.

An important anchor for the DRM system is the information management database. The fact that this output has not advanced was an issue reported with identifying a qualified person/firm to develop a tailor-made database. This is now reported progressing with recent recruitment of a consultant.

*Early Warning Systems*

The Early Warning Systems Program Support with GCF financing is approved, indirectly this tangible result can be attributed to the Program Support for GCF readiness work. This financing will advance these results further. The EWS strategy was established by Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services with support from Africa Adaptation Program. The GCF roadmap financing and strategy are developed.

*Information and Data Management*

The types of data being collected with PSD support include hazard information, baseline vulnerability, and disaster risk profiles. Data and information and knowledge management are an essential part of the participatory decision-making process for quality inter-sectoral responses and for budgeting and policy decision making. This work has advanced during period and will continue to advance with the new GCF financing for early warning. The current information management system is still rudimentary. A systems approach to information management is absolutely essential to effectively coordinate services, and budgets, undertake effective emergency communications and mandating collection of baseline information in other sectors, i.e. health, education, flood and on rainfall patterns, etc. for early warning. UNDP is in the process of engaging a consultant to undertake assessment and tailor an information management system (necessary work). The data consultant will be funded by the Norwegian Trust Fund.

*DRM Inclusive Planning Approaches with CBOs and District*

While a baseline assessment for DRM in communities was planned it had not been conducted. This is a lesson learned. The emergency preparedness activities and trainings need to be built around a baseline including, targeting of towards need in the district officials and local communities. Equipment, including phones and water gauges, has been procured and distributed to local communities. Community based hazards mapping is a key area for conducting vital local community based risk assessment. Work was completed on a national hazard atlas map. The WB is supporting community mapping work in key districts and DoDMA capacity Assessment. UNDP is also undertaking a capacity mapping. This work can be done jointly.

*DRM Learning: Schools, Role of Education for DRM and Learning for Resilience*

The program work on the role of education and schools for DRM was a key result, i.e. training volunteers, schools as safe, child-friendly spaces, etc. and for reaching the resilience outcome, PDNA inclusion of sector, etc. MOEST is the key partner to DoDMA for DRM. While institutional progression on DRM in school health and nutrition is already established in the education policy, the project provided good opportunities to operationalize actions. In a recent disaster, for example, the education-supported (PDNA) supported need or mobilizing USD 23 million,[[17]](#endnote-18) but they received only USD 4 million. The gap exposed the need for more work on financing solutions and for resource mobilization for emergency response in education building back better. MOE notably had successfully recruited teacher volunteers for the recent disaster, the evaluator met with the head volunteer’s teachers.

*Learning and Information Centers*

In line with the PSD learning strategy, the training of education sector colleagues has led to constructively developing resource books for schools and supportive efforts to identify alternative evacuation sites across districts to avoid class disturbances. Under the support, a DRM sourcebook for primary and secondary schools is was developed as a way of introducing DRM in school curricula. So far, the one for primary schools has been developed, and the one for secondary is planned for next year. Sourcebooks are used as resource material for teaching a subject matter.

PSD did not exactly establish the local centers, but rather existing climate information centers were rather used for DRM purposes, and this is working out very well. Information found at the centers covers the whole spectrum of the DRM cycle, not only emergency operations. These local education centers are demonstrated to also be good local platforms for local level emergency operation and coordination and for inclusive planning. Situating a multipurpose center in the district was a smart practice for bridging DoDMA local government work and communities. This work is transformative and can be scaled. The disaster risk management handbook produced by the PSD was recognized as a key learning tool. This is verified by many stakeholders interviewed.

**OUTPUT 3: Coordination of mechanisms and implementation arrangements for DRM/DRM established and used at national level and in the 15 disaster-prone districts**

***Key findings***

The output activities would support an efficient and effective coordination system for comprehensive disaster risk reduction at all levels and sectors. Malawi has a national DRM institutional structure which includes donors and NGos... The institutional framework for DRM is comprised of the Secretary to the Vice President and Commissioner for Disaster Management Affairs, the National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Committee (NDPRC), Civil Protection Committees (CPCs) and DoDMA, created through the DPR Act of 1991*.* The evaluator learned that the technical subcommittees of the National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Technical Committee are responsible for risk reduction, preparedness, and response and recovery activities. A National DRM Platform was established and operationalized in 2013 which served to share new knowledge experiences and encourage coordination of ongoing DRM initiatives among DRM stakeholders. The national platform was revitalized in 2015 around a national partnership and sector-wide approach to disaster risk reduction and management. The national Platform can be an opportunity to support sector wide coordination and development partners for a comprehensive DRM institutional capacity building approach.

Inherently, as mentioned earlier, the work of DRM is cross sector and interdisciplinary. The program thus aimed at strengthen coordination and putting in place mechanisms. Among others, the results of this output were thus significant: 1. DRM Platform was set up; 2. the sector working group has been revived; 3. Data collection tools were harmonized; 4. civil protection committees have been revived in some districts and capacity building of some district and city CPCs 4. Support provided to contingency planning was done (but not as adequately as needed for impact). Other key areas were not reported achieved, including the Program Support’s making good linkages to different assessments: MVAC, mapping, social protection etc. The reasoning was not provided.

Good practices identified included the functional community based early warning message system. Use of hazard and vulnerability maps and contingency plans is a process instilled and now led by district and local village committees.

The multi-hazard national and district contingency plans are developed and are being reviewed annually in line with seasonal forecast. The disaster assessment tools were reviewed and translated with support from DFID, channeled through UNDP and implemented under the program support, into to local languages for use Malawi communities. The SWG was operationalized with support. The Program Support has visibly strengthened coordination mechanisms at district, area and village levels through a number of training sessions focusing on coordination and general DRM issues, but this also needs much more work and support when the policy is rolled out.

# 4.2.2. Capacity Building Approach (NIM)

*Effectiveness of the National Implementation Approach - DRM capacity building interventions*

National implementation requires delivery through DoDMA own systems. There had been a lot of movement of DODMA and UNDP staff. During PSD, 3 out of 9 officers had pursued studies abroad i.e. support by funding from Irish aid. The support, while supportive of outcome level results - DODMA capacity building from other partners can be better coordinated with means to continue Program monitoring and functions as staff members take learning leave. DoDMA requires input of capacity support for implementation with a focus on DRM results based monitoring and management. According to interviews, this is planned.. NIM is an effective modality for learning through the learning by doing approach. UNDP is reported to have supported DoDMA with financial reporting, but the support to NIM for results based monitoring at upstream and subnational levels in 14 districts was needed( more technical support and results monitoring). DoDMA will need a large input of capacity to implement and monitor, in particular at district and community level. In terms of the resources, the financing was a medium sized investment but for outcome level changes much more investment is needed. The UNDP country team expressed that three UNVs are to be deployed to fill in the gaps in capacity at DoDMA. The evaluator commends the use of UNV as a partner in this work. There are many opportunities to build a joint program with as a national program on volunteerism for DRM.

*Programming Integration - Climate Change Resilience and Disaster Risk Reduction*

The potential for synergies across the UNDP portfolio on Outcome 1.2 on environment, natural resources management and climate change - DRR is apparent. For example, UNDP has 12 related projects (see also evaluation of CP 2016). As the CP evaluator in August 2016 put it, “It could be argued that all the CC-ENR projects are relevant.” Disaster risk reduction, and the climate change project contribute towards risk reduction and provide synergies for impacts especially at level of integrated services delivery for impacts. Another issues is the scale of capacity building projects and their ability to deliver concrete results that can impact on the development landscape. According to the recent evaluation of UNDP CP 2013-2017, linked Program Supports and activities within the Outcome 1 portfolio were low scale, with planned budgets of USD 500,000 over 3 to 4 years; in practice means an average of USD 100,000 a year. The PEI Program Support budget was USD 670,000 over a three-year period from 2013–2016; while the DRM Program Support had a planned budget of USD 555,000 implemented from 2012–2015. Going forward, elements could be better integrated and/or converged into one programmatic initiative and includes the DRR as a contributing component.

Currently, there are dual tracks of oversight and planning platforms for resilience, climate change and DRM/R, i.e. the National Climate Change Program (NCCP), which is fully funded by UNDP, is the national coordination platform that guides all climate change related Program Supports supported by all the Development Partners. Department that set up SWGs, climate change and DRM fall under separate SWGs.

|  |
| --- |
| **UNDP CP Program (2012**–**2017) Evaluation (August 2016)** |
| **UNDP Program Supports on environment, natural resources and climate change** |
| 1) Sustainable Land Management |
| 2) Implementing Urgent Adaptation Measures |
| 3) Climate Proofing Development Gains |
| 4) National Climate Change Program (NCCP) |
| 5) Environment and Natural Resources Management |
| 6) Decentralized Energy Services |
| 7) Sustainable Energy Management |
| 8) Early Warning Systems |
| 9) Increasing Energy Access |
| 10) Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) |
| 11) Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Support Program |
| 12) Support under UN REDD |

It is urgent to adopt a more program approach to CC and DRM based for mainstreaming and for capacity strengthening. The short-term and uncoordinated nature of the approach promotes territorial thinking (silos) and for some sectors has led to negative comments over the use of scarce funding (e.g. education, agriculture and health). DoDMA agrees that there is need to provide implementation for results requires *installing* *a more programmatic* *approach* *at DoDMA* in line with the integrated and cross sectoral DRM cycle.

*Governance, Management and Monitoring Structures (See chronology of support in annex with monitoring dates and activities)*

The Program Support has a high-level steering committee (see Annex). The practice has been to meet once a year. The *Technical Committee* (TC), membership includes directors from the ministries represented in the SC including department of climate change and meteorological services (DCCMs); UNDP (DRM program analyst and UNDP technical advisor); other UN agencies, nongovernmental actors[[18]](#endnote-19) and donors. The process was to develop annual work plans which go through both the SC and TC, and then are approved by UNDP and finally budget is provided.  Based on the approved Annual Work Plans (AWPs), UNDP made cash transfers according to the National Implementation modality (NIM) and followed the procedures of the UN Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) but approvals were reported as being slow. [[19]](#endnote-20)

The TC, has been a significant venue for technical guidance to DODMA in the preparation of annual work plans and also for guiding implementation of program activities.. The TC has constituted the inclusive cross sector thematic technical teams for overall monitoring of progress and approval of significant changes to the work plan and budget. Some respondent’s member of the TC reported this aspect as not strong.

The annual SC meeting was comprised of the UNDP, represented by the Resident Representative; Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, represented by the Secretary to Treasury; the Principal Secretary and Commissioner for DoDMA from the Office of the President and Cabinet. This meeting served as the Board of Directors for the program, responsible for oversight of program implementation. The Steering Committee (SC) was streamlined withthe National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Technical), and served also the national platform. It provided overall and strategic guidance during program implementation. This steering committee consisted of principal secretaries (PS) of ministries of finance and development planning MOFDP; agriculture, irrigation and water development MOAIWD;[[20]](#endnote-21) local government and rural development MOLGRD; health MOH; lands, housing and urban development MOLHUD; education, science and technology MOEST; office of the president and cabinet OPC; UNDP (environment cluster manager). Civil society organizations CSO were represented by Malawi Red Cross Society MRCS, concerning universal and Christian aid. Other UN agencies and donor agencies were called upon to attend the steering committee meetings as required. The PS for DoDMA chairs the steering committee, and UNDP acts as co-chair. The Chief Secretary chairs the NDPRC. The issue it was not operational rather high level and so meeting were prepared and agreements taken.

At the district level, coordination of program activities was through the Directorate of District Planning, headed by the Director of Planning and Development (DPD). In view of the fact that the program seeks to mainstream Disaster Risk Management issues into the District Development Planning process, the DPD is the overall coordinator of the program at the district level. The executive body was the District Civil Protection Committee (DCPC), chaired by the DPD, and the Assistant District Disaster Risk Management Officer (ADDRMO) served as secretary to the DCPC. The ADDRMO provided the necessary guidance to the DCPC to ensure Disaster Risk Management issues were being mainstreamed into the district development planning process. The DCPC also prepared and presented quarterly program progress reports to the District Executive Committee (DEC), which were shared with DoDMA and UNDP.

The results oversight however had been found to be unstructured for joint program level results monitoring. This aspect could be improved with adherence to the principles of results based management framework. For instance, the original plan for ME, according to the ProDoc, was to start this program with a baseline assessment for monitoring changes toward a functioning DRM system. The baseline was left out and this cascaded as a problem for monitoring. According to the Program Support chronology (DoDMA), the baseline study on local disaster risk management mechanism, budget allocation for DRR and gender specific needs would need to be conducted to more than 600 people in 14 Program Support target sites.

**DoDMA**

Program Support Personnel: DRR Advisor, ICT and Economist UNVs, Finance Analyst

**Program Support Board**

**DoDMA**

**National Disaster Preparedness and Relief Committee (NDRPC-OPC)**
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Vulnerability and Disaster Risk Management Sector Working Group

Technical

Committee

**Program Organization Structure**

**District Executive Committee**
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**Civil Protection Committee**
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*Technical Assistance*

The supply of technical assistance from UNDP to Program Support was found to be robust but can be improved i.e. financing DRM, national level risk assessment and so many other areas where UNDP global has expertise. The policy had international support to ensure the policy had benefited from external good practices. Aspects found to needing outside technical expertise include ensuring the execution of standards for public building such as evacuation centers, voluntarism standards, and DRM information and database development standards.

*UNDP Comparative Contribution[[21]](#endnote-22)*

UNDP, as an operational development agency was reported as being a trusted partner to GOM, supporting activities recorded as far back to Hyogo. Together, joint work on resource mobilization for taking this work forward is a priority. It was suggested that UNDP develop a historical picture of the partnership work for advocacy and case studies of the long term work for this purpose.

UNDP is well positioned and respected for its expert support for DRM and support for coordination work, especially for integrated design thinking and PSD management, including work intersecting finance, environmental governance, climate change, Forestry and DRM in institutional building towards resilience outcomes. This was confirmed by respondents interviewed by agencies (DoDMA; Health, Education and Finance) and the donor community (UN, IASC-Irish Aid, DFID and WB).

The PSD fits into UNDPs resilience and sustainable growth portfolio. The linkages between the work on environment, climatic change and DRR was noted as an n issue and this had been discussed throughout this evaluation and need to be addressed. UNDP’s strategic advantage for supporting DRM institutional work was recognized as its ability to work with small, strategic projects that show the investment case for scale-up in terms of value added for money and the cost case. During the period, UNDP went through an internal reorganization and change process that did not escape Malawi. There has been inconsistency in staff. UNDP must also ensure that its local program officers in this area are stable and present.

The development partners interviewed agree that UNDP has not been building on its comparative advantages and or positioning as much as it could to help GOM lead sector coordination for planning, but leadership was welcomed on coordination especially for planning and institutional strengthening for a more sustainable approach.

# *4.3. Efficiency*

# 4.3.1. Resources and Reporting (See annex for PSD resources situation)

This section considers how economically the resources and inputs, such as funds, expertise and time, have been have been converted to results across the different outputs. The question about resources has two key parts, whether there were sufficient resources for results and whether there was value for money.

# 4.3.2. Cost-effectiveness

The cost effectiveness of the PSD was very high, considering the PSD was implemented through NIM and per the actual upstream enabling work and preparedness activities and the actual results achieved. The project expressed **value for money.** I.e. upstream result on policy. Greater per local policy level results could have been much greater i.e. Sustainable local level impacts and more concentrated work with the local governments. It was a small financial investment. The funds were not enough for results across 14 districts. It was stretched to far over 14 districts. The resources for what was expected however was not found to be adequate for the expected level of engagement; for a sustainable impact on response and recovery, preparedness and building the capacity of DoDMA, the overall investment and resource needed was at a much larger scale. This is for institutional strengthening. Significant resources will need to be mobilized for impacts including support to national implementation for procurement and monitoring and work in subnational areas, i.e. resilience in communities. Costing for DRM and the investment case for DODMA work is, therefore, still very much needed.

# 4.3.3. Partnerships

Partnerships are core to DRM work, as it is inter- sectoral, interdisciplinary and multi-functional. As with intersectoral environmental management, those responsible for Disaster risk management DRM requires cross sector coordination of data for decision making and planning , other sectors for emergency response and partnerships. Output three was all about improving coordination which is really a function of DODMA. The evaluator scoped the similar work of partners and queried how it has added value to the Program Support results, e.g. whether there were instances of collaboration and potential for future work.

In general, partners scoped provided support to DRM under different banners and agendas but not really coordinated by project more as a voluntary actions to come together. This aspect can be improved with a sector approach whereby government lead and UNDP support coordination through a sector approach to the overall plan. The sector partners are all development and humanitarian actors operating around disaster preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation activities. A key finding has been around the need for enhanced coordination and convening. There is a clear role for UNDP to help government bridge support being provided by development partners and this Program. There is also a need to better convene partners around the DRM agenda for the scale of work needed for institutional strengthening work in order to get traction on the DODMA capacity needs in order for DODMA to build capacity and undertake the scale of capacity strengthening needed to fulfil its mandate.

Several opportunities for new resourcing partnerships were flagged: Irish Aid/DfID, WB Global, i.e. IDA mobilization, further responsiveness and leadership for integration with UNICEF, WFP and UN-Habitat work (see below). Partners are normally engaged through DoDMA. According to respondents, the sector working group might be better coordinated and or linked /joined (CC/DRR are interlinked work). The Sector Working Group (SWG) on Vulnerability and Disaster and Risk Management can be UNDP can develop a rational study of why these two working committees might merge. A joint ME framework and overarching theme such as resilience that is cross-sectoral and includes CC/DRR and environmental work stakeholders can be considered.[[22]](#endnote-23)

*World Bank*

TheWB is an active UNDP/GOM DRM partner. WB has a very stable full time DRM officer (five years in position). UNDP and WB have an informal arrangement to support and are already found to be generating synergies. The two recent PDNAs were led by UNDP and WB with government. They also reported as undertaking local level DRM capacity assessments. The PDNA process for post-disaster recovery and community mapping have been and remain key areas for synergies (PDNA’s 2015 flood and 2016 drought loss and damage assessments are good practices but found to be lacking joint follow up on institutional strengthening findings). The UNDP/WB engagement has potential for improvements through an operational sector-wide approach and sector working group (WB officer 2016).

*UN Habitat*

During the course of implementing this PSD, UN Habitat was found to be directly supporting the DRM work, through capacity building of city councils... The UN organization is actively progressing with government work on risk-informed standards for new buildings. They are focusing on the building environment and urban risk. They welcomed working with UNDP on local level pilots to illustrate standard and cheap design in evacuation centers and buildings in the informal and formal sector, including the highly vulnerable urban centers. UN-Habitat had activities in Karonga, Nsanje Chikwawa District, and joint work on slum upgrading and city development strategy Program Supports in Blantyre, Lilongwe, Mzuzu and Zomba. A good area of joint work can be design, i.e. building and standards and on urban risk where vulnerability is high. Future Program and sector work can build on this partnership and lesson learned.

*Irish Aid[[23]](#endnote-24)*

Irish aid has supported capacity development of DoDMA. Officers at DODMA have benefited from postgraduate courses at DoDMA funded by Irish Aid, between 2011 and 2017 (so far, 5 officers have been trained up to master’s level through Irish Aid). The Irish Aid supported the national ECRP Program and will end in 2017. This is an opportunity around institutional resilience development.[[24]](#endnote-25) The ECRP supported community-level resilience. A key point made during meeting was about possible partnership with UNDP on resilience and institutional strengthening, and in particular strengthening the DRM sector working groups’ work and the local DRM officer’s work. They suggest that work is needed to track DRR expenditure. The ECRP Program is to be redesigned with about 50 million British pounds and focuses on structures in 11 districts. The recommendation is to focus on documenting traditional resilience practices, scale them and revitalize them.

*The Chinese Government supported SGS*

Through a small grants modality, the government of the People’s Republic of China injected USD 400,000 into DODMA DRM Support in 2016-2017.

*United Nations Fund for Children UNICEF*

UNICEF has provided support to DoDMA through rolling work plans. Although this was focused on preparedness and response. Work with UNICEF can continue through the sector working group and UN one work. They clearly support that development partners can be working in an integrated fashion as they are providing support but not convening around a single well-resourced DRM plan.

*World Food Program WFP*

WFP’s work on DRR was found to have three key components: 1) Support to Education, 2) Nutrition Support and 3) Capacity Development related to Disaster Risk Reduction. This program started in 2012 and has been extended to continue activities until December 2018. Under component one, WFP provides school meals to primary and pre-primary students in 14 food insecure districts. With earmarked funding, WFP has rolled out an emergency school meals Program Support, given the context of widespread acute food insecurity in 2016/17. Component two enables WFP to provide treatment of moderate acute malnutrition to children, pregnant/breastfeeding women and people on HIV/Tuberculosis (TB) treatment. For people on HIV/TB treatment, WFP also provides treatment of severe acute malnutrition (SAM). The third component focuses on strengthening national capacity to prepare for, respond to and mitigate disasters—this final component is linked to field-level asset creation under Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) 200692. The three components are complemented by WFP’s support to agricultural markets and smallholder farmers through the Purchase for Progress and a Prevention of Stunting pilot. Partners welcome a sector-wide and program approach aimed at full cycle institutional resilience. They confirmed that the work of institutional resilience is a central shift in the right direction and could make a big difference for getting out of the cycles of disaster response. They can support these aims.

*United Nations Volunteers UNV*

There are many volunteer agencies working in villages, including Red Cross and UNV. This area has great potential for integration with the community level for DRM activities. Planning, empowerment and mobilizing supported volunteer groups for longer-term resilience against flood and other hazards can be a good strategy. The current UNV program might be approached for supporting the program with DRM volunteers - community movement .UNV currently supports 28 UNVs, across 14 international agencies and in three ministries in Malawi. UNV will also support three volunteers to DoDMA national to help with the capacity issues. UNV architecture is good for the PSD in terms of potential future partnerships on volunteerism and also links to regional and global UN funds and funders. Development of a national DRM volunteer program and conducting case studies on how volunteerism support mitigates the social impact of disasters are key recommendations.

*One UN work (Resilience and DRM)*

The One UN pilot in a disaster-prone DISTRICT (Phalombe) is a notable practice to build on as it shows how UN can work together on DRM and resilience. This is a good practice which includes comparative work on social protection of UNICEF agricultural rural development, FAO and UNDP on local governance. This promising practice can be built upon to demonstrate the One UN approach and bring others on board (Interview with the RC). A key finding was the expressed UN need to pool resources for resilience.

*Non-Government Organizations NGOs*

Evaluator met with NGOs involved in implementation, first, with the Catholic Relief Commission, a local based NGO in Lilongwe and second, with the COOPI-Italian cooperation in Salima district. NGOs are actively supporting DRM as implementing partners. COOPI is the Italian cooperation supporting community DRM and liaison work between the district disaster risk management office, the project and the village development communities. Both welcomed a greater sector-wide approach to disaster risk management and vulnerability.

# *4.4. Sustainability*

This analysis considers the gaps and action needed for continuation of benefits after program has completed and the probability of continued long-term benefits.

* **For DODAMAs institutional development, the program needs significantly more funding. The** UNDP /GOM program must be significantly up scaled financially and supported by other resourcing partners to help the DODMAs growth strategy. The institution is currently needs significant assistance to build it capacity as per the 2015 Policy and DRM law. The evaluation shows evidence that UNDP GOM cooperation has advanced the enabling environment for DoDMA to deliver a new DRM mandate. The sustainability depends however on the identification of resources and partners to help DODMA deliver on its DRM mandate as per the policy and also on the legal work that it has advanced. UNDP/WB informants informed that a capacity assessment is currently ongoing. WB/UNDP might jointly work with DoDMA to plan a comprehensive institutional response based on a consolidation. The UNDP might also best sustainability by building on its comparative advantages for upstream enabling work and demonstration and so streamlining its assistance to a demonstration pilot in a few key districts, provide piloting support to demonstrate the policy and the bill, including the deployment of budget and human resources for local DRM work that aims at bridging and integration
* **UNDP can employ better its convening power.** This is to mobilize/lead the development partners in a sector wide approach. Development partners, while working in consortia on DRM can be better bridged to the work of the PSD. UNDP can play a big role to better convene the development partners on behalf of the government for greater Program resourcing, monitoring and impacts. According to partners and the UN Resident Coordinator (see program of mission attached), the donor’s partners find it unnerving and difficult to provide humanitarian funding in the absence of a clear sector-wide approach with good targets and shared expected outcomes. This area, UN support for coordination through a sector working group, needs to be prioritized. Malawi is in protracted crisis mode, and the DRM work outside of humanitarian cycles can be more attractive to fund. Malawi has been very attractive for response and humanitarian appeals. DoDMA has done well with humanitarian appeals. The additional investment case for resilience and an institutional building investment case are needed. According to respondents, DRM resource allocation shows the government’s priority commitment across sectors, and that is needed for affirmative action for DRM system. How government departments have fared in terms of the actual budget support to DRM already is still an important question. This is a key point of action to actually know the expenditure and trends to influence the DRM budgeting/policy practice.
* **Ongoing Resilience work offers an opportunity.** This framework provides an overarching conceptual framework that can be employed as main theme to better align UNDP support on EG.CC/DRR /DRM. As part of this, UNDP can provide focused DODMA institutional strengthening support under a resilience banner that covers EG /DRM for the next CP. The contribution to environmental sustainability was generally manifested through the small grants scheme whereby capacitated communities have been enabled to undertake good practices with regard to the management of the natural resources and environment. The policy is also favorable for environmental resilience for protection, and management of the environment is among the pillars of the Malawi Vision 2020. This long-term strategy recognizes the importance of ensuring the environmental sustainability of development. As already highlighted by this evaluation, UNDP supports many projects on environmental sustainability but they are not linked for impact through demonstration of the community risk informed planning approach. However, other than the development and establishment of policies and legal frameworks, government implementation of these policies remains a challenge.

# *4.5. Cross-cutting issues*

DRM requires integration of cross-cutting issues- human rights, gender and environment in particular. The gender focused attributes of mainstreaming work and DRM governance for example should be reflected the program’s design. While the support activities has had cross-sector impacts at the level of the activities, i.e. small grants in the community’s ensured inclusion of women and focuses on ecological integrity, the design stage is the place to make gender goals prominent. . The evaluation noted that the gender mainstreaming in design and monitoring for it was generally weak. Based on reports however, there has been no targeted tracking and monitoring. Members of the Gender Working Group interviewed also observed that UN agencies generally did not know what and how to track, and gender equality outcomes and the gender scorecard assessment had not been done. The evaluator finds need for a cross-practice synergy, most likely to be achieved through the UNDP program officer on DRM between the work of this PSD and gender.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………

# 5. LESSONS LEARNED[[25]](#endnote-26)

Key lesson learned include:

* Without a clearly defined theory of change and joint monitoring plan and smart formulation of interventions indicators, the interventions may become too diverse, resulting in a fragmented program.
* While most interventions may be important and useful, given the development context in Malawi, too many interventions with limited scale may not necessarily add up to expected developmental outcomes.
* Even though UNDP has a distinct comparative advantage in normative work, a comprehensive environmental scan to determine where it really adds value for partners i.e. coordination of sector can enhance its impact.
* To achieve truly transformational impact, partnership should not only be seen in the context of resource mobilization, but also in terms of leveraging partner results in order to achieve better up-scaling and sustainability.
* To ensure the continued flow of program benefits, there is a need for well-defined exit strategies and sustainability planning.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program Support Areas | Lesson Learned |
| Strategies | Root cause analysis plus institutional-policy and finance analysis lead to good programs. Incorrect baseline is like a prescription for the wrong disease. |
|  | Planning and framing DRM systems within the context of resilience work for development is a good investment from the economic perspective. When food is diverted to feed people, money is diverted from roads and other things... |
| Log Frame | Tools for results monitoring include Log Frame and strong, smart indicators and strategic plan for change. A strong results framework is needed for upstream and downstream preparedness results. |
| Replicability | Intersectoral design and design for scale-up with partners makes for better strategies Having a good Program level knowledge management strategy to support learning and synergies helps inform replication and scale-up. |
| Capacity | That there must be in house capacity for national implementation and monitoring to build capacity. I, Support to NIM for procurement and knowledge networking and donor partnering is a case in point. |
| Finances | To build institutional resilience for DRM, funding is needed at a much greater scale. Currently the sector is underfunded by development partners, including banks and donors working on resilience CC/DRR/CBDRM/humanitarian response. |
| Knowledge Management | DRM program learning can be enhanced through knowledge management and partners learning approaches. |
| Result 1  Mainstreaming  /Governance |  |
|  | DRM is cross-sectoral work. Governance and mainstreaming are about the critical linkages that need to be built i.e. data sharing, convening and getting buy in from the sectors where DRR work happens. A multi- sectoral working group need be established for oversight of technical results and work planning. |
|  | Bridging communities with district and national DoDMA officers needs to be clearly adhered to in DRM program design. |
|  | Volunteers are important for DRM community action .The role of volunteerism and community organizing in implementation is central for community level impacts. |
|  | The PSD shows the importance of the instrumental role of education in DRM as partner in building resilience. |
|  | More DRM geographical focused pilots are better - in this case upstream where most problems are coming from, e.g. lower shire districts, and the problem in upland areas. |
|  | Resilience is an overarching concept than enable critical interlinkages between CC/ER/DRM/Development and Environmental Governance. |
| Result 2  IM Data, KM Systems CBDRM | IM and KM need separate strategies.  Role of Education in DRM is critical. Risk reduction mind-set changes is brought about through education and public awareness.  Educational institutions work through schools to change the mind-set of parents and communities. |
| Result 3  Coordination | Central to results is demonstration of coordination for DRM at the community and district level, strengthening linkages between community and district planning and capacity for preparedness and early warning and building on what exists in terms of working with communities,  Community level DRM workers under COOPI are shown to be important bridges with the districts... The bridges built through COOPI work was demonstrating the critical linkage for DRM approach to mapping and planning at the local government level. |
| SDG linkages | Building on ongoing work. DRM Program Support can make good linkages to SDGs planning. DRM financial analysis need to be conducted with the department of the planning and budget. |
| Gender programming linkages | More work on understanding the baseline and need for mainstreaming gender in DRM is needed. |
| Resourcing DRM and Resilience | An investment case can speed up work for finance. |
| Social Norms and urban vs rural | Urban DRM is needed to balance development focus on rural and deal with risk mainstreaming and risk mind-set holistically. |

# 6. CONCLUSIONS

The program support has satisfactorily strengthened the DRM coordination and generated good lessons that can support the next Program. The lessons and learning from period are generally saying there is a need for more coordination and sector-wide work on DRM risk governance and mainstreaming. This Program upstream policy work has successfully resulted in an increased awareness with humanitarian and development partners of the partnership between UNDP and GOM, it has successfully instituted DRM policy and reviewed the bill for legal consideration. A sector wide approach with greater resources and the continuation of the legal work will enable further policy operationalization and budgetary support for DRM mainstreaming, building of capacity and to get accelerated traction packaging and scaling of the downstream CBDRM lessons and work. According to respondents, local districts and councils are still a long way from being able to respond and help communities prepare.

The national resiliency planning is a great opportunity/impetus for partners to convene and support DoDMA mandate through work on capacity, governance and coordination. The opportunity is to link DRM PSD support to the resilience *agenda* and encourage broader development partners group to support DoDMA with DRM. The UNDP can support sustainability by streamlining assistance to operationalize policy and undertake a subnational demonstration of the new policy, including the deployment of budget and human resources for integrated package of services linking upstream and downstream and promoting bridging districts and communities and integration with CCA. UNDP might consider mobilizing financing partners to establish a pooled fund or multi-donor partnership to institute the institutional resilience work and help build the capacity of DoDMA to carry out its cross-sectoral and decentralized functions.

# 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

* For next cycle, UNDP - GOM continue the DRM support and integrate Program work on Environment, Climate Change and DRR under the overarching Resilience banner for greater impacts. Designate stable programming staff to support the new portfolio.
* UNDP - GOM conduct as a priority a scoping of baseline line for institutional capacity building support in districts to DRM.
* UNDP - GOM provide support in the DRM programming context for preparing for early recovery i.e. funding, coordination etc.
* UNDP - GOM convene a multi -stakeholder donor forum and development partners group around the resilience portfolio and sector wide approach.
* UNDP GOM explore UN joint programming modalities for next cycle DRM (RESILEINCE programming) i.e. urban design, national volunteerism movement and social protection UNICEF, UN- Habitat and UNV.
* UNDP GOM explore financing partnerships with Irish Aid and DfID, WB for next phase (financing and programming linkages);
* UNDP explore alternative mechanisms for pooling development partners fund AND innovative financing for DRM ;
* UNDP -GOM develop a robust full sized proposal that expresses capacity building support to GOM for next cycle DRM - NIM implementation and monitoring and knowledge sharing /networking for broader sector and partners, provinces learning for results.
* UNDP - GOM design a pilot project covering a few districts demonstrating DODMA functionality and the implementation of the new DRM policy. Ensure the pilot has a focus on CBDRM linking community to district level planning and action and also include volunteerism and learning centers.
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# ANNEX 2. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

| **Serial No.** | **Sector** | **Institution** | **Name** | **Contact Number** | **Email Address** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Government – Central Level** | Department of Disaster Management Affairs | James Chiusiwa | 0999937952 | [chiusiwaj@yahoo.com](mailto:chiusiwaj@yahoo.com) |
|  | Vice President’s Office | Milward Tobias | 0997093213 | [damalansambo@gmail.com](mailto:damalansambo@gmail.com) |
|  | Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development | Daisi Kachingwe | 0888852732 | [kachingwedk@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:kachingwedk@yahoo.co.uk) |
|  | Department of Economic Planning and Development | Yona Kamphale | 0888893405 | [ykamphale@yahoo.com](mailto:ykamphale@yahoo.com) |
|  | Ministry of Health | Allone Ganizani | 0888332454 | [ganizaniall@yahoo.com](mailto:ganizaniall@yahoo.com) |
|  | Ministry of Education, Science and Technology | Virginia Kachigunda | 0993384124 | [vkjinnie5@gmail.com](mailto:vkjinnie5@gmail.com) |
|  | Environmental Affairs Department | Emmanuel Nkomwa | 0888474006  0994537764 | [nafemko@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:nafemko@yahoo.co.uk) |
|  | Department of CC and Met. Services | -Fred Kossam or  -Amos Ntonya | 0995319352  0999370480 | [Fred.kossam@gmail.com](mailto:Fred.kossam@gmail.com)  [amosmtonya@gmail.com](mailto:amosmtonya@gmail.com) |
|  | Department of Water Development and Irrigation | Chikondi Mbemba  Piasi Kaunda | 0999232708  0999210598 | [chikondimbemba@gmail.com](mailto:chikondimbemba@gmail.com)  [piasikaunda@yahoo.com](mailto:piasikaunda@yahoo.com) |
|  | **UN agencies** | United Nations Development Program | Sothini Nyirenda | 0888773869 | [Sothini.nyirenda@undp.org](mailto:Sothini.nyirenda@undp.org) |
|  | United Nations Population Fund | Dorothy Nyasulu | 0888209973 | [nyasulu@unfpa.org](mailto:nyasulu@unfpa.org) |
|  | World Food Program | Duncan Ndhlovu | 0999972420 | [Duncan.ndhlovu@wfp.org](mailto:Duncan.ndhlovu@wfp.org) |
|  | United Nations Children’s Fund | Estere Tsoka |  | [etsoka@unicef.org](mailto:etsoka@unicef.org) |
|  | UN Habitat | John Chome | 01770133 | [John.chome@undp.org](mailto:John.chome@undp.org) |
|  | **Development Partners** | World Bank | Francis Nkoka | 0999484483 | [fnkoka@worldbank.org](mailto:fnkoka@worldbank.org) |
|  | Irish Aid | Lovely Chizimba | 0999866107 | [Lovely.chizimba@dfa.ie](mailto:Lovely.chizimba@dfa.ie) |
|  | **NGOs** | Catholic Development Commission | Martin Mazinga | 0999132468 | [mkmazinga@yahoo.com](mailto:mkmazinga@yahoo.com) |
|  | Concern Universal | Esther Mweso |  | [Esther.mweso@concern-universal.org](mailto:Esther.mweso@concern-universal.org) |
|  | COOPI | Aubrey Nyekanyeka | 0999954989 | [anyekanyeka@gmail.com](mailto:anyekanyeka@gmail.com) |
|  | Save the Children | James Lwanda |  | [James.lwanda@savethechildren.org](mailto:James.lwanda@savethechildren.org) |
|  | World Vision Malawi | Noah Tomoka | 0888361752 | [Noah\_tomoka@wvi.org](mailto:Noah_tomoka@wvi.org) |
|  | Association of Environmental Journalists | Matthews Malata | 0999646114 | [malatamathews@yahoo.com](mailto:malatamathews@yahoo.com) |
|  | Malawi Red Cross Society | Ethel Kaimila | 0999949084 | [ekaimila@redcross.mw](mailto:ekaimila@redcross.mw) |
|  | Christian Aid | Sophie Makoloma | 0881188823 | [smakoloma@christian-aid.org](mailto:smakoloma@christian-aid.org) |
|  | Centre for Environmental Policy and Advocacy | Dorothy Tembo | 0995430401 | [Dorothy@cepa.org.mw](mailto:Dorothy@cepa.org.mw) |
|  | **Districts** | Salima (DC and ADDRMO) and COOPI in Salima | Blessings Kantema | 0994200509 | [bblssins@gmail.com](mailto:bblssins@gmail.com) |

# ANNEX 3. RESULT-BASED PERFORMANCE MATRIX

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OUTCOME 1 | | | |
|  | Planned actions to produce results include | Validation |
| 1 | Review the Disaster Preparedness and Relief Act | Yes | A DRM Bill is currently in place. |
| 2 | Conduct a Public Expenditure Review for DRM and policy reviews | Yes | For the past two years DODMA conducted public expenditure reviews jointly with Ministry of Finance and Poverty Environment Initiative Program Support. The reports basically showed the area of environment, CC and DRM is underfunded. The report is attached. |
| 3 | Introduce DRM into school curricula at primary, secondary and tertiary level | Yes | DRM has so far been introduced in primary school curriculaUnder the Program Support, we are also developing a DRM sourcebook for primary and secondary schools as a way of introducing DRM in school curricula. So far, the one for primary schools has been developed, whereas the one for secondary is planned for next year. Sourcebooks are used as resource material for teaching a subject matter. |
| 4 | Develop and introduce budget guidelines integrating DRM concerns in government (national and district) annual budgeting | Waiting for the act/ In the process | DODMA developed the devolution plan as part of this process. Once this plan is approved, local councils shall be provided with funds for implementation of DRM activities |
| 5 | Implement revised policies and plans at national and local levels in 15 disaster prone districts | Yes | All activities being implemented are part of the policy. All Program activities draw from the policy |
| 6 | Incorporate DRM/DRM concerns Draft MGDS III for 2017–2022 | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| OUTCOME 2 | | |  |
|  | Planned actions to produce the activity result include | Comments |  |
| 1 | Establishment of a disaster database | Not yet | This activity has met with a lot of challenges in getting a qualified person/firm to develop the database |
| 2 | Review the national early warning systems and identify overlaps, gaps and needs in the existing systems | Yes | This was done and supported by the Early Warning Systems Program Support. A report is attached |
| 3 | Procure EWS equipment that necessary for effective EWS | Yes | Done under the Early Warning Systems Program Support |
| 4 | Formulate and operationalize a National Risk Communication Strategy on DRM/DRM, a very  important activity | Yes | The strategy was developed and a number of strategies have been implemented, such as production and airing of radio Program son DRM |
| 5 | Establishment of DDRR information centers | Yes | These were established by Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Stations with support from Africa Adaptation Program |
| 6 | Provide training and equipment for effective dissemination of early warning information in 15 disaster prone districts | Yes | Such trainings have been undertaken, targeting district officials and local communities. Equipment such as phones and water gauges have been procured and distributed to local communities |
| 7 | Set up mechanism for community based DRM activities at local level | Yes | Same as below |
| 8 | Support community based mitigation and risk reduction initiatives in the disaster-prone districts through implementation of a small grants facility | Yes |  |
|  | OUTCOME 3 | |  |
|  | Planned actions to produce the activity result include | Comments |  |
| 1 | Establishment of a Malawi National Platform (NP) as a coordination mechanism for DRM/DRR under UNISDR guidelines | Yes | The National DRM Platform was established and operationalized in 2013. It serves as a platform for sharing new knowledge experiences and ongoing DRM initiatives among DRM stakeholders. |
| 2 | Develop, review and operationalize national, district, area and village multi-sector emergency preparedness plans | Yes | Multi-hazard national and district contingency plans were developed and are reviewed annually in line with seasonal forecast. The National contingency plan for 2015/2016 is attached. |
| 3 | Develop and support linkages between DRM-related information databases, such as MVAC, UNFPA Vulnerability Profiling, DoDMA disaster database, hazard and vulnerability maps, social protection and agricultural and food security databases | Partially |  |
| 4 | Review of DoDMA’s damage assessment methods and protocols and its practical use to improve decision-making towards damage and losses | Yes | Disaster assessment tools were reviewed and translated to local languages for easy us by communities. The tools are attached. |
| 5 | Operationalize the Sector Working Group (SWG) on Vulnerability and Disaster and Risk Management and address capacity gaps through training of line ministries’ focal points | Yes | This SWG was operationalized with support from the Program Support, but it has not been very active since. |
| 6 | Review institutional arrangements for DRM/DRM in selected disaster-prone districts and strengthen coordination mechanisms (CPCs) at district, area and village levels | Yes | The Program Support strengthened coordination mechanisms at district, area and village levels through a number of training sessions focusing on coordination and general DRM issues. |
| 7 | Establish a donor coordination mechanism on DRM | Partially | DODMA has a national DRM institutional structure which includes donors. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Result** | | **Measurable indicators** | | **Baseline** | | **Target** | | **Means of verification** | | **Important assumptions and Risks** | |
| **Outcome**. Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management disaster risk by 2016. | | * Average number of days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster | | * days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster (2011:≥ 14 days | | * days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster 2016: <7 days) | | * Government publications and reports. * Evaluation reports. * Post disaster assessment reports * National MGDS Reports. | | * Government willing to put into practice what is reflected in the MGDS. * Continued donor financial and technical support * Political uncertainties * Political will and change in mind set for DRM. | |
| **Output 2.** Disaster risk management mainstreamed in policies and development plans | | * Number of key sector policies, development plans at national and district levels reflecting DRM * % increase in budget allocation on DRM * % reduction in economic and social losses after a disaster occurs * % of households adopting mitigative and risk reduction initiatives in the disaster prone districts | | * No key policy with DRM incorporated i.e. Agri. and water development, Env., Education , Forestry, lands housing and rural development policies * No DRM specific budget allocation * 60% economic and social loss * 30% of HH adopting mitigative measures | | * 4 key policies reflecting DRM * 1% budget allocation for DRM * Economic and social loss reduced to 20% * 80% of households | | * Sector plans, * Sector budgets, * Public Expenditure Reviews * Sector policies * Post disaster assessment reports * Survey reports * Social Economic profiles * District Development Plans * Government reports * Consultancy reports | | * Government willing to integrate DRM * DRM policy Approved and Act reviewed * Capacity built is retained within the government system at the ministry and assembly level * Government will be able to raise the required funds * Political uncertainties * Political will and change in mind set for DRM | |
| **Output 3.** Data and knowledge on the impact of natural disasters collected and made accessible to decision makers in Government, Private Sector, Civil Society, and Communities. | | * Number of strategies implemented from the communication strategy * Number of DRR principles incorporated in school curricula Number of government agencies, CSOs with access to data and reports on impact of natural disasters * Number of districts with resource centers * Number of DRM related data bases that are linked and periodically updated | | * No communication strategy * 0 * No DRM resource centers * 1 data base with no linkages | | * 10 strategies implemented * 1 * 14 resource centers * 8 databases linked | | * Survey reports * Policy briefs * Workshops and policy dialogue proceedings * Reports from government agencies, private companies, and CSOs * DRM data bases | | * Cooperation between the various ministries with respect to data sharing and management * Connectivity between the databases and the upkeep of relevant data * Enough awareness and understanding of the importance of DRM in promoting risk reduction * Wide media coverage on impacts of disasters | |
| **Output 4.** Coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for DRM/DRR established and used at national level and in the 15 disaster-prone districts | | * Number of targeted DCPC, ACPs and VCPCs established, trained and functional * Number of Sector Working Group, Steering Committees (SC)and Technical Committee (TC) and DRM platform meetings * Number of simulation exercises and updated contingency plans * Number of partner compliant to the Operational Guidelines on DRM | | * 30% of CPCs, ACPCs and VCPCs functional and trained * No DRM platform forum held, irregular SWG      * 1 simulation exercise * 14 contingency plans and one national contingency plan * 7 partners | | * 80% of ACPCs and VCPCs functional and trained * 10 platform meetings,10 SWG meetings, 20 TCs and SCs * 20 simulation exercises (4/yr) * 15 reviewed and operationalized   contingency plans   * 15 partners | | * Minutes of DRM platform and SWG meetings * DoDMA Reports * Steering and Technical committee minutes * District council reports * MGDS II monitoring reports * Sector reports | | * Cooperation between the various ministries with respect to data sharing and management * Continued donor financial and technical support * Limited staff turn-over at DoDMA and in the 15 target districts | |
| **Output 5** Monitoring and Evaluation | | * Number of sector Ministries and assemblies that have established M&E systems that are operational * % of trained sector staff using M&E skills in their work. * Number of Assemblies who have gender-disaggregated information reflected in selected sector reports such as for education, health, gender and agriculture | | * 5 * 35% (to be verified) * 4 districts (to be verified) | | * 11 * 80% * 11 districts | | * Baseline study report * Mid-term review report * Impact evaluation report | | * Level of appreciation of M&E increases at all levels over time | |

# ANNEX 4. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Disaster Risk Management Project---Project ID: 00067161**

**End of Term Evaluations**

**Terms of Reference**

1. Context
   1. **Background**

UNDP has continued to support the Malawi (GoM) through the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcomes focusing on environment and energy for sustainable economic development. The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II 2011/12-2015/16 is the overarching operational medium-term strategy for Malawi. Its main objective remains to reduce poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It is organized into six thematic areas: i) Sustainable Economic Growth; ii) Social Development iii) Social Support and Disaster Risk Management (DRM); iv) Infrastructure Development; v) Improved Governance and; vi) Cross-cutting issues of gender and capacity development. Under MGDS I, Malawi has achieved macro-economic stability, economic growth, unprecedented poverty reduction, national food security and a 50 % reduction in HIV prevalence rates.

**Links to the National Development Plan**

During the 2012 -2016 cycle, under the MGDS theme 1 on sustainable economic empowerment, UNDP's support has focused on improved coordination, investment planning, mainstreaming and knowledge management at the national and district levels to ensure a low emission and climate-resilient development. These objectives will be achieved by strengthening the policy environment, improving data and information management, and enhancing capacities for resource mobilization, coordination and monitoring of institutions responsible for climate change mitigation and adaptation, environment and natural resources management, disaster risk management and energy planning. UNDP support to government under this theme was through four main projects, namely: National Climate Change (NCCP), Disaster Risk Management (DRM), Environment and Natural Resources Management(ENRM); Sustainable Energy Management (SEM) and Poverty and Environment (PEI); but in this evaluation only the Disaster Risk Management (DRM) project will be evaluated.

**DRM --**With 15% of the population living in or on the fringes on flood-prone areas, and with the frequency and severity of natural disaster increased under the influence of climate change, UNDP expanded its efforts in DRM by leveraging its relationships with the Government at central and district level, civil society and UN agencies.

The National Disaster Risk Management (NDRM) policy lists the main priorities of the Government of Malawi (GoM) on disaster preparedness, response mitigation and recovery and, therefore, the following are the main pillars of UNDP support in Disaster Risk Management: mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning processes at all levels of government; establishment of an effective system to identify, assess and monitor disaster risks under data and information knowledge including early warning systems (EWSs); and strengthening coordination. The Malawi DRM system is in a transition phase from a disaster management-reactive approach to a more comprehensive disaster risk management approach. DRM is being mainstreamed in 14 disaster-prone districts. The flooding of 2015 saw this number increase as districts which were not considered disaster prone experienced flooding.

**Programs and Projects Review**

Between May and August, 2016 the County Office embarked on a process to explore options for the configuration of the CO Program portfolio into 2017. The exercise was a response to three main developments: 1) most Programs and projects in the current portfolio were designed to close in 2016, the final year of the 2012-2016 programming cycle; 2) new demands for projects to be aligned with UNDP Strategic Plan, core strengths of UNDP and reflective of programmatic approaches that avoid fragmentation and are innovative; 3) the realization that the current Program portfolio cannot be carried into 2016 due to limited core resources.

In the final analysis, among other conclusions, consideration will be given to:

1. Prepare a redesigned DRM project which ensures strengthening preparedness, early recovery and resilience as well as supporting the young people. (Noting UNDP’s normative mandate and DRR’s special role in building resilience addressing preparedness)
2. Developing a larger access to energy Program as it has potential to enhance communities’ livelihoods by incorporating key elements of and lessons from the Sustainable Energy Management and Decentralized Energy Services projects;
3. Integrating ENRM and PEI and
4. Developing an overarching program that encompasses adaptation and mitigation

The review also came up with three main lessons, namely: 1) to ensure appropriate institutional arrangements and thus avoid multiple layers of institutions and clarity on what would be the collaboration arrangements between national and local levels; 2) to build clear exit strategies and 3) the importance of appropriate level of leadership in steering committees to ensure availability of members at meetings.

* 1. **UNDAF Outcome**

All three projects fall under the UNDAF 1.2, namely: Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016. The UNDAF outcome was adopted verbatim as the UNDP Country Program Outcome MWI-27.

* 1. **Expected UNDAF Outputs**:
  2. Environment, natural resources, climate change, and disaster risk management mainstreamed in policies, development plans and Programs at national level and implemented in 14 disaster-prone districts;
  3. Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environmental and natural resources degradation and natural disaster collected and made accessible to decision makers in Government, Private Sector and Civil Society;
  4. Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk by 2016.
  5. Output 1.3.4: Innovative renewable and energy saving technologies piloted in targeted locations in rural and peri-urban areas enabling the development of a national Program. (subsequently dropped)

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE**

The purposes of the end of term evaluation are to:

1. Determine the extent to which the outcome and outputs of the three projects have been achieved;
2. Assess UNDP’s contribution to the outcome;
3. Document the achievements, best practices and lessons learnt during the course of implementation of the three projects to inform future decisions in design, implementation and management of similar projects.
4. Provide recommendations for future programming based on the results from the three projects while taking into account the aspirations of the Country Office to rationalize its portfolio to have few, large and more coherent projects during the period 2017 -2018.

The independent evaluation is to be commissioned from November, 2016.

The main users of the evaluation results include:

* The Program Steering Committees for NCCP, Environment & Natural Resources Management, Poverty & Environment Initiative, Energy and Early Warning and Disaster Risk Management.
* Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining;
* Office of the President and Cabinet;
* Environmental Affairs Department;
* Department of Energy Affairs;
* Department of Climate Changes Services and Meteorological Services;
* Department of Water Services;
* UNDP

1. **EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

**3.1 Scope**

Time period: January 2012- October, 2016.

Geographical coverage: national.

Thematic coverage: environment, climate change, disaster risk management and energy

The evaluation will assess the performance of the project using the Office of Evaluation…(OECD) evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

Based on the design consideration and implementation experience, the evaluation will identify priority interventions to be considered during the 2017-18 period and how they should be packaged.

**3.2 Objectives**

* Assess whether, and to what extent, the project’s outcome and outputs have been achieved;
* Determine the impact, both positive and negative, as well as intended and non-intended from contribution of the project to the achievement of the outcome;
* Examine and analyze factors which have positively and negatively impacted on achievement of project outputs and outcome;
* Assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of institutional arrangements and partnership strategies of each project;
* Assess the extent to which the UNDP-supported project outputs and non-project assistance contributed to the respective UNDAF and Country Program outcome;
* Examine the extent to which gender equality and women empowerment and human rights targets as cross-cutting issues were integrated and achieved;
* Document lessons learnt and best practices during the course of implementation to inform future decisions in project design, implementation and management of similar interventions;
* Provide a framework for a large and coherent Program encompassing priority interventions in the areas of disaster risk management, climate change, energy and environment.

**4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS**

* 1. **Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation will use standard evaluation criteria to assess its performance, which includes relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

* 1. **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:

* Whether the problem the projects addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived;
* Whether the target beneficiaries of the projects are clearly identified;
* Whether the outcome and outputs of the projects were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with SMART indicators;
* Whether the relationship between outcome, outputs, activities and inputs of the projects are logically articulated;
* Whether the projects are relevant to the development priorities of the country;
* Did the design of the projects take scale and scaling up into consideration;
* Given the capacity building objectives of the projects, how effective were the projects’ capacity building interventions?

**4.2.2 Implementation:**

* Whether the management arrangements of the projects were appropriate;
* How effective was the delivery of inputs specified in the project documents, including selection of sub-grantees, institutional arrangements, identification of beneficiaries, scheduling of activities and actual implementation;
* The fulfillment of the success criteria as outlined in the project document;
* The responsiveness of the project management to significant changes in the environment in which the project functions (both facilitating or impeding project implementation);
* Determine whether or not lessons learnt from other relevant Programs/projects were incorporated into the project.
* The monitoring and backstopping of the projects as expected by the Government and UNDP;
* The projects’ collaboration with industry, associations, private sector and civil society, if relevant.
* The role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on project delivery.

**4.2.3 Efficiency:**

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

**4.2.4 Effectiveness**:

* What are the major achievements of the project vis-à-vis its objectives, performance indicators and targets? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.
* Have there been any unplanned effects/results?
* Whether there is evidence of UNDP contribution to the outcomes of the projects.
* What major factors affected project delivery and offer what appropriate interventions might have strengthened or addressed them.

**4.2.5 Sustainability**

* Assess whether or not the projects’ achievements are sustainable?
* Is there an exit strategy for any of the elements of the Program?
* What should be done to strengthen sustainability of project outcomes?
* Assess whether or not the UNDP resource mobilization strategy for the project was appropriate and effective.

1. **METHODOLOGY**

The evaluator should provide details in respect of:

1. **Review of projects documentation**. Review of key project documents such as approved project documents, recent studies, reviews, projects monitoring documents, disbursement reports, progress reports and other information available with implementing partners.
2. **Construct a theory of change**, identify detailed evaluation questions, methods (mixed methods) and instruments, stakeholder mapping, etc.
3. **Data collection**: (i) visits to selected stakeholders to carry out in depth interviews, inspection, and analysis of project 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.
4. **Analysis:** Data triangulation and analysis triangulation to validate evidence and arrive at findings.

The evaluator 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 for all three projects.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**
2. The Resilience and Sustainable Growth (RSG) Portfolio Manager will provide the overall oversight to the project evaluations and ensure timely delivery and satisfactory final products.

1. 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.
2. The Program Analysts responsible for Disaster Risk Management, will support the evaluator 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 IPs, grantees, beneficiaries and DPs. The Program Analysts will be supported by the UNDP M&E Specialist to ensure that the evaluation meets the expected UNDP standards.
3. The evaluator 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).
4. The evaluator will be expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of office equipment and supplies, communication, accommodation and transport. Furthermore, the evaluators will be expected to familiarize themselves with the United Nations Evaluation Group’s standards and norms for conducting project evaluations.
5. The evaluator will provide the RSG Portfolio Manager with regular updates and feedback.
6. **DELIVERABLES**

* **Inception reports** – will be expected to be formulated within 5 days of the start of the assignment. The reports will include a detailed approach and methodology, schedule, draft data collection protocols and an evaluation matrix. Annex 1 gives a template of the evaluation matrix. The work plan should also include an outline of the evaluation reports as set out in Annex 2 of these TORs. The evaluator will **propose a performance rating scale** to be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.
* **Draft evaluation report** – The Evaluator will present a Draft Report within 5 weeks after presentation of the inception report.
* **Lessons Learned report –** this will be a section within the evaluation 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 stake holders.

1. **EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS**
   1. **Qualifications**

* Minimum of a Master’s degree in economics, disaster risk management, energy, social sciences or environmental sciences.

**8.2** **Experience**

* Minimum of 7 years of professional experience in any of the areas of environment, energy, climate change and disaster risk management;
* Experience in gender mainstreaming;
* Minimum of 5 years’ experience in program development
* Experience in conducting evaluations for UN agency, government or international aid agency projects in areas of energy, climate change, environment and disaster risk management;
* Excellent communication skills.

**8.3 Evaluator’s competencies:**

* Organizational Development and Management
* Strategic thinking
* Team work skills and experience in leading teams
* Result oriented

1. **TIME AND DURATION:**

The evaluator will be hired for a maximum of 30 person days.

Contract Start Date: 17th November 2016. Contract End Date: 13th January 2017**.**

1. **TIME TABLE**

**Weeks**

|  |
| --- |
| **Activity** |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Contract and Entry meeting | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inception report, draft revised | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection and analysis |  | 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 |  |

1. **EVALUATION ETHICS**

Responsibility of the Country Office is to ensure credibility and independence of evaluation; responsibility of the evaluator is to provide impartial, evidence-based, report adhering to international evaluation standards and norms, Code of Conduct, etc.

**ANNEXES**

**Annex 1**: Evaluation matrix template

Inception report

# 

# ANNEX 5. RISK MATRIX

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANNEX** | **Type** | **Description** | **Anticipated Impact and Probability Scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high)** | **Mitigation Options** |
| Staff turnover in DoDMA, including in the 15 disaster-prone districts (ADDRMOs) | Organizational | Staff leaving DoDMA and the districts for better paying jobs, in other agencies, such as NGOs. | Probability: 3  Impact: 4 | While key staff members resign from their positions for various reasons, measures will be taken through the Program to ensure that they are rapidly replaced. |
| Political instability | Political | Continued reduction of donor support to GOM. Government may negatively affect financial leveraging efforts by UNDP. | Probability: 3  Impact: 4 | Through UNDP, political  developments and  governance issues in the country will be monitored closely and discussed with donor partners, and  appropriate measures will be adopted that will not  negatively affect the future  Of the Program. |
| Financial management and absorption capacity of implementing partner with IPSAS principles | Strategic | Weak financial management system that has led to poor audit reports and  Accountability issues. Low financial absorption rate of IP  May affect Program delivery. | Probability: 4  Impact: 3 | Use of direct payment modality. Placement of a Financial Analyst within DoDMA to ensure financial accountability and timely reporting. |
| Political will and change in mind set for DRM | Strategic | It has taken a lot of lobbying with policy makers to demonstrate the need for mainstreaming DRM,  Including in budgets. Further delays in putting this into practice may affect the Program. | Probability: 2  Impact: 3 | Continued advocacy is required to ensure commitment to  Mainstreaming DRM into sector plans and budgets. |
| Diverting Program funds for other recurrent  expenditures or Program Supports in DoDMA and Implementing Partners | Financial | Continued implementation of the zero-deficit budget may affect the availability of funds for other recurrent transactions, which may in turn lead some implementing partners to support some of their recurrent activities from this Program as they wait for funds from Treasury. | Probability: 2  Impact: 3 | The recruitment of the Fund Advisor/Financial Analyst  With extensive experience in providing technical support to government for multi-donor Program Supports will ensure close monitoring of all funds disbursed for activities under this Program. |

# 

## ANNEX 6: FINANCIAL REPORTS 2012-2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1: FINANCES FOR PROGRAM SUPPORT (2012-2016)   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | F i n a n c i a l R e p o r t - January - December 2012 | | | |  |  | | | Currency: | USD | | | Available Resources (a) | | | | Source of Funds |  | | | TRAC | 44,000.00 | | | TRAC 3 | 21,452.00 | | | ONE FUND | 42,205.00 | | | CHINA |  | | | Total Available Resources | 107,657.00 | | | Output and Target Details: | Expenditure | | | Output 1: DRM Mainstreaming | 28,409.83 | | | Output 2: Data and Knowledge management | - | | | Output 3: Coordination | 27,818.43 | | | Output 4: Monitoring and evaluation * | 2,118.09 | | | Output 5: Program Support Management | 50,221.99 | | | Output 6: Preparedness to El Niño |  | | | Total Expenditure | 108,568.34 | | | Balance as at 31 December 2012 | (911.34) | | | **F i n a n c i a l R e p o r t - January - December 2013** | | | |  |  | | | Currency: | USD | | | Available Resources (a) | | | | Source of Funds |  | | | TRAC | 555,000.00 | | | TRAC 3 |  | | | ONE FUND | 108,088.00 | | | CHINA |  | | | Total Available Resources | 663,088.00 | | | Output and Target Details: | Expenditure | | | Output 1: DRM Mainstreaming | 181,770.59 | | | Output 2: Data and Knowledge management | 61,163.23 | | | Output 3: Coordination | 55,885.34 | | | *   |  | | --- | | Output 4: Monitoring and evaluation | | 2,554.04 | | | Output 5: Program Support Management | 342,364.09 | | | Output 6: Preparedness for El Niño |  | | | Total Expenditure | 643,737.29 | | | Balance as at 31 December 2013 | 19,350.71 | | |  | | | |  | | | | F i n a n c i a l R e p o r t - January - December 2014 | | | |  | |  | | Currency: | | USD | | Available Resources (a) | | | | Source of Funds | |  | |  | |  | | TRAC | | 700,998.00 | | TRAC 3 | |  | | ONE FUND | |  | | CHINA | |  | |  | |  | | Total Available Resources | | 700,998.00 | |  | |  | | Output and Target Details: | | Expenditure | |  | |  | | Output 1: DRM Mainstreaming | | 97,409.36 | |  | |  | | Output 2: Data and Knowledge management | | 235,343.71 | | *   |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | Output 3: Coordination | | 59,024.33 | |  | |  | | *   |  | | --- | | Output 4: Monitoring and evaluation | | | 15,417.57 | |  | |  | | Output 5: Program Support Management | | 264,204.00 | |  | |  | | Output 6: Preparedness to El Niño | |  | |  | |  | | Total Expenditure | | 671,398.97 | |  | |  | |  | |  | | Balance as at 31 December 2014 | | 29,599.03 | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| F i n a n c i a l R e p o r t - January - December 2015 | |
|  |  |
| Currency: | USD |
| Available Resources (a) | |
| Source of Funds |  |
| TRAC | 750,000.00 |
| TRAC 3 |  |
| ONE FUND |  |
| CHINA |  |
| Total Available Resources | 750,000.00 |
| Output and Target Details: | Expenditure |
| Output 1: DRM Mainstreaming | 132,116.32 |
| Output 2: Data and Knowledge management | 159,808.30 |
| Output 3: Coordination | 95,868.18 |
| *   |  | | --- | | Output 4: Monitoring and evaluation | | 21,054.71 |
| Output 5: Program Support Management | 395,223.14 |
| Output 6: Preparedness to el nino |  |
| Total Expenditure | 804,070.65 |
| Balance as at 31 December 2015 | (54,070.65) |
|  |  |
| F i n a n c i a l R e p o r t - January - December 2016 | |
| Currency: | USD |
| Available Resources (a) | |
| Source of Funds |  |
| TRAC | 427,000.00 |
| TRAC 3 |  |
| ONE FUND | 27,585.00 |
| CHINA | 373,000.00 |
| Total Available Resources | 827,585.00 |
| Output and Target Details: | Expenditure |
| Output 1: DRM Mainstreaming | 216,953.85 |
| Output 2: Data and Knowledge management | 103,915.74 |
| Output 3: Coordination | 16,846.59 |
| Output 4: Monitoring and evaluation * | 14,499.06 |
| Output 5: Program Support Management | 191,371.70 |
| Output 6: Preparedness to El Niño | 66,220.05 |
| Total Expenditure | 609,806.99 |
| Balance as at 31 December 2016 | 217,778.01 |

**DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM SUPPORT EVALUATION**

**TENTATIVE MISSION PROGRAM, 14 TO 21 DECEMBER, 2016**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date/Time** | **Person (s) to be met** | **Venue/Location** |
| **14 December, 2016** |  |  |
| 12:20 | Arrival – Kamuzu International Airport |  |
| 15:30 – 17:00 | Andrew, Sothini, Ben, Etta, Peter | UNDP |
| **15 December, 2016** |  |  |
| 08:30 – 09:30 | Mr. Ben Botolo, Commissioner; Mr. James Chiusiwa, Deputy Commissioner. 0999937952 | DoDMA, Capital Hill |
| 09:45 – 10:15 | Mr. Milward Tobias, Vice President’s Office. 0997093213 | Capital Hill |
| 10:30 – 12:00 | Reference Group Meeting |  |
| 13:30 – 14:15 | Daisi Kachingwe, Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development. 0888852732 | Capital Hill |
| 14:30 – 15:15 | Mr. Allone Ganizani, Ministry of Health. 0888332454 | Capital Hill |
| 15:30 – 16:15 | Ms. Virginia Kachigunda, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. 0993384124 | Capital Hill |
| **16 December, 2016** |  |  |
| 08:30 – 09:15 | Mr. Yona Kamphale, OPC. 0888893405 | Capital Hill |
| 09:30 – 10:15 | Mr. Emmanuel Nkomwa, Environmental Affairs Department. 0888474006 | Lingadiz House, City Centre |
| 10:30 – 11:15 | Mr. Chikondi Mbemba, Department of Water Development and Irrigation. 0999232708; Mr. Piasi Kaunda. 0999210598 |  |
| 13:30 – 14:15 | Mr. Martin Mazinga, Catholic Development Commission. 0999132468 |  |
| 15:15 – 16:00 | Ms. Sophie Makoloma, Christian Aid. 0881188785 |  |
| 16:15 – 17:00 | Mr. Noah Tomoka, World Vision Malawi. 0888361752 |  |
| **17 December, 2016** |  |  |
| 08:30-09:30 | Mr. Blessings Kantema, Salima District Council. 0994200509;  Mr. Aubrey Nyekanyeka, COOPI, Salima. 0999954989 |  |
| 09:45 – 12:00 | Site visit and meeting with selected community |  |
| 13:00 | Travel back to Lilongwe |  |
| **19 December, 2016** |  |  |
| 08:30 – 09:15 | Mr. James Lwanda, Save the Children |  |
| 09:30 – 10:30 | Ms. Ethel Kaimila, Malawi Red Cross, |  |
| 11:00 - 11:45 | Ms. Dorothy Nyasulu, UNFPA. 0888209973 | Evelyn Court, Area 13 Market |
| 13:30 – 14:15 | Mr. Duncan Ndhlovu, WFP. 0999972420 | Area 14 next to Family Dental Clinic |
| 14:30 – 15:15 | Ms. Estere Tsoka, UNICEF | UNICEF House, City Centre |
| 15:30 – 16:15 | Mr. John Chome, UN Habitat. 01770133.  **Confirmed** | Zowe House, City Centre |
| **20 December, 2016** |  |  |
| 08:30 – 09:15 | Mr. Francis Nkoka, World Bank. 0999484483 |  |
| 09:30 – 10:15 | Mr. Lovely Chizimba, Irish Aid. 0999866107. **Confirmed** | Arwa House, City Centre |
| 10:30 – 11:15 | Mr. Matthews Malata, Association of Environmental Journalists. 09996466114 |  |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Debriefat DoDMA, Mr. Ben Botolo, Mr. James Chiusiwa, Mr. Ms. Veronica Mhango, Mr. Jeremiah Mphande. |  |
| 15:30 – 16:15 | Debrief at UNDP. Andrew, Sothini, Ben, Peter |  |
| **21 December, 2016** |  |  |
| 10:30 | Travel to the airport |  |

# ANNEX 7 - CHRONOLOGY OF PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

| **DATE** | **ACTIVITIES** |
| --- | --- |
| **UNDP Disaster Risk Management Program Support to Malawi, 2012-2016** | |
| **2012 - 1ST YEAR OF THE PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTIVITIES** | |
| 1-5 October | Two officers from the Department participated in the SADC DRR preparedness workshop that was held in Gaborone in Botswana from 1st to 2nd October 2012, under the theme: *‘Strengthening Partnerships in DRR and Preparedness in the SADC region.’* |
| 13 October 2012 | Supported International Day for Disaster Reduction in Salima. Activities during the launch included pavilion displays by NGOs, storytelling, dances, drama and speeches. |
| 29-31 October | Reviewed national contingency plan through a workshop held in Liwonde |
| 8-9 November | The Department coordinated a stakeholders’ meeting on the state of Lake Chilwa that was held in Zomba from 8th to 9th November 2012. The meeting was called after the Department had been requested by Zomba district council to declare the Lake Chilwa area a disaster zone as the Lake was drying up which was negatively affecting the livelihoods of the communities living around the lake. |
| 20 November | Adverts were placed in the print media for the recruitment of Financial Analyst to strengthen the department's accounting section. |
| 26-30 November | The Department facilitated the review of district contingency plans for five districts of Blantyre, Machinga, Salima, Dedza and Mangochi, through a workshop that was held in Zomba |
| 3-14 December | The Department monitored disaster risk management interventions in the districts of Nsanje, Chikhwawa, Phalombe, Zomba, Machinga and Balaka. One of the key observations during the monitoring was lack of preparedness due to limited financial resources. |
| **2013 – 2ND YEAR OF THE PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTIVITIES** | |
| January | Two consultants, one national and another one international, were recruited to facilitate the review of the Disaster Preparedness and Relief (DPR) Act of 1991 |
| 16th - 19th January | Participated in floods interagency disaster needs assessment missions in Mangochi, Nsanje and Phalombe |
| 5-6 February | Held a taskforce workshop in Salima to finalize DRM Handbook and Interim Operational Guidelines for DRM |
| 11th - 16th February | Two officers attended the Fourth Africa Regional Platform for DRR and the 5th Africa Drought Forum in Arusha, Tanzania |
| 19th - 23rd February | Participated in interagency disaster needs assessment missions following floods in Chikwawa |
| 20th February | Vice President of the Republic of Malawi, Right Honourable Khumbo Kachali, officially launched the National Platform for Disaster Risk Management at an event held at Crossroads Hotel in Lilongwe. More than 500 delegates attended the launch, who included government ministries and departments, civil society, district commissioners and other district officers, traditional leaders, academia, UN agencies, donor community, media, business community/private sector, and politicians |
| 28th February | Held first stakeholders consultative meeting in the Ministry of Justice’s conference room on the review of the DPR Act |
| 28 February | Held first meeting with OPC Policy Unit to present and discuss the draft DRM Policy |
| March | Printed 150 copies of the DRR Framework |
| 1 March | Held second meeting with OPC Policy Unit to discuss the draft DRM Policy |
| 7 - 8 March | Held a task force workshop in Salima to draft ToRs, grant award criteria and modus operandi for community based DRR activities |
| 18th March | Held a meeting at Crystal Waters Resort in Salima to incorporate comments from OPC and finalize the National Disaster Risk Management Policy |
| 19 March | Held second stakeholders consultative workshops on the review of the DPR Act at Cross Roads Hotel in Lilongwe |
| 20th March | Held first meeting and training of the National Platform for DRM at Crossroads Hotel. The training was facilitated by the African Union Commission and UNISDR |
| 21st March | Held a NDRMTC/NP workshop to present and discuss draft ToRs, grant award criteria and modus operandi for community based DRR activities at local level as well as inclusion of civil strife in the Operational Guidelines through a workshop held at Cross Roads Hotel in Lilongwe |
| 25-29 March | Two workshops were concurrently held at Crystal Waters Resort in Salima and at Annies Lodge in Zomba to build the capacity of secondary education methods advisers (SEMAs) and desk officers for secondary schools (DOSSs) in DRM to faciitate integration of DRM in the curriculum |
| 15-17 May | Held workshop to integrate disaster risk management into district socio-economic profiles and district development plans of Chikhwawa and Phalombe districts at Mount Soche Hotel in Blantyre |
| 18-25 May | Three officers attended the Fourth Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Geneva, Switzerland held under the theme: *‘Invest Today for a Safer Tomorrow: Resilient People – Resilient Planet’* |
| 28-29 May | Held local level consultations on the draft to present and discuss draft ToRs, grant award criteria and modus operandi for community based DRR activities at local level. Participants were drawn from Karonga, Salima, Mangochi, Phalombe, Chikhwawa and Nsanje. Each district was represented by the Director of Planning and Development, the Assistant District Disaster Risk Management Officer, two non-governmental organizations and two Community Based Organizations |
| 29-31 May | Held workshop to integrate disaster risk management into district socio-economic profiles and district development plans of Mangochi, Ntcheu and Karonga districts at Annies Lodge in Zomba |
| June | Printed 3000 copies of the DRM Handbook |
| 12-14 June | Conducted training for secondary school teaching materials publishers and writers at the Malawi Institute of Education in Zomba |
| 17 June | Held stakeholders consultative workshop to present proposed outline of National DRM Communication Strategy at Cross Roads Hotel in Lilongwe |
| 27 June | Held third national stakeholders consultative workshop on the draft DRM Bill in Lilongwe |
| 8 July | Presented revised draft DRM Bill to national and district stakeholders at Crossroads Hotel, Lilongwe |
| 15 July | Held local level consultations on the draft DRM Bill in Chikhwawa, Nsanje  districts |
| 18 July | Held local level consultations on the draft DRM Bill in Salima district |
| 22 July | Held local level consultations on the draft DRM Bill in Balaka district |
| 23 July | Held consultations on the draft DRM Bill with Blantyre, Zomba, Lilongwe and Mzuzu city councils at Golden Peacock Hotel in Lilongwe |
| 24-26 July | Held workshop at Kambiri Lodge in Salima to integrated disaster risk management into district socio-economic profiles and district development plans of Zomba, Dedza, Nkhatabay and Nkhotakota districts |
| August | Adverted a request for Program Support proposals for the DRR Small Grants Scheme |
| 7 August | Held Sector Working Group meeting for the Social Protection and Disaster Risk Management at Cross Roads Hotel in Lilongwe |
| 12-16 August | Held taskforce workshop to draft National DRM Communication Strategy at Crystal Waters Resort in Salima |
| 2 – 6 September | Held local level stakeholders consultations on the draft National DRM Communication Strategy in Chikhwawa, Phalombe and Mangochi districts |
| 30th September | Launched the DRR Framework and DRM Handbook were launched at a function held at Crossroads Hotel in Lilongwe. |
| 7-11 October | One officer attended the International Disaster Management training course in Singapore |
| 14-16 October | Reviewed grant proposals and shortlisted applicants for the DRR small grants scheme held at Sunbird Ku Chawe Hotel in Zomba |
| 17 October | Officially commemorated the international day for disaster reduction in Zomba district. The Vice President of the Republic of Malawi was the Guest of Honour |
| 10-19 November | Conducted field appraisal on the shortlisted applicants for the DRR small grants scheme in Phalombe, Salima, Karonga, Balaka, Zomba, Blantyre, Chikhwawa and Nsanje districts |
| 26-28 November | Conducted training on simulation exercise for national and district stakeholders at Crossroads Hotel in Lilongwe |
| 29 November | Held workshop to present draft National DRM Communication Strategy at Golden Peacock Hotel in Lilongwe for stakeholders’ input |
| **2014 – 3RD YEAR OF THE PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTIVITIES** | |
| 17 January | Held a DRR small grants scheme selection technical committee meeting. The technical committee made a final selection of applicants to be offered grants. |
| 12-13 February | Held a second national DRM platform meeting which targeted all stakeholders that are involved in DRM. The platform meeting covered six broad areas such as: Sharing 2013 successes and challenges from platform members; Agreeing on Malawi’s position on the successor framework to the Hyogo Framework for Action |
| 24 February | Held local level stakeholder consultation meeting on the Draft DRM bill in Karonga |
| 24-27 February | Conducted technical field appraisals in Phalombe, Salima and Karonga districts for successful grantees under the DRR Small grants Scheme. |
| 7 March | Held consultative workshop with Lilongwe, Blantyre, Zomba and Mzuzu City Council as well as Luchenza Municial Council on the draft national DRM communication strategy at Crossroads Hotel, Lilongwe |
| 17 March | Held a meeting with the Cabinet Committee on Social Development, HIV and Aids at Crossroads Hotel in Lilongwe to solicit their views on the draft DRM policy before submission to the Cabinet for approval |
| 17-20 March | Held a workshop to orient successful DRR small grants scheme recipients at Annies Lodge in Zomba |
| 31 March – 4 April | Held workshop to draft DoDMA’s Devolution Plan at Crystal Waters Resort in Salima |
| 14-19 April | Signing of MoU with SGS recipients and District Councils |
| 23-25 April | DoDMA held an internal workshop at Sunbird Livingstonia Beach Hotel in Salima to provide its comments on the draft bill. At the end of the meeting, a number of issues were proposed to be removed, amended or added. A meeting was also held during the quarter with the local consultant where the issues were discussed and agreed upon. |
| 28 April – 2 May | Held community level consultations on the communication strategy in Nsanje, Zomba, Nkhatabay and Salima to incorporate issues of climate, weather and early warning systems in the communication strategy, which is part of the activities under the UNDP/GEF early warning systems Program Support. |
| April-May | Disbursed first tranche of DRR small grant scheme funds to all 5 grantees |
| May | Procured filing cabinet for finance and administrative assistant |
| 13-16 May | Two officers attended 5th Africa Regional Platform on DRR in Abuja, Nigeria |
| 9-20 June | Collected baseline data in Karonga, Rumphi, Machinga and Zomba. The data was collected by a national as well as district level team over 2 weeks in the 4 districts. |
| 10-12 June | Conducted a joint monitoring of SGS Program Support in Salima with a UNDP China mission |
| 21-25 July | Held workshop to draft management guidelines for DoDMA’s devolution plan |
| 28 July – 15 September | Supported a search and rescue training for officers from Malawi Defence Force, Fire Brigades, Department of Civil Aviation and Malawi Red Cross Society at MAFCO in Salima. The training was facilitated by Rescue South Africa. |
| 6 – 15 August | Conducted joint monitoring exercise for the DRR small grants recipients in Karonga, Salima and Phalombe districts |
| 27 – 28 August | Conducted a media tour to the search and rescue training exercise at MAFCO in Salima |
| 17th Nov to 4th Dec | Conducted simulation exercise in Karonga, Salima, Chikwawa and Nsanje districts. The exercise which targeted community members from disaster prone areas aimed at strengthening their preparedness capacity to be able to respond to disasters |
| December | Finalised the development of the National DRM Communication Strategy |
| **2015 - 3RD YEAR OF THE PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTIVITIES** | |
| 4 February | The National Disaster Risk Management Policy is approved by Cabinet and shared with all DRM stakeholders |
| 24th February and 23rd March | Held two steering committee meetings. The first meeting was held on 24th February, 2015 where 2015 annual work plans for both DRM Support Program and Early Warning Systems Program Supports were discussed and approved. An extra ordinary meeting was held on 23rd March where annual work plans which factored in flooding recovery activities were discussed and approved. |
| 14th to 18th March | Supported two officers to attend Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction from 14th to 18th March, 2015 where the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction was adopted. |
| 21st March | The National Disaster Risk Management Policy and National Disaster Risk Management Communication Strategy launched. The launching marked the beginning of implementing the two documents |
| 8th to 9th May | Media practitioners were engaged in the dissemination of the NDRM Policy through an awareness workshop that was held. |
| 22nd to 26th June | Drafted disaster rism management plans for Mzuzu, Lilongwe and Zomba cities as a first step towards addressing issues of urban vulnerabilities and risks |
| 13th to 20th July | The National Disaster Risk Management Policy was officially disseminated to 12 districts of Zomba, Phalombe, Machinga, Mangochi, Nsanje, Chikwawa, Blantyre, Mwanza, Balaka, Ntcheu Dedza and Salima districts |
| 7th August | Held a Social Support and DRM Sector Working group meeting. The objective of the meeting was to draft a contribution towards the development of the national development strategy, a successor of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II. |
| 10th to 12th August | Held a review meeting of the SGS community based disaster risk reduction Program Supports. The meeting reviewed the successes achieved by the Program Supports and challenges faced and suggested solutions to address the challenges |
| 25th to 27th August | Held a training of Primary Education Advisors (35) on disaster risk management. The training was part of the process of ensuring that DRM is integrated in school curricula |
| August | Produced 9 radio jingles, 2 television jingles, 10 radio plays and 1 theme song on disaster risk management. The media products focused on general disaster risk management areas such as risk reduction, preparedness and response. The jingles and radio plays were aired in various media houses in 2016. |
| 12th to 16th October | Supported a Climate Change, Natural Resources and Disaster Risk Management symposium that was held under the theme ‘towards green societies for sustainable development’. The symposium provided a platform for sharing knowledge on climate change, environment and natural resources and DRM through paper presentations and other activities |
| 14th October | Held a Consultative meeting with Parliamentary Committee on Climate Change and Natural Resources on the Disaster Risk Management Bill was held on 14th October, 2015. The committee observed that the Bill still emphasized on response with minimal risk reduction provisions. The committee therefore recommended the inclusion of risk reduction issues in the Bill |
| 18th October | Commemorated the International Day for Disaster Reduction at Bodza Primary School, T/A Makhuwira in Chiwawa district. The day was commemorated under the theme ‘knowledge for life’. |
| 27th to 28th October | Supported and officer to attend the Third Session of the Executive Board meeting of the Technical Centre for Disaster Risk Management and Urban Resilience in Southern Africa |
| 26th November to 3rd December | Held a workshop where DRM was integrated into district development plans for two districts: Machinga and Nsanje. |
| 3rd to 4th December | Held an orientation training of new grantees under the Small Grants Community Based Disaster Risk reduction initiative. The training aimed at orienting the new grantees to UNDP rules and guidelines on Program Support implementation, among many others |
| 14th to 18th December | Supported two officers to attend a training on ICT for Disaster response in Kenya |
| 21st to 24th December | Held a working session to draft management guidelines for the devolution plan. |
| December | Funds were disbursed to all five Program Supports for implementation of Program Support activities |
| December | Districts were supported to review their contingency plans and conduct simulation exercise |
| **2016 - 5TH YEAR OF THE PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTIVITIES** | |
| 4th to 15th April | Supported an officer to attend a training on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results in Cape Town, South Africa |
| 23rd to 27th May | Held a workshop on pre-testing of the National Disaster Risk Management training manual |
| 31st May to 1st June | Held a National Disaster Risk Management Platform meeting jointly supported by development partners and civil society organization |
| 23rd May to 8th June | Conducted training of civil protection committee on coordination of disaster recovery interventions in Rumphi, Salima, Nsanje and Mangochi districts. The training aimed at equipping the CPCs wih skills on knowledge on how to coordinate and manage recovery Program Supports |
| 30th May to 7th June | Carried out an assessment of meteorological stations in 15 district that were affected by floods in order to determine maintenance needs, The report showed that there was minimal damage that was caused to the stations. |
| 2nd to 12th August | Conducted a table-top simulation exercise in partnership with Malawi Defense Force and the United States Army-Africa Command. The simulation aimed at strengthening the preparedness capacity of humanitarian actors in the country |
| 3rd August | Held a consultation meeting with Local Councils on Management Guidelines of DoDMA’s devolution plan. Vital input was received during the consultation meeting that led to the finalization of the guidelines |
| 5th August | Held a DRM Technical Committee meeting where progress made in the implementation of Program Support activities was presented and a request to reprogram funds among activities was made and approve |
| 7th August to 13th September | Undertook community mapping in Machinga and Rumphi districts. Maps were produced and are expected to be used in implementing risk reduction, preparedness, response and recovery interventions |
| 19th to 28th September | Recorded a total of 22 radio Programs focusing on disaster preparedness, risk reduction, response and recovery in Nsanje, Chikwawa, Blantyre, Thyolo, Zomba and Balaka. The Programs are aired on a DRM radio Programs on Malawi Broadcasting Corporation. |
| 27th September to 1st October | Held a taskforce working session to finalise the National DRM Training manual. The training manual will serve to unify the content that is delivered during DRM trainings targeting various audience |
| July to December | Supported the implementation of 6 community based disaster risk reduction Program Supports through putting out expression of interest, shortlisting, proposal appraisal, orientation of successful grantees and disbursing funds to successful grantees. A number of monitoring visits were also undertaken at intervals. |
| July to December | Established Emergency Operation Centres by procuring equipment which was installed in the centres |
| July to December | Established a Community Based Flood Forecasting and Early Warning System in Karonga district. This aims at strengthening flood early warning information sharing among populations at risk |
| 7th to 9th December, 2016 | Held a workshop to domesticate the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR). The workshop developed an action plan on what would be done in order to domesticate the SDRR |
| 17th November | Supported a validation workshop of the National Resilience Plan. The NRP aims at dealing with a problem of recurrent food insecurity. |
| 18th to 27th December, 2016 | Established DRM Community Listening Clubs in Phalombe, Nsanje, Mangochi, Salima, Rumphi, and Karonga districts. The DRM Clubs would form part of the audience during recording of various DRM Programs; listen to radio Programs on DRM and share with members of the surrounding communities; give feedback to DoDMA pertaining to DRM Programs aired; and suggest possible areas that DRM Programs could focus on. |

1. PSD is used interchangeably with Program Support and or program support throughout this report. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. R-Relevant; S-Satisfactory; MS-Moderately Satisfactory; U-Unsatisfactory. Likely (L): There are negligible risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
3. The DRR/M system comprises national institutions specifically responsible for DRM, national policies on DRM, and specialized emergency response

   Institutions. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
4. Key Recommendation from Presenting August 2017

   1. UNDP streamline its portfolio assistance to DRM whole of government demonstration.
   2. UNDP/GOM can act swiftly and strategically and respond to ongoing resilience planning support. Build a case for integrated DRM programming for resilience. Instill a program approach to the DRM sector under resilience banner.
   3. UNDP/GOM develop a sector wide partnership strategy to inform the new result framework.
   4. UNDP/GOM Develop an inter-sectoral working technical committee that bring other relevant sectors, i.e. education, health, agriculture etc. Stakeholders into program to monitor results.
   5. UNDP/GOM Work with partners to undertake a DRM sector need and gap assessment as per the new 2015 policy. Focusing the next program on operationalizing the DRM policy and capacity building work with the local district officers in line with is a great opportunity for scaling the Program and building on lesson learned.

   [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
5. UNDP Program Support Document Malawi 2012-2016 [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
6. All disasters are slow onset when realistically and locally related to conditions of “susceptibility.” The root cause of disasters is vulnerability, which accrues over the long term, based on long-term human values, decisions and activities. A hazard event might be rapid-onset, but the disaster, requiring much more than a hazard, is a long-term process, not a one-time event. The increase in prevalence of slow onset medium and small/constant cycles of disaster has been linked to climate change that is exacerbating vulnerabilities globally. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
7. http://www.recoveryplatform.org/assets/publication/PDNA/CountryPDNAs/Malawi\_Drought\_2016\_PDNA.PDF [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
8. CPD Malawi 2012-2016 [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
9. A comprehensive baseline was included as activity under expected output four which is concerned with setting up monitoring framework for the Program. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
10. Two most recent Malawi PDNAs. Both have section on institutional situation. <http://www.recoveryplatform.org/assets/publication/PDNA/CountryPDNAs/Malawi_Drought_2016_PDNA.PDF> and http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Malawi-2015-Floods-Post-Disaster-Needs-Assessment-Report.pdf [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
11. PDNA 2016 World Bank ILO UN system http://www.recoveryplatform.org/assets/publication/PDNA/CountryPDNAs/Malawi\_Drought\_2016\_PDNA.PDF [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
12. *The Government of Malawi (GoM) requested the World Bank’s support to conduct a comprehensive Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA), in partnership with the United Nations Development Program UNDP and the European Union.* The Flood PDNA, led by the Department of Disaster Management Affairs DoDMA, took place from February 18 to March 7, 2015. It has provided: (1) an impact and needs assessment across 12 selected sectors (2) cross-cutting guiding principles and a preliminary recovery strategy, and (3) a roadmap that prioritizes early, medium- and long-term needs for each sector. These elements are expected to be followed by the development of a *National Early Recovery Plan ERP,* under the auspices of DoDMA that will provide a programmatic plan of action covering key institutional, policy, financing and implementation actions to ensure efficient, resilient and sustainable recovery. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
13. **RIASCO Analysis for Malawi** RIASCO Action Plan for Southern Africa: Response Plan for the El Niño-induced Drought in Southern Africa (May 2016 - April 2017) http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/RIASCO%20Action%20Plan%20Draft%20Document%20PDF%20version.pdf [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
14. **Disaster Overview PDNA FLOODS (Flood Damage and Risk Assessment)**

    1. *Malawi faces a number of hazards, both natural and human-made, which include floods, drought, stormy rains, strong winds, hailstorms, landslides, earthquakes, pest infestations, diseases outbreaks, fire and accidents*. The intensity and frequency of disasters have been increasing in the face of climate change, population growth, urbanization and environmental degradation. Farmers in Malawi are directly affected by such disasters as they are highly vulnerable to natural hazards. The Lower Shire, for instance, which constitutes a key agricultural region of the country, is prone to cycles of recurrent floods and droughts. Between 1967 and 2003, the country experienced six major droughts and 18 incidences of flooding, which heavily impacted smallholder farmers. More recently, two major floods struck the country, including the district of Nsanje in January 2012, and the Mangochi District in January 2013, impacting many people and washing away large swathes of agricultural fields. These disaster events also resulted in the loss of life, infrastructure destruction (including roads, rail, bridges and homes), crop loss, perpetual food insecurity and health impacts (diarrhea, cholera and malaria). In the case of Nsanje, for instance, recovery and reconstruction needs were estimated at US$7.3 million.

    2. *The January 2015 rainfall was the highest on record for Malawi, and constitutes a 1 in 500 year event, and caused significant flooding, predominantly in the Southern Region, exacerbating an already precarious situation for rural households in this region*. It is estimated that the floods affected 1,101,364 people, displaced 230,000 and killed 106 people. As a result, on January 13, 2015, the President declared a state of disaster for the following 15 districts: Nsanje, Chikwawa, Phalombe, Zomba, Blantyre, Chiradzulu, Thyolo, Mulanje, Balaka, Machinga, Mangochi, Ntcheu, Salima, Rumphi and Karonga. Several of these affected districts represent the poorest areas of the country. Based on the recent Integrated Malawi Household Survey, the most highly affected districts—Nsanje, Chikwawa, Phalombe and Zomba—have poverty incidences above the national average of 50.7 percent, ranging from 55 to 80 percent. The sheer lack of household data and information, such as Sex and Age Disaggregated Data (SADD) of the people affected by floods, limits the capability to undertake gender analysis to guide the emergency response and is yet another reminder of the urgent need of a national registration mechanism.

    3. *The 2015 floods have caused substantial damage and losses in the productive, public infrastructure and social service sectors, including private and community assets.* The floods washed away livestock, destroyed thousands of buildings, houses and assets, and damaged roads, bridges, irrigation infrastructure and school and health facilities. To compound the disaster, the onset of the rains this year was delayed by more than 30 days in most parts of the Southern Region. This late start of the rainy season and the shortened growing season that followed will likely further impede crop production and recovery in a country that heavily relies on agriculture for economic growth and subsistence [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
15. Mainstreaming of DRR is a governance process enabling the systematic integration of DRR concerns into all relevant development spheres. In other words, responsive, accountable, transparent and efficient governance structures underwrite the environment where DRR can be institutionalized as an underlying principle of sustainable development. Therefore, building resilient communities in disaster-prone countries requires that: a) underlying risk factors are continuously considered in all relevant sectors; and b) risk reduction standards and measures are an integral part of the planning and delivery of core development services and processes, including education, environment, and health. UNDP [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
16. Mainstreaming of DRR is a governance process enabling the systematic integration of DRR concerns into all relevant development spheres. In other words, responsive, accountable, transparent and efficient governance structures underwrite the environment where DRR can be institutionalized as an underlying principle of sustainable development. Therefore, building resilient communities in disaster-prone countries requires that: a) underlying risk factors are continuously considered in all relevant sectors; and b) risk reduction standards and measures are an integral part of the planning and delivery of core development services and processes, including education, environment, and health. UNDP [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
17. Stan Kita [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
18. The representation could be broadened to include other NGOs and Civil Society Networks [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
19. 1. Cash transfers for activities in AWPs can be made by UNDP using the following modalities:
    2. Direct cash transfers whereby cash is transferred directly to the Implementing Partner (DoDMA) prior to the start of activities based on agreed cost estimates;
    3. Reimbursements whereby the Implementing Partner is reimbursed for expenditures agreed prior to the costs being incurred; and
    4. Direct payments to vendors or third parties for obligations incurred by the Implementing Partners on the basis of requests signed by the designated official of the Implementing Partner.

    [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
20. All the Principal Secretaries in the ministry will be represented in the Steering Committee [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
21. Did UNDP provide adequate technical support to the Program Support design and implementation including monitoring? Give examples? Did BCPR or headquarters support with key tools such as PDNA and databases, etc.? [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
22. The development agencies operating in the disaster risk reduction and management space were found to be operating in silos/vacuums, and there is an issue with semantics of resilience-type programming. There is a great need for sector-wide approach to resilience and for leadership on systems building and institutional strengthening. Donors are operating dual-layer Program Supports that are focused on aspects of the work, whether it is downstream or upstream. The need was clearly for leadership and a platform that enable a holistic approach. Many respondents agree that the resilience framework is the opportunity for better partnering, whether it is through joint Program Supports and robust sharing of information on what they are doing. The UNDP has been providing service to help coordination, such as donor mapping and other activities’ [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
23. Excerpt from DFID report 2017 Putting theory into practice: how DFID is doing development differently. [Leni Wild](https://www.odi.org/experts/554-leni-wild), [David Booth](https://www.odi.org/experts/93-david-booth) and [Craig Valters](https://www.odi.org/experts/1258-craig-valters)

    The UK’s Department for International Development (DFID) has begun to take some of these challenges seriously, focusing on how its own processes and systems need to adapt. This report reflects the experience of staff from the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in supporting these efforts within DFID throughout 2016. It is particularly timely: commitments to do development differently have particular relevance as DFID is coming under considerable political and media scrutiny and scepticism.

    We found that DFID’s portfolio of Programs increasingly exhibit some ‘doing development differently’ features, across sectoral work on governance, private sector development, basic service delivery, conflict and gender. There is a growing emphasis on being ‘problem driven’ – setting aside standard formulas and templates and focusing instead on specific constraints to development that need to be unlocked to enable progress. Less encouragingly, DFID Programs have found it harder to commit upfront to experimentation and ‘learning by doing’ as a core method of work.

    We therefore recommend DFID takes action in the following areas:

    build leadership vision and a supportive management culture;

    make adaptation more strategic;

    move towards more ‘adaptation by design’;

    streamline approval and procurement to manage uncertainty; and

    find new ways to support locally led problem solving. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
24. Colleagues suggested that the UNDP PO meet with Aiden Fitzpatrick at DfID officers to plan next phase as they are now planning and considering the sustainability aspects [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
25. Key Lessons from PPP feedback August 2017

    ***Design***

    * Strong monitoring - *Theory of Change* and *Mechanisms for monitoring*
    * *Importance of Establishing a base line for work on capacity development linked to the KM strategy*
    * Partnerships and Inter-sector built into *design plan*
    * *Design for scale up*

    ***Implementation***

    * Support for NIM
    * Stable HR
    * Contingency Plan for Disasters
    * Coordination mechanisms for linkages between CC/DRR

    ***Results***

    * Policy results are about engagements /good relationships and identifying moments for change
    * Data and information management results require much inter-sectoral work. Having a strong communication and knowledge management plan can help
    * Coordination is central to results in DRM – a multi-stakeholder and multi sector wide approach will inherently support these expected results.

    [↑](#endnote-ref-26)