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Executive summary

This report presents findings and recommendations of a Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of UNDP Malawi’s Country Program (2019-2023). UNDP’s Country Program (CP) is part of the support of the UN system to the Government of Malawi in implementing the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) III to achieve national development outcomes and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The 2019-2023 UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), in short UNCF, is the primary vehicle through which the UN system is supporting priority areas in the MGDS III based on its mandates and capacities. The Malawi UNSDCF has been structured around three pillars:

* Pillar 1 – Peace, Inclusion, and Effective Institutions.
* Pillar 2 – Population Management and Inclusive Human Development; and
* Pillar 3 – Inclusive and Resilient Growth.

The UNDP has operationalized the UNSDCF through its Country Program Document. The CPD is articulated around the following four outcomes:

* **Outcome 1:** By 2023, Malawi has strengthened economic diversification, inclusive business, entrepreneurship, and access to clean energy
* **Outcome 2:** By 2023, households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to healthy ecosystems, and resilient livelihoods.
* **Outcome 3:** By 2023, rights holders in Malawi access more accountable and effective institutions at the central and decentralized levels that use quality disaggregated data, offer integrated service delivery, and promote civic engagement, respect for human rights and rule of law
* **Outcome 4:** By 2023, Malawi has strengthened institutions for sustaining peace, inclusive societies, and participatory democracy.

## The MTE methodology and limitations

This MTE deployed a mixed methods-methods approach in the context of the global COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, although the borders were open, executing the EMTE still presented some difficulties that the evaluation team considered. The primary data collected was mainly qualitative and came from two sources: direct field interviews and direct observations during the fieldwork conducted by the MTE team. Secondary quantitative data were collected from the CP documents, projects’ performance reports, the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, and other available documents. The data were triangulated with the literature review results; targeted field interviews were undertaken for validation to ensure data validity and reliability so that findings and recommendations would be evidence-based.

The limited timeframe and stakeholders’ availability*- S*ome key stakeholders were not readily available. Therefore, flexible interview schedules were adopted to accommodate stakeholders’ availability, even during the data analysis phase of the evaluation.

## Findings

**Relevance**

The MTE team found that the CPD was highly relevant to the Malawi Government. It aligns with perfect fitness to the MGDS III, the Malawi 2063 vision, and the Malawi Investment Plan I, which are the development guiding and policy documents of the Malawi Government during the lifespan of the CPD. Thus, the interventions under the CPD make direct contributions to desired result areas of the Government and people of Malawi.

The CPD also aligns with and is logically linked to the UNSDCF. All the programming outcomes of the CPD draw directly from the UNSDF and are designed to contribute more directly to higher-level results sought by the UN system in Malawi as codified in the UNSDCF. The MTE team found the CPD to be a helpful implementation tool of the UNSDCF and the SDGs in general, especially as both the Malawi Government development documents and the UNSDCF mainstreamed SDGs in their formulations.

The CPD commenced in 2019, one year into the lifespan of UNDP’s Strategic Plan. On the programming dimension, UNDP sought to do three critical things as outlined in the Strategic Plan: (a) Eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions and keeping people out of poverty, (b) Accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development, primarily through innovative solutions that have multiplier effects across the Sustainable Development Goals; and (c) Building resilience to crises and shocks to safeguard development gains. The MTE team observed that portfolio programming under the CPD speaks directly to UNDP’s strategic objectives for programming outlined in the SP.

**Coherence**

Regarding Coherence, the MTE team found that for the Resilience and Sustainable Growth (RSG) portfolio, there are several areas for potential synergies and inter-linkages between projects which could be harnessed to enhance coherence within the portfolio. RICE portfolio was found to constitute a cohesive and coherent component of UNDP’s Country Program. Most interventions under the RICE portfolio are primarily coherent and have solid theories of action/change. The leading ones in this regard are the NRIS, and the MECS. However, other interventions are less internally coherent as they lack an articulation of theories of change to guide programming and understanding.

The MTE team noted that almost all RSG projects had governance, transparency, accountability, and capacity-building issues regarding coherence between portfolios. The MTE team believed that periodic joint portfolio review and learning sessions would benefit the RSG portfolio to make up for the governance deficits in their portfolio. Despite these potential synergies between the portfolios, the MTE noted that the CPD was weak in capturing and monitoring these synergies.

**Effectiveness**

In terms of Effectiveness, the MTE noted that the main objective of the CPD is to contribute to the reduction of poverty, inequality, and vulnerability to shocks. The CPD planned to achieve this objective by scaling up employment and sustainable livelihood opportunities for vulnerable groups, including women, youth, persons with disabilities and albinism, and communities living in areas prone to flooding, drought, and other shocks.

The CP has implemented a private sector development programme through the MICF, which has created more than 1500 jobs, of which 35Percentage are occupied by women, in Malawi over the past three years. Apart from creating direct jobs through value addition, the programme has empowered communities by introducing innovations, value addition, and supporting the development of local small and medium enterprises through the ACRE project. The MTE noted that only jobs created by MICF are being counted and reported because of limited coordination, especially on data collection and collation within the RSG portfolio.

Through the implementation of the CPD, UNDP managed to engage 45 private sector institutions to implement this output. As a result of MICF Projects, 2,112 low-income, unskilled people have gained permanent employment, while 1,306 small and medium enterprises (SMEs) have accessed MK287 Million worth of loans. From these MICF investments, 74,167 smallholder households, of who 40Percentage are women, have from the new or enhanced income-generating activity of livelihood improvement.

UNDP Malawi currently supports access to clean energy for poor rural households through the “Access to Clean and Renewable Energy (ACRE) Project.” ACRE has already started establishing Productive Energy Use hubs (PEUH) in new mini-grid sites, where agribusiness cooperatives in agro-processing and other off-farm enterprises will also be established.

The CPD also focused on building the resilience of vulnerable groups to shocks by increasing their knowledge and skills to adapt and mitigate the effects of climate change. In this regard, UNDP works closely with Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAS), including Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, to build capacities of Local Governments to adopt and implement climate adaptation, mitigation, and disaster risk reduction (DRR).

The effectiveness of the CPD at mid-term was negatively and positively affected by the Covid 19 pandemic. UNDP put up a robust response mechanism that helped governance institutions continue doing their work on the positive side. In this regard, the support with IT infrastructure to enable virtual meetings of the National Assembly stands out. The support provided to governance institutions during the peak of Covid 19 demonstrates UNDP’s capability for adaptive management and responsiveness that is highly commendable. On the negative side, Covid 19 slowed down and, in some cases, stalled project implementation as travel and physical, interpersonal interactions became constrained as measures of containing the spread of Covid 19.

**Efficiency**

The implementation of the CPD has been with medium-level efficiency with several areas that could be improved. The MTE noted that the most significant internal setback on efficiency is that the annual implementation cycle is cut by up to a quarter for most interventions. This is because the preparation of Annual Work Plans (AWP) and corresponding budgets start late. Instead of having them completed by December of the preceding year, the preparatory work is done during the first quarter of the implementation year. By the time the necessary approvals are obtained, up to 25Percentage of implementation time is lost.

The MTE team noted that the CP is constrained by an inadequate number of M&E staff regarding monitoring and evaluation. The practice mainly depends on receiving and reviewing partners’ implementation reports or reports of program analysts. There are rare opportunities for occasional field visits by M&E staff.

The implementation of UNDP Malawi's interventions depends on the quality of partnerships that UNDP can strike with various stakeholders central to achieving the desired results. UNDP is commended for identifying partners based on their institutional mandates, track record, and competitive advantages. Nonetheless, the MTE observed that sometimes key potential partners that are central to achieving the desired results are sidelined.

UNDP’s interventions in the sphere of governance have a high degree of sustainability, especially those whose implementing partners are government MDAs. However, a lot depends on the extent to which the intervention is institutionalized and integrated into the day-to-day functions of the MDA

## Conclusions

The CPD is relevant to the development needs and policies of the Malawi Government, the local communities, women and men, boys and girls, and other vulnerable groups. These needs are many and require addressing many development problems, including high levels and deep-rooted poverty, vulnerability, and inequalities responsible for weak capacities of individuals, households, communities, and the nation to achieve economic growth and sustainable resilience. The CPD’s three pathways, which summarize the theory of change, reflect a realistic road map to reduce these widespread development challenges. The CPD builds bridges between national development strategies, sectoral policies, individual CPD projects, and sustainable development goals.

While the CPD was relevant and was well aligned with the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy at design in 2019, there is a policy shift in development planning in Government currently from poverty reduction to wealth creation through industrialization and urbanization, based on the new vision of the country, the Malawi 2063. The CPD will need to be aligned with this approach, including strengthening the ToC, including a diagrammatic presentation, to show linkages with policies and synergies between various CPD interventions. In particular, the RSG portfolio in general and private sector development will have to be reviewed, streamlined, and realigned by targeting sectors for wealth creation through agricultural value chains (Pillar 1: Agricultural productivity and commercialization) and processing and manufacturing (Pillar 2: Industrialization). The RICE portfolio has docking points in Malawi 2063 through the ‘Enablers’ of the vision generally and Enablers 2 (Effective Governance Systems and Institutions), Enabler 3 (Enhanced Public Sector performance), and Enabler 5 (Human Capital Development).

The CPD has implemented many diverse projects at the effectiveness level, contributing to various outcomes and impacts at individual, household, community, and institutional levels.

However, accomplishing results could have been even better if not for technical and operational problems related to some interventions.

The Spotlight Initiative programme on ending violence against women and girls targeting SDG 5 on gender equality to close in on inequalities through improving GBV related coordination mechanisms is an excellent positive action. The district councils targeted in 6 Spotlight Initiative Districts are now able to mainstream gender and disability in their development plans. Furthermore, Traditional |Leaders have taken the lead to de-normalize cultural practices that facilitate GBV through the revamped chiefs’ forums platforms that enable chiefs to end child marriages report GBV cases, thereby killing the silence culture, among others other things, and share best practices.

Under the MECS mostly so far, critical impacts of the CPD have been observed at the upstream, midstream, and downstream levels. The upstream impacts have mainly been the improved policy and institutional capacity through various macro-level activities, including those done through DIAT and project-specific policy advocacy work with MDAs at the national level. In addition, the Adoption of model gender and anti-sexual harassment policy for higher education by the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) alongside 22 public and private universities is a significant institutional framework shift in implementing the Gender Equality Act and adoption of gender equality principles in the higher learning institutions. At midstream, the main impacts have been the capacity building of decentralized institutions, including District and City Councils, through training programmes, equipment, and infrastructural development. The main focus of the CPD has been on contributing to poverty reduction and resilience building. The MTE found evidence of functioning pathways at the household level as planned in the ToC.

The programme shows potential for sustainability, both technically and institutionally. For example, most RSG projects aim to build household resilience by investing in adaptation and DRR interventions, which address the felt needs of communities. The communities are likely to continue implementing these projects because of their understanding of the impacts of climate change.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations is a list of strategic and operational recommendations to improve the CP current programming and inform the design of the next CPD:

1. UNDP should review the CPD to identify or ascertain the alignment and complementarity of the CPD to MIP-1 priorities and, if possible, should do so jointly with the NPC. The MTE makes this recommendation because the Government of Malawi, through the NPC, hopes that UNDP may set a leading example to others so that the NPC can use the experience gained to support other development partners in aligning their country's development strategies to Malawi’s new vision and its implementation plan.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. As part of the alignment under recommendation 1 above, it is recommended that UNDP review the theory of change underlying the CPD and include its visual representation, showing clear nodes of synergy, which should be points of collaboration between and within portfolios. To enhance internal coherence, specific indicators should be developed and monitored to maximize synergies and coordination arrangements.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. It is recommended that UNDP establish a system for aggregating the number of households/farmers or beneficiaries reached across all RSG projects and replicate a similar system/indicator for RICE projects.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. UNDP should seek to complete project documentation for the long-term interventions in place in the RICE portfolio since all the projects in the RSG portfolio are already documented. Where a project document is not possible, a sufficiently informative write-up covering aspects such as the rationale, the theory of change, and the project's implementation strategy should be developed..

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** Medium

1. UNDP should improve the clarity of the ‘SDG hotspot’ concept to enhance the empirical usefulness of the concept in programming and develop and document a theory of action and strategy for the SHAI project.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. In terms of implementation models, it is recommended that UNDP should discuss thoroughly with its partners the implementation model that is adopted for each of its new projects. In cases where a DIM model is used, UNDP should support the implementing partner to build its capacity in specific areas of capacity deficits to enable future projects using the NIM. Whichever implementation model is agreed upon, there must be regular sharing of information about any new developments or challenges that affect project implementation.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** Medium

1. At a project level, UNDP program staff and their implementing partner's staff should strengthen project monitoring site visits and address operational issues in a timely fashion to minimize unwarranted delays that affect the achievement of project objectives. All project staff should have a minimum number of M&E responsibilities embedded in references or job descriptions.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. The ‘Sense making’ protocol and process should be replicated in other portfolios to enhance holistic and coherent approaches to addressing development challenges rather than a silo approach. However, the replication should be without the protraction of the exercise beyond a maximum of three months.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. The analysis of various stakeholders' power, interests, and attitudes (i.e., Political Economy Analysis) should become a regular practice in UNDP projects, not just at the project design stages but during implementation. This is because none of the variables are static or frozen in time. They are dynamic as people respond to changes in their environment. By doing so, UNDP will ensure that implementing partners work politically savvy through precise mapping of stakeholders and their interests and incentives that may block or propel reform or achievement of results and calibrate the support and opposition levels to the reform/initiative.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** Medium

1. To enhance the quality of relationships with its development partners, UNDP should regularly share progress reports on projects being implemented, including progress on CPD implementation. The sharing of information with the development partners should be institutionalized and regularized.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

# Introduction

This report presents detailed findings and recommendations of a Mid Term Evaluation of UNDP Malawi’s country program (CP) which commenced in January 2019 and is expected to end in December 2023. UNDP’s country program is part of a larger UN support system to the government and people of Malawi. The 2019-2023 UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), in short UNCF, is the primary vehicle through which the UN system is supporting priority areas in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS)based on its mandates and capacities. The Malawi UNCF has been structured around three pillars:

* Pillar 1 – Peace, Inclusion, and Effective Institutions.
* Pillar 2 – Population Management and Inclusive Human Development; and
* Pillar 3 – Inclusive and Resilient Growth.

To operationalize the UNSDCF, the UNDP has implemented a set of twenty-seven projects under its current Country program Document 2019-2023. The projects that have been implemented cut across all development sectors targeted by the Malawi Government.

# The Mid-term evaluation

The mid-term evaluation was conducted to assess progress towards achieving the CP outcomes. The evaluation assessed the current program's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, identified ways to strengthen it going forward, and set the stage for new initiatives. The mid-term evaluation also has a vital accountability function by providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results. The evaluation also provided an opportunity for UNDP to engage critical stakeholders to discuss achievements, lessons learned, and adjustments required in response to an evolving development landscape, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and changing national priorities.

This evaluation took a mixed-methods approach. The primary data collected was qualitative. However, quantitative secondary data was collected from progress reports and documents produced by projects under the country program in Malawi. The data were triangulated with the literature review results and validated through interviews. The methodology adopted for this evaluation was based on the following nine points:

1. Scoping meeting with UNDP
2. Literature review
3. Identification of parties to be interviewed
4. Development of collection tools
5. Preparation of the inception report
6. Field work
7. Drafting and submission of the interim report
8. Online feedback workshop
9. Submission of the final report

## Scoping meeting with the UNDP team

The scoping meeting was held online in November 2021, following the contracting of the evaluation team. That meeting was attended by the UNDP country team (RR, DRR, M&E team), the national consultants, and the international consultant. It served as a forum to discuss the CP, context, projects, results, and challenges. The meeting was also an opportunity to identify which stakeholders to meet with as part of the midterm evaluation. The scoping meeting also ensured a common understanding of the terms of reference and allowed the consultants to outline their understanding of the assignment and discuss the timing. The Evaluation Team prepared a list of documents that had to be reviewed, and the UNDP M&E staff mobilized the documents and made them available.

## Literature review

The literature review covered all documents received from the UNDP country Program team. It covered planning documents, projects pro-docs, performance reports, monitoring reports, protocols, and other documents related to the CP interventions in Malawi. The individual projects' performance reports were carefully consulted to analyze their performance over time and better understand their challenges.

## Identification of interviewees and institutions to interview

Representatives of all project stakeholder groups participated in the evaluation. These stakeholders included projects staff, UNDP Malawi staff, staff from Ministries, embassies, UN agencies, Civil Society Organizations, project staff, community members, and project beneficiaries. The list of people and institutions met during the review is in the annexes.

## Development of collection tools

Following the literature review, the consultants developed data collection tools. This MTE took a mixed qualitative and quantitative approach, which considered the constraints induced by the prevalence of Covid-19. In addition, quantitative data were collected from secondary sources. The data collection tools used were interview guides for the various stakeholders. Those interview guides are attached to this report. The consultants also used direct observation for selected projects at selected sites visited during the data collection phase of the evaluation.

## Preparation of the inception report

The consultants prepared an inception report that synthesized all the previous steps and outlined the subsequent steps in the process. After approval by UNDP, the inception report provided the guiding framework for the evaluation.

## Field work

The review team interviewed UNDP staff in Malawi and the embassy staff and staff from other UN agencies, ministries, and CSOs. Following the interviews in Lilongwe, the international consultant left the country. The national consultants continued with data collection including field visits where they met with project beneficiaries and observed and verified some tangible outputs. The travel schedule is included in the appendices of this report. In the context of Covid 19 and to avoid exposing participants unnecessarily to the risks of contamination and infection, the consultants decided not to conduct focus group discussions if avoidable. Instead, one on one or group interviews were preferred. Before and after the field visits, additional data was collected through telephone or online platforms for virtual meetings, especially zoom.

## Data analysis and writing and sharing of the evaluation report

The evaluation team subsequently triangulated the data:

* Triangulation of sources: the team compared information from different sources - for example, perspectives from various stakeholder groups, documentation, and observation.
* Triangulation of methods: The team compared the information gathered by the different methods (interviews, literature review, key informant interviews, direct observation).
* Triangulation of evaluators: the team compared the information collected by its different members.
* Geographic triangulation: The team compared information collected in the different intervention areas to ensure differentiation between results that can be generalized and results that are limited to a particular context.

The results of the field phase were triangulated and validated through consultations between key stakeholders and the evaluators. The evaluators regularly consulted with stakeholders on the data, considering how internal and external factors influenced and explained the results.

## Ethics

The evaluation approach adhered to high ethical standards in full compliance with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical principles, including protecting the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders by ensuring compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing data collection and reporting.

The evaluators ensured the security of the information collected before and after the evaluation, and protocols to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of information sources were put in place and followed. Knowledge and data collected as part of the evaluation process will also be used only for the evaluation and not for any other purpose without the express permission of UNDP and its partners.

In the context of Covid-19, the evaluators conducted their investigations in strict compliance with the prevention measures decreed by the authorities.

## Limitations of the evaluation and solutions applied

The limitations of the evaluation are both natural and operational. The natural limitations relate to the methodology adopted. The context of the review and the nature of the tools adopted imply a possible divergence in the interviewees' views. These divergences can sometimes be due to the different experiences of the stakeholders or to the bias that one party or another may have. The evaluators conducted several triangulations of the interview results to draw conclusions representing the situation to address this issue.

Also, the evaluation team was challenged by the unavailability of some of the stakeholders who had traveled outside of Lilongwe during the data collection phase. To address this, the team decided to conduct consultations over the phone and by zoom

Finally, with the prevalence of Covid-19 during this evaluation, the team did not conduct focus groups as they would have liked to avoid the risks associated with contaminating participants at these gatherings. The evaluators increased direct observations in the field and individual interviews with beneficiaries to compensate for this.

# The Country program

The Malawi Country program interventions are rooted in the country's Results and resource framework 2019-2023, defined in the current CPD. Those interventions align with the United Nations Cooperation Framework (UNCF) defined outcomes and the National development priorities set forth by the Government of Malawi.

The 2019-2023UNCF is the primary vehicle through which the UN system supports the Malawi Government's priority areas of the Malawi Government as outlined in the MGDS and based on its mandates and capacities. The Malawi UNCF is structured around three pillars:

* Pillar 1 – Peace, Inclusion, and Effective Institutions.
* Pillar 2 – Population Management and Inclusive Human Development; and
* Pillar 3 – Inclusive and Resilient Growth.

The UNDP, through the CPD, has operationalized the NCUNCF through the implementation of a total of twenty-seven projects clustered in work packages called portfolios. Under the Country program Document 2019-2023, the programming work of UNDP is in three main clusters, namely Responsive Institutions and Citizen Engagement (RICE), Resilience and Growth (RSG)), and Development Impact Advisory Team (DIAT).

The CPD was designed to deliver four outcome level results and account for at least eleven outputs, as summarized in the table below:

Table 1. The following matrix is a snapshot of the CPD results framework:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1: By 2023, Malawi has strengthened economic diversification, inclusive business, entrepreneurship, and access to clean energy** | **Output 1.1:** Women and youth in targeted areas have access to employment opportunities.  **Output 1.2:** Public and private sector institutions enabled to develop and implement policies and practices that enhance innovation, productivity, and entrepreneurship.  **Output 1.3:** Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted at the national and subnational levels to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy) |
| **Outcome 2: By 2023, households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to healthy ecosystems and resilient livelihoods.** | **Output 2.1:** Scaled-up action, finance and partnerships for climate change adaptation, mitigation, and disaster risk management across sectors.  **Output 2.2:** Adaptive capacity of rural households and reduced exposure to climate risks strengthened |
| **Outcome 3: By 2023, rights holders in Malawi access more accountable and effective institutions at the central and decentralized levels that use quality disaggregated data, offer integrated service delivery and promote civic engagement, respect for human rights and rule of law** | **Output 3.1:** Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (MoJCA), Malawi Human Rights Commission (MHRC), Police Services, Prison Services, Judiciary, Legal Aid Services and Paralegal Advisory Service Institute (PASI) are enabled to implement and monitor policies, laws and strategies for equitable access to justice.  **Output 3.2:** Selected governance institutions are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency and accountability  **Output 3.3:** Central and Local government institutions are enabled to develop and manage evidence- based policy planning, monitoring and evaluation systems for inclusive and effective delivery of services and achievement of results.  **Output 3.4:** Use of digital technologies and quality disaggregated data enabled for improved public services and other government functions |
| **Outcome 4: By 2023, Malawi has strengthened institutions for sustaining peace, inclusive societies, and participatory democracy.** | **Output 4.1**: Parliament, Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC), Centre for Multiparty Democracy and non-state actors are enabled to perform core functions for inclusive participation and representation  **Output 4.2**: Gender-sensitive National Peace Architecture structures with real-time conflict early warning monitoring systems at national and district level are adopted. |

Of the 7 27 projects implemented under the CPD, nine projects are within the RICE portfolio. In comparison, 17 projects (the 17 projects included specific funding windows funded by different donors for the MICF) are under the RSG portfolio, according to data provided by UNDP. While some projects have a national coverage in terms of their reach, others are localized to specific geographical areas depending on development challenges targeted by the interventions.:

Table 2: Summary of projects implemented by UNDP through the CPD

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Serial #** | **Portfolio** | **Proj. Id** | **Project Title** | **Start date** | **End date** | **Intervention area/districts** | **Donor(s)** |
|  | RICE | 100113 | [National Registration and Identification System](https://intranet.undp.org/sites/MWI/project/00100113) | 01/11/2016 | 31/12/2021 | National | EU, NRE, Irish Aid, FCDO, USAID  Government of Malawi  UNDP |
|  | RICE | 73899 | Social Cohesion | 01-Jan-13 | 31-Dec-21 | National | EU  UNDP |
|  | RICE | 121496 | EHiN | 01-Sep-19 | 31-Dec-21 | National |  |
|  | RICE | 103966 | [Malawi Electoral Cycle Support (2017-2020)](https://intranet.undp.org/sites/MWI/project/00103966) | 01-Jun-17 | 31-Dec-21 | National | EU, NRE, Irish Aid, FCDO, USAID |
|  | RICE | 108391 | Access to Justice though Village Mediation & Paralegal Services | 01-Dec-17 | 31-Dec-21 | National | EU |
|  | RICE | 117665 | [Spotlight Initiative](https://intranet.undp.org/sites/MWI/project/00117665) | 01-Jan-19 | 31-Dec-22 | Ntchisi, Nsanje,Machinga, Nkhatabay,Mzimba , Dowa | EU  UNDP-HQ |
|  | RICE | 132037 | Foresight and Anticepatory Governance | 01-Jul-20 | 30-Jun-22 | National |  |
|  | RICE | 125479 | Hotspots Acceleration Initiative (SHAI) | 01-Jan-20 | 31-Dec-23 | Nsanje and Phalombe | Irish Aid |
|  | RICE | 118210 | DIAT | 01-Jan-19 | 31-Dec-23 | National |  |
|  | RICE | TBD | Human Rights Support Project | TBD | TBD | National | UNDP  Irish Aid  EU |
|  | RSG | 102187 | [Modernized Climate (M-CLIMES)](https://intranet.undp.org/sites/MWI/project/00102187) | 01-Apr-17 | 31-Dec-23 | Chitipa, karonga, Lilongwe, Salima, Dedza, Nkhotakota, Kasungu, Mchinji, Ntchisi, Dowa, Mzimba, Nkhatabay, Rumphi, Phalombe, Chiradzulu, Ntcheu, Mangochi, Zomba, Mulanje, Chiikwawa, Nsanje | GCF |
|  | RSG | 114165 | Climate Resilience Initiative in Malawi (CRIM) | 01-Jan-19 | 31-Dec-22 | Kasungu(TA Simulemba and Kaluluma) , Mzimba(T/A Kampingo Sibande and Mtwalo) | Flanders |
|  | RSG | 115077 | [Poverty Environment Action for SDGs](https://intranet.undp.org/sites/MWI/project/00115077) | 01-Sep-18 | 31-Aug-22 | Machinga, Mangochi,  Mchinji, Kasungu, Dowa,  Salima and Mzimba | UNEP |
|  | RSG | 123350 | Malawi – China Post-Disaster Recovery Partnership | 01-Dec-19 | 31--Dec-- 2021 | Zomba. Phalombe | China |
|  | RSG | 125267 | Private Sector Development II | 01-Jan-20 | 31-Dec-23 | National |  |
|  |  |  | MICF and Growth Accelerator |  |  | National | RNE |
|  |  |  | MICF and Growth Accelerator |  |  | National | FCDO, IFAD, KfW |
|  |  |  | Za Ntchito |  |  | National | EU |
|  |  | 118989 | Accelerator Lab | 01-Jan-19 | 31-Dec-21 | National |  |
|  |  | 131153 | Increase Universities ProductionCapacity for COVID-19 PPEs | 01-Oct-20 | 31-Mar-22 | MUBAS, KUHES(COM), MUST, MZUNI, UNIMA(CHANCO) |  |
|  | RSG | 135132 | Malawi Green Corps | 01-Jan-21 | 31-Dec-23 | Karonga, Mzuzu, Dedza, Ntcheu, Salima, Mangochi , Machinga, Zomba , Blantyre |  |
|  | RSG |  | BioFin | Jul-19 | Dec-21 | National | Flanders |
|  | RSG | 136404 | National Child Project under the GEF Africa Minigrids | 01-Sep-21 | 01-Sep-25 |  |  |
|  | RICE | 131914 | Public Sector Innovation Initiative | 01-Jun-21 | 30-May-22 | All local councils | UNDP-HQ |
|  | RSG | 126170 | Access to Clean and Renewable Energy | 01-Jan-20 | 31 December 2023 | Mchinji , Mulanje and Rumphi |  |
|  | RSG | 116269 | National Climate Resilience Program | 01-Jan-19 | 31 December 2023 | National | UNDP-HQ |
|  | RSG | 126010 | TRANSFORM | 01-Jan-20 | 31-Dec-21 | Machinga and Zomba | UNDP-HQ |

Findings

# Relevance

This criterion is concerned with the extent to which the CP's design, strategies, activities, and implementation were best suited for the problems that the project sought to address.

The CPD theory of change is explained in the following summary narrative. The impact or principal objective of the programme is to contribute to the reduction of poverty, inequality, and vulnerability to shocks. There are three main pathways in which UNDP will achieve this objective.

1. The first pathway comprises inclusive, sustainable growth interventions by enhancing economic innovation, inclusive business, job creation, entrepreneurship, and access to renewable energy. This pathway is dominated by the MICF and the Growth Accelerator Project, but the MTE also found additional and substantial contributions from the ACRE project.
2. The second pathway consists of interventions towards scaling up climate adaptation and resilience to shocks for vulnerable communities. The dominant projects are the MCLIMES, the CRIM Project, the Transform Project, and the National Climate Resilience Programme.
3. The third and final pathway is strengthening governance and human rights institutions for development effectiveness, transparency, accountability, improved service provision, and civic participation. Interventions include promoting civic engagement, respect for human rights, the rule of law, peace and democracy, and support to national and local development planning, coordination, and monitoring capacities processes with special attention given to localization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The ToC was developed using UNDP guidelines on the theory of change, which has identified four characteristics or purposes of the ToC: to understand development challenges by enabling UNDP to think through the many immediate, underlying, and root causes of development challenges they influence each other systematically. Secondly, ToCs help explain and test UNDP's assumptions when planning a particular intervention to lead to a development change. Thirdly, ToCs help UNDP manage risks as part of programme and project management. And finally, the guidelines indicate that theories of change help UNDP make course corrections if the approach used is not working[[1]](#footnote-2).

The MTE team found that the ToC firmly and with evidence aligns with the Sustainable Development Goals, the foundation for UNDP and Malawi Government policies, programmes, and projects. Below the SDGs, the CPD is consistent and logically linked to the UNSCDF, which means the CPD is an implementation framework that operationalizes the selected UNCF outcomes. For this reason, the ToC identifies and maps onto specific NUNCF outcomes and their indicators, which means that UNDP is playing a pivotal role in implementing the UNCF and can therefore report its contribution as a member of the One UN Family. In a similar approach, the CPD was aligned to the MGDS, which was at the time of the design of the CPD in 2019, the national development blueprint for Malawi. The objective of the MGDS was to move Malawi to a productive, competitive, and resilient nation through sustainable agriculture and economic growth, energy, industrial, and infrastructure development while addressing water, climate change, environmental management, and population challenges[[2]](#footnote-3). Therefore, the CPD was aligned to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy 2017-2022 and other critical national policies and strategies. For example, the CPD aims to contribute to poverty reduction, inequality, and vulnerability to shocks which were also the central pillar of the MGDS. At a sector level, poverty reduction has also been the main objective of many sectoral policies in Malawi.

With the Malawi 2063 and its first ten-year implementation plan, the MIP 1, the Malawi Government has shifted its development policy focus from poverty reduction, which was the core focus in the MGDS and the CPD, to self-reliance and wealth creation. Even with the policy shift, the UNDP CPD is still relevant and aligned to Malawi 2063. For example, the CPD has been instrumental in scaling up employment and sustainable livelihood opportunities for vulnerable groups, including women, youth, persons with disabilities and albinism, and communities, through projects implemented within the RICE and RSG portfolio. These projects have created jobs, improved livelihoods, and resilience to climate change, contributing to self-reliance and wealth creation at households, which are tenets of the Malawi 2063.

However, the shift in the development paradigm means that the ToC for the CPD needs review as there are potential weaknesses, especially in the deductive logic of the ToC and the existing CPD projects in relation to the new national development blueprints. The National Planning Commission expects that this situation is not only specific to UNDP but also to other development partners and civil society organizations. As a result, the NPC further expects UNDP to play a frontline role in supporting the Malawi Government to facilitate alignment and realignment of development strategies amongst donors and NGOs. To do this properly, UNDP will need to start the process internally by reviewing the CPD, learning from it, and then supporting others. UNDP already has an Accelerator Lab, a partnership that established the Innovation Coordination Team, a platform where public universities and NPC collaborate to ensure innovation activities by academia are aligned with MW2063 priorities. This mandate of this platform can be widened to include extended support to NPC to roll out alignment and realignment of development strategies amongst donors and NGOs.

Delving further into CPD projects’ ToCs, the MTE noted that projects are designed using a standardized template with strong ToC provisions and clear links to the CPD outcomes and indicators. Monitoring and reporting by Programme Analysts are also done on that basis, which means that the CPD is integrated into all projects’ theories of change. For the RSG portfolio projects, however, there is a need for the portfolio also to adopt the sense-making process to identify pathways or a common framework through which projects can be clustered, coordinated, and connected to the CPD; instead of each project directly relating to the CPD (which would be ok, if the number of projects was limited or the portfolio was small), which creates coherence and coordination challenges.

The UNDP guidelines and the template for developing Programme Document on ToC require that the ToC be depicted in a visual theory of change diagram. However, the guidelines and the template for programme documents do not indicate one essential purpose of visualization of the theory of change, which is the identification of synergies between pathways, which inherently depict areas or nodes where coordination during programme or project implementation is paramount importance. For example, in the theory of change for the CPD, the three pathways have essential connections that are currently either not being monitored or recorded. The MTE holds a strong view that the lack of acknowledgment of this critical role of the ToC, fostering synergies and coordination, is the reason why the three CPD portfolios (pathways) have had limited internal and external coherence between and within each other.

At the subnational or district level, the CPD has significantly contributed to implementing the Decentralization Policy by supporting the implementation of District Development Plans (DDP). The MTE team noted that the CPD outcomes aligned with district development priorities in all district visits. In the districts visited, the common development issues programmed in the DDP included in the CPD were food and nutritional security, poor housing and ICT infrastructure, high environmental degradation and negative impacts of climate change, poor energy sources, low economic development and limited job opportunities. A critical analysis shows that these issues are being addressed by various projects implemented under the CPD. For example, the economic development issue is handled by the MICF through job creation, by the ACRE project through the development of SMEs; the food security issue is being addressed through the MICF, the ACRE, the SDG Tracking project, and many more.

Field visits undertaken as part of the CPD midterm evaluation found strong evidence that the CPD is contributing to improved resilience of vulnerable groups. For example, the construction of 200 flood resilient households in Chikwawa district has significantly resulted in the protection of lives and livelihoods for women and children and people with disabilities, who dominated the beneficiaries of the housing project. During field visits made to MICF in Chikwawa and Thyolo, the team noted that smallholder farmers have been mobilized, capacitated, and effectively participated in agricultural value chains, which increased their household income. In the same vein, the ACRE project has supported power generation and enhanced mini-grid connectivity to target beneficiaries in Mulanje district. It was reported that those that have been connected to the mini-grid are now actively engaged in small and medium scale off-farm businesses such as phone charging, maize milling, and grocery shops, which improves their household income and resilience. Such households depend less on agriculture for their livelihoods hence are likely not to be too negatively affected by climatic shocks.

**Outcome 1 of the CPD** is significant for Malawi, given that half of the population lives below the poverty line and that the majority of those who are poor are women and children. The CPD tackles poverty, which is severe and deep-rooted and has been increasing (GoM, 2012). About a quarter of the population is estimated to live in extreme poverty, especially in rural areas where poverty is widespread (Rasmussen, 2018). In 2017, about 74Percentage of households in Malawi reported poor, while 24Percentage reported extremely poor, using subjective self-assessment (National Statistics Office, 2017). Figure 1.1 shows that the incidence of poverty (national poverty headcount) across the country has not changed much from 2004 to 2017, 52.4Percentage in 2004 to 51.5Percentage in 2017 ( (NSO, 2019), which justifies the importance of the CPD and the projects that are implemented within its mandate.

The current CPD, unlike previous CPDs, has focused a lot of attention on the implementation of projects to ensure that UNDP addressed the actual needs of people, other than just focusing on systems strengthening at the national and institutional level. This has meant that the CPD has been people-centered and benefits the poor people of Malawi. The poor are moderately poor (about 26.2Percentage) and ultra-poor (24.5Percentage). The poverty levels are higher in rural areas, where 59.5Percentage of households are poor compared to 17.7Percentage in urban areas (NSO, 2019). The CPD targets these categories by implementing projects at the community level. For example, by enabling all Malawians, including the poor ones, to have a national registration card, the first in Malawi, the CPD has improved poor people's access to social services, such as finance, which has improved the financial inclusion of the population. A midterm evaluation of the IFAD-funded Finance Access for Rural Markets, Smallholders and Enterprise (FARMSE) found that due to the national registration and identification system, the rural poor smallholder farmers could access banking, including loans, banks accounts, and other related services.

This outcome is also critical in gender and poverty in Malawi. In urban and rural areas, poverty is gendered, with women being more affected than men (NSO, 2019). According to NSO, 49.3Percentage of male-headed households are poor compared to 58.3Percentage in female-headed households (NSO, 2019). In addition, and when considered by sex of household head and residence, poverty rates are higher in rural and urban female-headed households; 64.5Percentaget and 29.5Percentage respectively, compared to male-headed households; 57.6Percentage and 16.8Percentage, respectively (NSO, 2019). The CPD recognizes that women in Malawi play an essential role in the country's economic development. Still, they have limited or no control over economic resources such as land, valuable household assets, even when such resources and assets belong to them (NSO, 2019). The lack of control over such economic assets is an essential setback to attaining women's economic independence, compromising gender equality and women’s empowerment. It is a vital factor in making women vulnerable to poverty (Chirwa, Kumwenda, Jumbe, Chilonda, & Minde, 2008). Projects such as the one MICF funded and implemented by Prescane in Chikwawa, have enabled women to make productive use of their land and use the land shares in a private entity, a partnership between a private sector company and local communities. In addition, to economically empowering women through productive land-use systems, the project has enhanced the participation of women in decision making, arising from their involvement in the cooperative and their interaction with senior private sector captains. In the medium to long-term, especially if poverty reduction and wealth remain central to UNDP programming, these approaches contribute to engendered poverty reduction.

**Outcome 3, “Strengthening resilience and shocks to crises”**, is relevant and supports the integration of climate change adaptation into national, subnational and sector development plans, including accelerating adaptation investments based on community priorities, sustainable solutions to natural resources management responsive local institutions. Projects such as the CRIM, MCLIMES, TRANSFROM, NCRP have actively engaged stakeholders to ensure that climate change adaptation and DRR are prioritized in planning, financing, and implementing public programmes. Projects such as MLCIMES have also enabled farmers and fishers to access reliable and timely information to reduce disaster risk, inform livelihood decisions, and guide infrastructure and urban planning.

The outputs and outcomes sought and pursued under the RICE portfolio are relevant. They align or have points of intersection or docking in essential development blueprints that Malawi Government uses to spearhead national socio-economic development and effective democratic governance. In particular, interventions under this portfolio are aligned to one or more of the following framework documents: Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS III), United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);

While the outputs and outcomes of most interventions are focused on addressing specific challenges to improve either the responsiveness or inclusiveness of systems, processes, and institutions and enhancing the quality of citizen engagement or participation, the intervention theory is not always complete for some interventions. The results indicators are not always appropriate or relevant to the desired results. Some interventions are at the conceptual level and are not thought out. For instance, the SHIA, which has focused on developing an information system, is not supported by a compelling narrative that provides a sound rationale for the intervention. The intervention logic is not sufficiently clear or robust. The empirical meaning of ‘SDG hotspot’ is unclear or consistent, and some output level results do not logically flow from the outcomes.

Some interventions, such as the NRIS, have very well thought out theories of change that guide action and have produced widespread catalytic effects for even higher development outcomes envisaged in national development documents.

**UNDP’s delivery methodology:** the evaluators observed that UNDP had deployed different delivery methods for various interventions within the portfolio, varying between direct implementation on one hand and partner implementation on the other hand. While decision factors are project or partner-specific, it was observed that there is an increasing propensity for direct implementation. It was further observed that several partners expressed reservations on UNDP’s direct implementation modality.

**Policy/debate influence**: In the recent past, UNDP’s support has catalyzed and influenced policy practice on several issues within the governance sphere. Debate and influence have been most robust on the following subjects: Electoral reforms; Constituency boundary review and demarcation, and social cohesion, especially on balancing the application of freedom of religion, right to education, and right to a peaceful and safe environment. However, there has been a lost opportunity for influencing development discourse and programming by operationalizing the SDG hotspot concept as implementation commenced before the thought process was completed. Similarly, at the level of ideas, the foresight and anticipatory governance initiative hold the potential to become a fulcrum of popular discourse within a community of practice of governance and development, but the initiative is yet to fly.

# Coherence

According to the OECD DAC criteria, coherence is the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector, or [institution. It](http://institution.it/) defines how different interventions support or undermine the intervention and vice versa and includes internal and external coherence. Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/government and the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/government adheres. External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors’ interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonization, and coordination with others and the extent to which the intervention adds value while avoiding duplication of effort.

For internal coherence, the MTE team analyzed two subsystems to assess the synergies and interlinkages between interventions within each portfolio and across portfolios.

For the Resilience and Sustainable Growth (RSG) portfolio, The MTE team found several areas for potential synergies and interlinkages between projects. For example, private sector programmes such as MICF isare potentially synergistic with the ACRE project on economic empowerment of vulnerable groups and the provision (and need for) energy to drive the rural economy. The team, for example, found a case in Thyolo, where a milk bulking group has problems accessing power from the national grid. Yet, a few kilometers in Mulanje, the ACRE project generates power for rural communities. Yet there is no collaboration between the two projects implemented within the same portfolio. The provision of weather information through improved early warning systems implemented by MCLIMES was critical to all community members participating in CPD projects, including CRIM, Transform, NCRP H, and other resilience-related projects. The DRI4M project collaborates with the Department of Water Resources and Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services on some activities through its link with the GCF-funded M-CLIMES Project to produce USSD messaging for four local councils. The NRIS project created an identification system that allowed other projects to identify and register beneficiaries easily. It also enabled other projects, including those outside UNDP, to track project progress and impact on their beneficiaries by ensuring that the same beneficiary is supported and followed, which is only possible with a national identity card. The MTE also identified many food security and livelihood-related synergies across many projects.

The MTE found that the RICE portfolio is a cohesive and coherent component of UNDP’s Country Program. The unity of purpose, complementarities, and synergies among the projects under the portfolio are clear and self-evident. They are attributed to the ‘Sense-Making ‘process undertaken over two years. Through this process, stakeholders reflected on programming experiences in the governance sphere, extracted insights, drew lessons, and constructed meanings necessary to inform result-based programming[[3]](#footnote-4). However, the sense-making process took too long. The exercise could probably be carried out within a maximum period of three calendars.

Most of the interventions under the RICE portfolio are primarily coherent with solid theories of action/change. The leading ones in this regard are the NRIS, and the MECS followed by interventions under Social Cohesion. However, some interventions come across as not being internally coherent enough as they lack an articulation of theories of change to guide programming and understanding. For instance, the SHIA, the focus on a few selected villages in Nsanje and Phalombe is only remotely connected to developing a data and information system, and the lack of a practical meaning of an SDG hotspot compounds the incoherence. Internal incoherence is a phenomenon most associated with interventions that have not been crystallized into a project document. Such interventions become very elastic as they accommodate new ideas that can cause confusion and create the perception of being less purpose driven.

At the intervention level, another type of incoherence or inconsistency relates to a mix-up of process and result indicators and, in some cases, incongruence between the result and the indicator. For example, the Spotlight Initiative, among other desired outcomes, seeks to ensure that women and girls who experience violence ***use available, accessible, and quality essential services***. For this, results indicators are ‘proportion of women who report experiencing violence’ and ‘proportions of women who report to court/police and have their cases referred’. The indicators are inadequate to fully capture the intervention's results and lead to under-reporting achievements of the program.

In terms of coherence between portfolios, the MTE team noted that almost all RSG projects had governance, transparency, accountability, and capacity-building issues; therefore, they needed to benefit from the expertise of the RICE portfolio. Despite these potential synergies, the MTE noted that the CPD was weak in capturing and monitoring these synergies. The CPD theory of change should have visually illustrated such possible areas of synergy. Still, currently, the UNDP guidelines on developing ToCs, do not provide adequate guidance on the same. As a result, we found that during implementation, coordination, cross-project learning, and lessons learned between projects and portfolios were quite limited. It was reported by implementing partners that the extent to which this is done depends on the Portfolio Leads at UNDP, which should not be the case. As a result, projects focus on reporting on their indicators. This also applied to the portfolio and CPD level, where we did not get evidence of cross-portfolio learning systems. Later on, national CPD learning and dissemination events where UNDP and Government jointly share what they have done and achieved together with other stakeholders, including additional development partners. These issues will now be critical because the Government expects that UNDP takes a leading role in supporting donor coordination, including learning and adaptation.

In terms of external coherence, the MTE found some elements of CPD projects consistent and implemented in collaboration with other development actors’ interventions. For example, CPD RSG projects worked with the now-closed Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Change (BRACC) programme, a £90 million project funded by the Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO, formerly DFID) of the Government of United Kingdom. The ACRE project collaborates well with the Malawi Rural Electrification Project, also implemented by the Ministry of Energy. Many other donors and NGO implemented projects working and collaborating with UNDP-supported projects. The review team also noted that the DIAT has generally done well and focused more on higher-level policy coherence, which is good, but felt that they should do more in facilitating internal coherence, which is possible if their capacity is beefed up.

Similarly, the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit has focused more on project monitoring less on cross-project collaboration, learning, and adapting projects to emerging situations. The leading cause has been the limited staff in the DIAT, M and E function of UNDP, and limited authority provided by the theory of change. The MTE concluded that internal coherence, learning, and coordination between projects and portfolios are weak. At the same time, external coherence is more robust, but there are also significant opportunities for further improvement.

# Effectiveness

The terms of reference for the CPD evaluation defined effectiveness as to how the CP is achieving its intended outcomes and outputs. A review of reports from UNDP showed that the CP “outcomes” such as “outcome 1: Advance poverty reduction in all its forms and dimensions” do not have CP level outcome indicators. Instead, the CPD uses very high-level indicators that are for the CUNCF. This means that CPD can only report on output indicators; hence the following section presents the progress made on achieving outputs for the CPD. CPD outcomes must have indicators that aggregate to CFUNCF outcome indicators at a higher level, or data should be ll collected for the same UNDAF indicators but at the CPD level. Even at the output level, there is no structured system for aggregating outreach indicators for related projects, especially for RSG projects, which implement activities at the district, community, and household levels.

## Approach for performance assessment of indicators

The MTE summarized the program's performance for each indicator as indicated in Table 1 in this section of the report. Performance was assessed by determining how far the current achievements are from the overall CPD end line target. The team summarized the proportion of set targets that have been achieved for each result/output area. This will help UNDP get a quick picture of which result areas need strengthening and which ones are on track to meet the overall program targets. In terms of methods for assessing performance, Laugerud et al (2009) conducted a midterm evaluation of the Norwegian funded project *“Enhancing Food Security and developing Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Project”* in Malawi and used a rating system that was based on UNDP and FAO Annual Performance reporting[[4]](#footnote-5). Under the system, the ratings were:

* Highly satisfactory (HS): Project/project has delivered (or is highly likely to deliver) all of its planned results and has achieved or exceeded *all its major* relevant objectives.
* Satisfactory (S): Project/project has delivered (or is expected to achieve) satisfactory most of its planned results with only a few shortcomings and has achieved *most of its major* relevant objectives.
* Marginally satisfactory (MS): Project/project has achieved (or is expected to achieve) some planned results and has achieved some of its major relevant objectives.
* Marginally unsatisfactory (MU): Project/project has achieved (or is expected to achieve) only few of its planned results and has achieved *only a few of its major* relevant objectives.
* Unsatisfactory (U): Project/project has not yielded and is not expected to yield its planned results and *failed to achieve most of its major* relevant objectives, and thus has significant shortcomings.
* Highly unsatisfactory (HU): Project/project has not yielded (and is not expected to yield) any worthwhile development results and has *failed to achieve any of its major* relevant objectives.

The MTE has adapted the above rating and matched it with the achievements (in percentage) the CPD has made against end-line targets. Indicators that score above 41Percentage of their target were likely to be achieved at the end of the programme as indicated in Table 1 and applied in Table 4:

**Table 2: Performance rating scale**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Level of achievement of indicator targets | Classification of performance | Adapted Laugerud et al, 2009 rating | Code | Recommendations |
| Between 0 and 20Percentage | Completely behind schedule | Highly unsatisfactory (HU) and Unsatisfactory (U) | HU/U | Reduce targets and the number of indicators/activities |
| Between 21Percentage and 40Percentage | Slightly Behind Schedule | Marginally satisfactory (MS): | MS | Reduce targets and the number of indicators/activities |
| Between 41Percentage and 60Percentage | On-Schedule | Satisfactory (S) | S | Speed up implementation to ensure completion on time |
| Between 61Percentage and 80Percentage | Ahead of Schedule | Highly satisfactory (HS): | HS | Implement normally and deepen impact for sustainability |
| Between 81Percentage and 100Percentage | Almost completed/Completed | Highly satisfactory (HS): | HS | Slow down and deepen impact |
| Above 100Percentage | Completed | Highly satisfactory (HS): | HS | Deepen impact and focus on sustainability |

## Outcome 1: Advance poverty reduction in all its forms and dimensions

The main objective of the CPD is to contribute to the reduction of poverty, inequality, and vulnerability to shocks. The CPD planned to achieve this objective by scaling up employment and sustainable livelihood opportunities for vulnerable groups, including women, youth, persons with disabilities and albinism, and communities living in areas prone to flooding, drought, and other shocks.

### Output 1.1: Women and youth in targeted areas have employment opportunities.

The CPD has one indicator on this output. The indicator tracks the number of jobs that are created by MICF. However, the MTE noted that other CPD projects created jobs, including the ACRE project. Still, because of limited coordination within the RSG portfolio, only jobs created by MICF are counted. The MTE also noted that the CPD’s theory of change did not have a graphic or visual “solution tree” which helps the program visualize potential synergies between pathways. These synergies help projects implement a programme to identify areas of coordination. The current CPD theory of change performs this role because of the lack of a clear identification of synergies between pathways.

**Indicator 1.1.1:** Number of new jobs generated by firms participating in the Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund (MICF).

The CPD has implemented a very innovative and effective project, the MICF, and as a result, it has achieved its job creation indicator by recording a performance of 232Percentage. The CP has implemented a private sector development programme through the MICF, which has created more than 1500 jobs, of which women occupy 35Percentage. Apart from creating direct jobs through value addition, the programme has empowered communities by introducing innovations, value addition, and supporting the development of local small and medium enterprises through projects such as the ACRE project and the MICF. Interviews with women who benefitted from the MICF project through employment and access to high-value markets reported that their income has improved through participation in the programme. Hence, their ability to meet day-to-day expenses has also increased, resulting in improved livelihoods. In the long-term, their wellbeing will improve, as indicated in the theory of change.

### Output 1.2: Public and private sector institutions enabled developing and implementing policies and practices that enhance innovation, productivity, and entrepreneurship.

**Indicator 1.2.1:** Number of private sector entrepreneurs enabled to access regional and international markets, including access to affordable capital to de-risk investment and business growth.

There was no target set for this indicator, although Table 4 shows UNDP managed to engage 45 private sector institutions to implement this output. From the MICF alone, the CPD has implemented 59 private-sector innovations between 2014 and 2021. Of the 59 projects, 41Percentage (24) have been implemented under the current CPD between 2019 and 2021. About gender and women empowerment, 58,484 smallholder households have benefitted from new or enhanced income-generating or livelihood improvement opportunities because of MICF projects. Of the beneficiaries, 40Percentage are women. Of the projects supported, 32Percentage of projects are led by female owners or managers, which has contributed to improved participation of women in decision making, a key governance portfolio objective of the CPD.

During the implementation of the CPD, the MICF has invested in the following economic development subsectors: 1) Innovative Finance, 2) Agribusiness, 3) Financial Outreach, 4) Economic Resilience, and 5) Tourism. During the CPD implementation, UNDP secured a funding partnership to implement the MICF from key donors, including the UK Government Foreign, Development and Commonwealth Office (FCDO), KfW, and the Government of Norway. Through the innovations supported, private sector companies can add value from agricultural produce bought through business development arrangements with farmers, implying that farmers are now, through the CPD, able to access high-value markets, which contributes to increased income at the household level. Field visits to MICF supported projects confirmed these findings.

**Indicator 1.2.2:** Number of product certifications granted by an accredited national product certification body

The Malawi Bureaus of Standards (MBS) is the local standards authority in Malawi. It has supported certifications of 748 product certifications against a baseline of 10. Certification enables companies to access regional and international markets and local but high-value markets, such as chains stores. This helps farmers or producers make more profits from their enterprises, which increases disposable income at the household level, leading to improved well-being and resilience against climatic shocks.

### Output 1.3: Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted at the national and subnational levels to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy)

**Indicator 1.3.1:** proportion of households benefiting from clean, affordable, and sustainable energy access.

This output is being achieved through the CPD’s Access to Clean and Renewable Energy (ACRE) Project, aiming to increase access to clean, affordable, reliable, and modern energy by enhancing energy technologies' sustainability, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness. So far, the project supports the development of mini electricity grids to improve access to clean energy in rural areas to catalyze the development of productive energy uses in the targeted regions and electricity for household lighting and cooking. ACRE has already started establishing Productive Energy Use hubs (PEUH) in new mini-grid sites, where agribusiness cooperatives in agro-processing and other off-farm enterprises will also be installed. During the MTE field visit to Mulanje Electricity Generation Agency (MEGA) in Mulanje, it was noted that the PEUHs had already been set. As planned in the ACRE project, these PEUH accommodate enterprises such as vending (electricity, airtime, mobile money), agro-processing, cold storage, entertainment facilities, and warehousing. In turn, these enterprises also contribute to the economic empowerment of households, especially women who are most affected by energy poverty.

**Indicator 1.3.2**: Cumulative installed generation capacity for rural populations through mini-grids

The CPD plans to provide 2000kw of electricity by the end of the ACRE project in 2023. So far, the project has only provided 379kw of electricity, representing 19Percentage of targets, implying that the programme is lagging.

## Outcome 2: Strengthening resilience and shocks to crises

Malawi’s economy is dependent on agriculture and therefore highly dependent on weather, and therefore, the economy is vulnerable to climate change-related shocks. In addition, given Malawi’s high dependence on natural resources, environmental degradation is a chronic problem. For these reasons and others, the CPD also focused on building the resilience of vulnerable groups to shocks by increasing their knowledge and skills to adapt and mitigate the effects of climate change.

### Output 2.1: Scaled-up action, finance and partnerships for climate change adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk management across sectors.

To achieve this output, UNDP is implementing the following projects: 1) Disaster Risk Management (00117790), 2) Climate Resilience Initiative in Malawi (00114165), 3) Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems (00102187), 4) Transform (00126010) and 5) the National Climate Resilience Programme (00116269). There are three indicators as follows:

**Indicator 2.1.1:** Proportion of local governments adopting and implementing climate adaptation, mitigation, and disaster risk reduction (DRR) strategies, including through South-South and trilateral cooperation.

By 2020, the CPD had achieved 119Percentage of its target, reaching out to 25 Councils instead of the planned 21. To achieve this indicator, UNDP works closely with Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAS), including Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, to build capacities of Local Governments to adopt and implement climate adaptation, mitigation, and disaster risk reduction (DRR). Malawi has a single tier of local government comprising four City Councils, 28 District Councils, two Municipal Councils, and one Town Council. Through the CPD, UNDP facilitated the capacity building of 25 LGAs to develop and implement climate resilience activities, including mitigation and DRR activities. For example, through the DRM4R project, UNDP has supported 18 interns who have been placed in nine local governments (Mzuzu and Lilongwe City Councils, Balaka, Mulanje, Mangochi, Chikwawa, Zomba, and Phalombe District Councils in 7 districts district Councils. The interns are actively involved in implementing climate risk and adaptation activities, supported by the project and other partners. The project also supports Mitigation works in the target councils as one of the country's mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in district development planning systems.

In addition, through the National Climate Resilience Programme (NCRP), implemented through the Ministry of Forestry and Natural Resources – Environmental Affairs Department, the CPD has developed the Bua River Ecosystem Restoration and Management plan (BRERMP). This process also included capacity building and training of District Environmental Sub-Committees in six districts of Mchinji, Lilongwe, Kasungu, Ntchisi, Dowa, and Nkhotakota. A total of 103 DESC members were trained in ecosystem-based management approaches. The gained training skills were applied in the participatory baseline analysis that DESC members conducted with national and international consultant assistance. The baseline study has identified hot spots that would be priorities for intervention. If implemented, the BRERMP will protect a catchment of nearly 10,686 km2 (1,063,603 ha), of which approximately 11Percentage are protected areas in the six districts.

Under the Transformational Adaptation to Climate Resilience in Malawi (TRANSFORM PROJECT), the CP has **e**nhanced the adaptive capacity of District Councils, community institutions, and households to respond to shocks and risks by training district staff in ecosystem hotspot identification and gender-sensitive - CoBRA baseline assessments. It has also promoted water catchment management through ecosystem management approaches such as riverbank rehabilitation, natural regeneration, bamboo planting and planting of water retention trees, and supporting the establishment of nature-based enterprises.

**Indicator 2.1.2:** Percentage of public expenditure on climate change adaptation and mitigation

There is no quantitative data to report on this indicator (Table 4). However, qualitatively, it was reported that UNDP, together with its implementing partners, lobbies the government, using evidence generated nationally and internationally, to increase public expenditure on climate change adaptation and mitigation, estimated at 3.5Percentage in 2019.

**Indicator 2.1.3:** Percentage of sectoral plans that mainstream climate risk and adaptation

So far, the CPD has achieved 29Percentage of its targets (Table 4).Through the Disaster Risk Management for Resilience (DRM4R) Project, implemented by the Department of Disaster Management Affairs, the CPD has strengthened the capacity of national and local-level disaster risk and resilience governance, improved delivery of risk reduction and early recovery services in disaster-prone urban and rural areas and improved ability for planning, monitoring, and evaluation of the disaster risk management sector. For example, the programme has supported the Disaster Risk Management sector's planning, monitoring, and evaluation functions by improving sector coordination through sector working groups. It has further supported the implementation of the DRM-related pillar of the National Resilience Strategy, where the CPD has also collaborated with the now-defunct joint UN programme on resilience co-financed by the British Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office (FCDO) through the “Building Resilience and Adapting to Climate Change (BRACC)” initiative, which has now been closed by the British Government.

Similarly, in Kasungu and Mzimba districts, the CRIM project strengthened the capacity of local governance structures in climate change response. It supported the development of District State of Environment Report (DSOERs) and integration of climate change adaptation in sectoral plans and district budgets. In promoting household resilience, the CRIM project supported the establishment of village savings and loans associations (with total savings in the third quarter of over MK47,000,000), training of business groups, and invested in value chains identified by district-based value chain analyses. In integrating forest management and income generation for resilience building, the project identified and supported non-timber forest-based enterprises, such as beekeeping, mushroom production, fish farming, and livestock production.

### Output 2.2: Adaptive capacity of rural households and reduced exposure to climate risks strengthened

This output is contributed to by 1) Disaster Risk Management (00117790), 2) Climate Resilience Initiative in Malawi (00114165), 3) Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems (00102187),

**Indicator 2.2.1**: Percentage of population in targeted areas with access to tailored climate information and early warnings

So far, the CPD has achieved 67Percentage of the target set by the programme, mainly through the Saving Lives and Protecting Agriculture-based Livelihoods in Malawi: Scaling up the Use of Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems (M-Climes). The project has already reached 21 districts, and in these districts, it is expected that 1600000 people will benefit from the Improved Hydromet Network across Malawi. In addition, “at *least 195000 farmers to be reached through a cadre of 16000 lead farmers, who the project has trained* in 14 food-insecure districts” (as declared by the Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committee). So far, the project has installed the first-ever lake weather early warning system targeting four districts of Lake Malawi.

The Lake weather warning system includes installing lake buoys, which automate lake weather multipurpose early warning systems that will eventually protect the lives of 60 000 fishers (30000 directly and 30000 indirectly). Until the UNDP MLCIMES project, the lives of fishers and community members were lost due to unpredictable lake weather, coupled with the lack of an early warning system tailor-made to fishers. In addition, the MCLIMES project will benefit eight flood-prone districts in Malawi, with at least 115 000 community members to benefit from Automated Community Based Early Warning Systems.

The CPD, through the DRM4R project, has supported the construction of evacuation centres in Mangochi, Balaka, Chikwawa, Zomba, Phalombe, and Chikwawa and Phalombe. The evacuation centres will strengthen the capacity for district and local-level disaster risk governance, which is an essential priority of the CPD. Through the same project, the CPD has supported the development of the Disaster Risk Information Management System (DRIMS) system in targeted councils Phalombe, Mangochi, Chikwawa, and Balaka District Councils. The DRMIS has been updated in all four priority districts. District officials have been trained on DRMIS. In some districts like Phalombe and Balaka, Civil Protection Committees at the community level have also been trained DRIMS, which will likely enhance disaster risk reduction in the targeted communities.

From the review of documents and consultation with various stakeholders, the MTE found that the CPD has three categories of direct beneficiaries. These include 1) institutions, which are MDAs and CSO institutions at national, district, and community level; 2) individuals within the institutions supported (who may also be indirect beneficiaries) and the community members, who include vulnerable women, men, boys, and girls. The MTE did not find aggregated indicators that report on the numbers reached for the three categories across all projects and suggest that these should be added so that the UNDP reach can quickly and be presented in a given period.

## Outcome 3: By 2023, rights holders in Malawi access more accountable and effective institutions at the central and decentralized levels that use quality disaggregated data, offer integrated service delivery and promote civic engagement, respect for human rights and rule of law

### Output 3.1: Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (MoJCA), Malawi Human Rights Commission (MHRC), Police Services, Prison Services, Judiciary, Legal Aid Services and Paralegal Advisory Service Institute (PASI) are enabled to implement and monitor policies, laws and strategies for equitable access to justice.

**Indicator 3.1.1:** Number of detainee releases by paralegal officers at police, court, prisons and juvenile centres.

Under the CPD, the Access to Justice Project implemented by the PASI is responsible for direct contributions to results measured by the indicator. From a baseline value of 73,389 releases in 2017, the CPD target is 81,789 by 2023. The program is a star performer at mid-term as it has facilitated more than the entire program target of releases at 164,312 detainees[[5]](#footnote-6). This represents an increase of 224 Percentage of the five-year target of 81,789. The release of detainees means that they can now enjoy their freedom and reunite with their families, participate in economic activities, and contribute to the country's economic and social development, unlike when they are under detention. This stellar performance enabled stakeholders' collaboration and commitment, especially magistrates and duty bearers at police formations, prisons, and juvenile centres. It was also due to the advantages of experience and expertise that implementing partners accumulated over the years of their engagement. This performance suggests that targets are set too low as the five-year target is beaten in half the time by a significant margin. UNDP and PASI must review the parameters and assumptions under which targets are set and revise the targets accordingly to reflect realities.

**Indicator 3.1.2.** Percentage of human rights cases/complaints investigated and resolved within 12 months of submission

From a baseline of 59 Percentage in 2016, the CPD target is to reach 60 Percentage by 2023. The evaluation observed that the 1Percentage increment on the baseline for five years appears relatively too low. UNDP and MHRC should review the assumptions and parameters considered in settingatarget.

In terms of actual performance, data collection for the available evaluation data was for 2019 and 2020. For 2019, the commission received 798 cases and carried over 699 cases from previous years. Thus, the Commission had a total of 1,497 cases to process. Out of this total number, the Commission processed 709 cases, of which 529 were concluded, representing 74.6 percent of those processed cases and 37 percent of the total number of cases in 2019. The commission resolves cases through investigations that provide recommendations to respondents; providing legal advice; providing human rights advice; Alternative Dispute Resolution, Litigation, and referral of cases to appropriate authorities such as Ombudsman. Table 3 provides a breakdown of how the cases were handled:

**Table 3: MHRC case handling ,2019**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Means of Handling | No. of Cases | Percentage (Percentage) |
| Investigated | 175 | 12.0 |
| Legal Advice | 258 | 17.2 |
| Referral | 126 | 8.4 |
| ADR | 14 | 0.1 |
| Litigation | 27 | 1.8 |
| Pending investigation | 897 | 59.9 |
| Totals | **1497** | **100.00** |

For 2020, the Commission registered 520 cases and brought forward 493 cases from 2019. Thus, the total number of cases to be addressed was 1013. These were handled as follows:

**Table 4 : MHRC case handling 2020**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Means of Handling | **No. of Cases** | **Percentage (Percentage)** |
| Investigated | 202 | 20.0 |
| Legal Advice | 143 | 14.1 |
| Referral | 17 | 2.0 |
| ADR | 32 | 3.2 |
| Litigation | 26 | 2.6 |
| Pending / under investigation | 593 | 58.5 |
| Totals | **1013** | **100.00** |

In both years, the Commission dealt with less than half of the cases, and the proportions of cases investigated were 12 Percentage and 20 Percentage, respectively. At the time of data collection, disaggregated data on dates of registering the complaints and dates of their resolution were not readily available as the complaints handling system is manual. Consequently, it was impossible to determine the indicator's last element, i.e. cases resolved within 12 months of submission.

However, given that the baseline value of the indicator is given as 59 Percentage in 2016, then the performance on investigations in 2019 and 2020 under the CPD declined sharply.It is observed that ‘percentage of complaints investigated’ under-reports the number of resolved cases as investigation, in the scheme of the MHRC, is only one way of resolving the cases.

In the absence of guiding notes on how to work out the indicator, it is probable that the indicator intended to focus on the percentage of cases processed rather than the percentage of cases investigated and resolved. If this is the correct indicator, 2019 and 2020 would be 40.1 Percentage and 41.5 Percentage, respectively. Overall, there is a need to review the indicator's accuracy and sufficiently align it to how the MHRC presents its data on complaints handling.

The somewhat suboptimal performance on complaints handling is attributed to many factors, including inadequate funding and other resources for investigations, staff turnover, shortage of legal practitioners to screen cases, provide legal advice, and litigate cases. For all this, the MHRC had only one legal practioner[[6]](#footnote-7).

**Indicator 3.1.3.** Mechanism for promoting and protecting the rights of marginalized women, children, people with disabilities, people with albinism, and LGBTI person in place.

It is a core mandate of the MHRC under section 13 of their Act to promote the human rights of vulnerable groups such as children, illiterate persons, persons with disabilities, and the elderly. To ensure that the vulnerable groups are not glossed over, the MHRC has established directorates that specialize in the issues of the various groups. These directorates are Child rights, Disability and elderly, Civil and political rights (which deals with LGBTI issues), Economic, social, and cultural rights, and Gender and Women’s rights. To promote the human rights of the various groups, the Commission provides human rights education, information, and training to the various groups and many other intermediary human rights organizations that work on and with the vulnerable groups identified. For the protection of rights, the Commission has an effective complaint handling system that spells out how complaints of violations of rights falling in the different thematic areas or directorates should be processed and addressed.

For many years, the MHRC has had the human rights education and information mechanisms and complaints handling system (human rights protection mechanism). Therefore, the indicator was not very accurate. It suggests that there was no mechanism for promoting and protecting the rights of the various vulnerable groups identified in the output statement. The indicator is not aware of what obtains empirically. This raises questions about how the indicator was chosen and whether the MHRC was involved. In conversations with Directors of the various directorates, it became clear that the CPD may have referred to improvements to the current mechanism. Still, it is impossible to figure out what mechanisms were envisaged without a project document.

The only vulnerable group that falls outside the regular promoting and protecting their rights is LGBTI. MHRC, with UNDP support wanted to establish a mechanism for promotion and protection of their rights. Their case is unique because LGBTI practices are criminalized under the Penal code. At the request of the Ministry of Justice, the MHRC designed a public Inquiry on LGBTI rights to identify ways of promoting and protecting them. Faith-Based Organisations opposed the activity. Other CSOs challenged the activity because a public inquiry was the least suitable way of deciding on issues of minority rights in a context where the majority was against them[[7]](#footnote-8). With the support of UNDP, the activity was redesigned into a national study. However, it did not take off as UNDP did not have the money to finance the study. Progress stalled.

Nonetheless, through CEDEP, a National Reference Group (NRG) on LGBTI was created. It comprises CSOs, and the MHRC participates as Vice-Chair. The NRG receives complaints from the LGBTI community and advises on remedial actions to protect LGBTI persons. Public promotion of LGBTI rights is problematic because of the criminalizing law, but protection activities are carried out. Thus, UNDP may wish to consider renewing its support on mechanisms for promotion and protection of human rights of the various groups by supporting reviews of the existing systems and supporting work leading to an establishment of a more permanent or standardized method for the protection of LGBTI rights.

### Output 3.2: Selected governance institutions are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency and accountability

UNDP matrix of outputs and indicators made available to the MTE team indicated that under this output (3.2), UNDP had not yet supported any project directly leading to the achievement of this output[[8]](#footnote-9) Nonetheless, the MTE observed that several interventions had been implemented and had yielded the desired results encapsulated in this output. In particular, the following were noted:

The Electronic Health Information Network (eHIN) project implemented on a pilot basis by the Ministry of Health in Blantyre, Rumphi, and Ntchisi districts is promoting transparency and accountability in the health sector, focusing on the supply chain management of health commodities and improving transparency and enabling accountability for product inventory, distribution, and utilization. It has demonstrated substantial latent potential for curbing the pilferage of drugs and other medical supplies and monitoring and reporting on the performance of medical equipment.

The Spotlight Initiative has revamped gender technical working groups (GTWGs) at a national level and in 6 districts where the program is implemented to improve transparency and accountability in police, courts, education, and hospitals on service delivery for the marginalized survivors of GBV. The GTWGs and Chiefs forums act as oversight institutions on implementation targets under SDG5.

At the peak of the Covid 19 pandemic in Malawi, Parliament could not meet and transact its core democratic functions. UNDP provided ICT support (equipment, software, and subscriptions to online meeting platforms) to Parliament to enable parliamentarians to hold plenary meetings to transact pertinent national business[[9]](#footnote-10).

In addition to the interventions highlighted, UNDP could consider interventions in key governance institutions based on robust problem analysis of the performance of the identified governance institutions, which could include the Anti-Corruption Bureau, the Auditor-General, the Fair Trade and Competition Commission, the Public Procurement and Disposal Authority (PPDA)in addition to the NRIS work and those identified in the CPD under this output.

### Output 3.3: Central and Local government institutions are enabled to develop and manage evidence- based policy planning, monitoring and evaluation systems for inclusive and effective delivery of services and achievement of results.

**Indicator 3.3.1:** Sustainable financing mechanism for SDG achievement at national and subnational levels in place

In 6 districts, the Spotlight Initiative *on EVAGW* facilitated the identification of SDGs targets that should be incorporated into the minimum data requirements for local government plans. However, it is unclear whether the financing is guaranteed and sustainable despite a need for SDG inclusion in the plans. Nevertheless, the capacity building on gender-responsive budgeting for the different government sectors under the Spotlight Initiative Programme was a positive step towards ensuring financing of the SDG targets. The SHAI project also propagates a coordinated, targeted SDG Hotspot service response based on the assumption that sufficient funding supports integrated service response. In this way, the project has since seen the UNDP commit funds for service response and take the lead in implementation in the districts, demonstrating the current lack of a locally entrenched system for financing the service response. The project also notes one of its challenges is the lack of coordination amongst development partners and other actors at local and central levels and weak leadership from the district councils; this disconnect could lead to challenges in establishing entrenched financing mechanisms.

The indicator on sustainable financing mechanisms can also be said to be broad. The parameters on sustainability need to be further defined so that it is easier to identify and take measurements in the relevant areas and design interventions that best address them. The scope is also unclear, as projects set to address the indicator are only active in a few districts and villages. In terms of progress, data from UNDP shows that the indicator has not been achieved, and performance is at 0 Percentage of target.

**Indicator 3.3.2:** Number of local councils with planning, monitoring, and evaluation systems that incorporate development targets for marginalized groups, including women, youth, children, persons with albinism, and disability.

SHAI project intends to institute SDG Hotspot monitoring dashboards that collate multi-sectoral data in 5 districts. So far, these have been created in 2 districts, but at the time of data collection for the evaluation, they were not yet online, such that data from them had not yet been used in designing programmatic interventions[[10]](#footnote-11).Therefore, DEC members have not been trained to use the system in planning and monitoring services. However, it is worth noting that the information from the data collection used in the dashboards *was* used to inform the village and district action plans in the target areas in Q1 and Q2 2021. Also, evidence-based action plans have been developed in two districts using hotspot assessment; a socio-economic survey tool with gender markers for tracking and monitoring development performance has also been developed

## Outcome 4: By 2023, Malawi has strengthened institutions for sustaining peace, inclusive societies, and participatory democracy.

### Output 4.1: Parliament, Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC), Centre for Multiparty Democracy and non-state actors are enabled to perform core functions for inclusive participation and representation

**Indicator 4.1.1.** Proportion of political parties represented in Parliament with effective gender equality policies. Baseline: 0 (2017); target 75 Percentage.

UNDP has not yet supported any project leading to the achievement of this output[[11]](#footnote-12) during the period that MTE focused on. The two partners working with political parties and gender equality, respectively, CMD and UN Women, confirmed this. So far, 80 Percentage of the target has been met (Table 4). However, the indicator is inadequate to demonstrate the overall output as it narrowly focuses on political parties. While this can tangentially determine whether CMD could perform its core functions, the indicator excludes Parliament, MEC, and other non-state actors. Indicator formulation needs to be improved.

### Output 4.2: Gender-sensitive National Peace Architecture structures with real-time conflict early warning monitoring systems at national and district level are adopted.

**Indicator 4.2.1.** National and subnational coordination and monitoring mechanisms for conflict prevention and sustaining peace in place

There is no specific project under the CPD that implemented activities under this indicator. However, reports from the Office of the President and Cabinet show that 100 Percentage of the target has been achieved (Table 4). Through a component of the Social Cohesion project led by the Office of the President and Cabinet the National Peace Architecture at the national level was set up earlier and enhanced under the current country program. At the sub-national level, District Peace Committees (DPC), as field structures of the Malawi Peace and Unity Commission (MPUC)), have gained traction as coordinating and monitoring mechanisms for conflict prevention, management, and resolution. The DPCs were created based on the National Peace Policy (NPP) of 2017 and are functional in six districts. The NPP provides guidelines for DPCs, obligations, and membership.

Through a component of the social cohesion project implemented by the Public Affairs Committee (PAC) that), a phone application was developed to capture data for early warnings on electoral violence for the 2019 and 2020 elections[[12]](#footnote-13). Furthermore, a collaborative mechanism started through interface meetings between DPCs and Village Mediators. Four of the existing six DPCs were involved in 2019[[13]](#footnote-14). This synergistic approach between Access to Justice and Social Cohesion is commendable. The MTE observed remarkable progress towards enacting the Malawi Peace and Unity Commission Bill, which is expected to be introduced in Parliament in February 2022. This will institutionalize the National Peace Architecture and conflict tracking systems.

**Indicator 4.2.2.** Proportion of the district peace committees with 40:60 female to male ratio. Baseline 3; target 28

Like indicator 4.2.1, there is no specific project under the CPD that implemented activities under this indicator. However, reports from the Office of the President and Cabinet show that 89 Percentage of the target has been achieved. The gender dimension of the DPCs has not been reported in the quarterly and annual reports of both the PAC and OPC as implementers of the Social Cohesion Project. Interviews with representatives of the implementing partners only confirmed awareness of the need for gender-balanced DPCs. Still, they could not establish how many of the six DPCs fit the description of the indicator. There is a need to get project implementers to capture and report all data relevant to the indicators for reporting progress on the implementation of the CPD.

**Table 5 : CPD Output indicator performance assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NATIONAL PRIORITY/ GOAL:** Transition of Malawi to a productive, competitive and resilient nation. | | | | | | | | | |
| **UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #1:** By 2023, Malawi has strengthened economic diversification, inclusive business, entrepreneurship, and access to clean energy | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELATED STRATEGIC PLAN OUTCOME 1:** Advance poverty reduction in all its forms and dimensions | | | | | | | | | |
| **CPD OUTPUT, INDICATORS AND CONTRIBUTING PROJECT (Italised bold)** | **BASELINE** | **TARGET** | **ACTUAL RESULTS, 2020** | | | **PERFORMANCE** | **PERFORMANCE RATING** | **DATA SOURCE** | **INDICATOR INCLUDED IN PRODOC/AWP** |
| Output 1.1: Women and youth in targeted areas have access to employment opportunities. ***(00125267 Private Sector Development Programme)*** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | **Male** | **Female** | **National Aggregate** |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 1.1.1:** Number of new jobs generated by firms participating in the Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund (MICF)**.** | 0 | 650(30Percentage females) | 978 | 527 | 1505 | 232Percentage | Completed | MICF Reports | YES |
| Output 1.2: Public and private sector institutions enabled to develop and implement policies and practices that enhance innovation, productivity and entrepreneurship. ***(00125267 Private Sector Development Programme)*** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 1.2.1**: Number of private sector entrepreneurs enabled to access regional and international markets, including access to affordable capital to de-risk investment and business growth. | 0 | Target not set yet | na | na | 45 | target not set | Target not set | Ministry of Industry, Trade and Tourism | yes |
| **Indicator 1.2.2:** Number of product certifications granted by an accredited national product certification body. | 0 | 10 | na | na | 748 | 7480Percentage | Completed and targets surpassed | Bureau of Standards annual Report | yes |
| 1.3: Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted at the national and subnational levels to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy) ***(00126170 Access to clean and Renewable Energy (ACRE)*** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 1.3.1:** proportion of households benefiting from clean, affordable  and sustainable energy access. | 7Percentage | 15Percentage (30Percentage female headed, 40Percentage of households with disabilities) | 13 | 5.6 | 18.6 | 124Percentage | Completed and targets surpassed | Department of Energy Services | yes |
| **Indicator 1.3.2:** Cumulative installed generation capacity for rural populations through mini-grids | 56Kw | 2000Kw | na | na | 385 | 19Percentage | Completely behind schedule | Department of Energy Services | Yes |
| **NATIONAL PRIORITY/ GOAL:** Actively respond to climate change, prevent disasters, strengthen sustainable natural resource management and environmental  protection | | | | | | | | | |
| **UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #2**: By 2023, households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to healthy ecosystems and resilient livelihoods. | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELATED STRATEGIC PLAN OUTCOMES:** **Outcome 3**: Strengthening resilience and shocks to crises | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1: Scaled-up action, finance and partnerships for climate change adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk management across sectors. ***(00117790 Disaster Risk Management, 00114165 Climate Resilience Initiative in Malawi, 00102187 Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems. 00126010 Transform, 00116269 National Climate Resilience Programme)*** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 2.1.1**: Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement climate adaptation, mitigation and disaster risk reduction (DRR) strategies, including through South-South and trilateral cooperation. | 5 | 21 |  |  | 25[[14]](#footnote-15) | 119Percentage | Completed and targets surpassed | Department of Disaster Management Affairs | No Project |
| **2.1.2:** Percentage of public expenditure on climate change adaptation and mitigation. | 3.50Percentage | 7Percentage |  |  | No data | No data | na | Department of Climate and DRR, Public expenditure review reports 2014, 2018, 2021 | Yes (NCRP) |
| **2.1.3:** Percentage of sectoral plans that mainstream climate risk and adaptation | 20Percentage | 70Percentage |  |  | 20Percentage | 29Percentage | Slightly behind schedule | Department of Climate and DRR, Public expenditure review reports 2014, 2018, 2021 | Yes (DRR, NCRP) |
| **2.2:** Adaptive capacity of rural households and reduced exposure to climate risks strengthened ***(00117790 Disaster Risk Management, 00114165 Climate Resilience Initiative in Malawi, 00102187 Modernized Climate Information and Early Warning Systems. 00126010 Transform***) | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 2.2.1** Percentage of population in targeted areas with access to tailored climate information and early warnings | 10Percentage of population in target areas (Male: 628,620; Female: 663,136; 60Percentage of persons with disabilities) | 17Percentage population in target areas (Male: 1,093,242; Female: 1,154,912). |  |  | 6.70Percentage | 67.00Percentage | Ahead of schedule | Independent Reviews | Yes (M-CLIMES) |
| **NATIONAL PRIORITY/GOAL** : GOOD GOVERNANCE | | | | | | | | | |
| **UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #3**: By 2023, rights holders in Malawi access more accountable and effective institutions at the central and decentralized levels that  use quality disaggregated data, offer integrated service delivery and promote civic engagement, respect for human rights and rule of law | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELATED STRATEGIC PLAN OUTCOME: Outcome 2**: Accelerate structural transformation for sustainable development | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1: Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (MoJCA), Malawi Human Rights Commission (MHRC), Police Services, Prison Services, Judiciary, Legal Aid Services and Paralegal Advisory Service Institute (PASI) are enabled to implement and monitor policies, laws and strategies for equitable access to justice ***(00108391 Access to justice through Village Mediation and Paralegal Services, 00067141 Malawi Human Rights Support )*** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 3.1.1**: Number of detainee releases facilitated by paralegal officers at police, court, prisons and juvenile centres. | 73, 389 (2017) ) | 81,789 (2023) | na | na | 164,312 | 201Percentage | Completed and targets surpassed | Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs | Yes(Acces to Justice) |
| **Indicator 3.1.2**: Percentage of human rights cases/complaints investigated and resolved by MHRC within 12 months of submission | 59Percentage | 60Percentage | na | na | 68Percentage | 113Percentage | Completed and targets surpassed | MHRC Reports | Yes (MHRS) |
| **Indicator 3.1.3:** Mechanism for promoting and protecting the rights of marginalized women, children, people with disabilities, people with albinism and LGBTI persons in place | 0(2017) | 25(2023) | na | na | 1 | 4Percentage | Completely behind schedule | Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development | Yes (MHRS) |
| 3.2: Selected governance institutions are enabled to perform core functions for improved transparency and accountability ***(00108391 Access to justice through Village Mediation and Paralegal Services, 00067141 Malawi Human Rights Support )*** | | | | | | | | | |
| There is no **3.2.1** in the CPD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Indicator 3.2.2:** Number of reforms enforcing transparency and accountability in public institutions | TBD | TBD | no data | no data | No data | No data | Not assessed | Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development | No Project |
| **3.3**: Central and local government institutions are enabled to develop and manage evidence-based policy planning, monitoring and evaluation systems for inclusive and effective delivery of services and achievement of development results | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 3.3.1:** Sustainable financing mechanism for Sustainable Development Goal achievement at national and subnational levels in place. | 0 | 1(2023) |  |  | 0 | 0Percentage | Completely behind schedule | Ministry of Economic Planning and Economic Development | No Project |
| **Indicator 3.3.2**: Number of local councils with planning, monitoring and evaluation systems that incorporate development targets for marginalized groups including women, youth, children, persons with albinism and persons with disabilities. | 0 | 25 | na | na | 1 | 4Percentage | Completely behind schedule | Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development | No Project |
| **3.4** Use of digital technologies and quality disaggregated data enabled for improved public services and other government functions | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 3.4.1:** Number of public institutions that leverage National ID services for Delivery and Monitoring services | 1 (2018) | 12 (2023) | na | na | 12 | 100Percentage | Target achieved | National Registration Bureau | Yes (NRIS) |
| **Indicator 3.4.2:** Number of sectors with data collection/analysis mechanisms  providing disaggregated data to monitor progress towards the Sustainable  Development Goals: (a) conventional data collection methods (e.g., surveys); b) administrative reporting systems; and (c) new data sources (e.g., big data) | 0 | 16 | na | na | 4 | 25Percentage | Slightly behind schedule | Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development | No Project |
| **NATIONAL PRIORITY/GOAL:** GOOD GOVERNANCE | | | | | | | | | |
| **UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #4:** By 2023, Malawi has strengthened institutions for sustaining peace, inclusive societies and participatory democracy. | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELATED STRATEGIC PLAN OUTCOME: Outcome 2:** Accelerate structural transformation for sustainable development | | | | | | | | | |
| **4.1:** Parliament, Malawi Electoral Commission, Centre for Multi-Party Democracy (CMD) and selected non-State actors are enabled to perform core functions for inclusive participation and representation ***(00103966 Malawi Electroral Cycle Support)*** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 4.1.1:** Proportion of political parties represented in Parliament with effective gender equality policies. | 0 (2017) | 75Percentage |  |  | 60Percentage | 80Percentage | Ahead of schedule | CMD | No Project |
| 4.2: Gender-sensitive National Peace Architecture structures with realtime conflict early warning monitoring systems at national and district level are adopted.***(00073899 Social Cohesion)*** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Indicator 4.2.1**: National and subnational coordination and monitoring mechanisms for conflict prevention and sustaining peace in place. | No (2017) | Yes (2023) |  |  | 1 | 100Percentage | Completed | OPC Report | No Project |
| **Indicator 4.2.2:** Proportion of district peace committees with 40:60 female to male quota | 3 | 28 |  | 25 | 25 | 89Percentage | Ahead of schedule | OPC Report | No Project |

Source: Adapted from UNDP, 2021

## Factors affecting effectiveness

The MTE found two groups of factors that affected the progress and quality of CPD implementation, which, if not adequately addressed, will also affect programme impact and sustainability. The first group was internal factors, which UNDP has control over and can adaptatively manage, while the second are external factors, which UNDP does not have control over. Under internal factors, **the first issue was that during the design of projects or the preparation of project documents, stakeholders, especially at the district level, and in some key MDAs reported that they were not adequately consulted** to ensure that projects to be designed address felt needs and priorities and do not duplicate existing efforts. For example, the Ministry of Local Government reported that they were not satisfied with the SDGs Tracking Project implemented in Phalombe and Nsanje Districts and felt resources could have been used to support upgrading the existing Local Assembly Management Information System (LAMIS).

**The second issue is that projects are not responsive or flexible to emerging needs and priorities of implementing partners during implementation**. It was reported that projects tend to be implemented to the letter without adapting to address emerging challenges and opportunities. It was reported that participatory and regular project reviews seem not to be a feature of CPD projects.

**A third issue was the direct implementation method (DIM)** which UNDP uses to implement its projects, which uses activity-based funding models where UNDP pays service providers directly. This model draws a joint and costed work plan covering a specific period between UNDP and the IP. The IP prepares an activity proposal and budget during implementation and submits it to UNDP, paying for the required services. All implementing partners reported strong reservations against this method, indicating that it causes severe delays, procurement inefficiencies, and demotivates IPs, affecting project ownership. Critical and central level partners like the National Planning Commission suggested a selective approach to using the DIM, based on proper and independent fiduciary risk assessment, other than applying it universally to all MDAs.

**The fourth issue**, which is also aligned to how UNDP uses the CPD theory of change, **is the coordination between and within portfolios**. The MTE noted that while there is progress in terms of coordination within the governance portfolio, through the sense-making process, it was not observed in the RSG portfolio, which did not adopt the sense-making ideology/process when it was introduced. As a result, the RSG projects are not appropriately linked and coordinated; hence, they are individually aligned to the CPD, without a converging framework. As a result, synergies are not being adequately identified and utilized.

Finally, and related to **limited UNDP monitoring capacity** (few people in the M and E team). The MTE noted that UNDP limitedly monitors projects implemented at the subnational and community level. As a result, there are many operational issues that the MTE team identified at the implementation level that is not being addressed and many opportunities that are not being taken advantage of. The MTE observed these challenges during site visits for the MCLIMES, ACRE, and Resilient Houses in Chikwawa. Box 1 provides evidence of some of the operational issues that could have been resolved timely if supportive monitoring visits were regular or if actions were taken to address them promptly.

|  |
| --- |
| * A research boat, bought through MCLIMES, was delivered in March/April in 2021 but has been idle the whole period (about nine months), including during the MTE, simply because it has not been launched and officially handed over to the Department of Fisheries * Through its training college, the same Department received goods procured by MCLIMES, but most of the supplies had incomplete components. When reported, replacements have taken months and had not yet been delivered at the time of MTE, which has affected outreach activities with fishers. * MEGA had financial (remuneration-related) management issues that made UNDP pull out funding and support to the organization instead of working with it to address the problem and move forward. |

**External factors included the COVID19 pandemic**, which forced the government to introduce prevention measures that prevented public officers and other stakeholders from large gatherings like meetings and restricted travel and imposed requirements for people to work from home. **The other external factor was the political volatility** after the 2019 tripartite elections and the Presidential Election in 2020. During this period, street demonstrations were held quite regularly, demanding the resignation of the then Chairperson of the Malawi Electoral Commission. UNDP had supported the 2019 Elections under the MECS project by investing in the Results Management and Transmission system. During the 2020 Fresh Presidential election, UNDP focused on logistics of electoral materials, civic and voter education, and COVID 19 prevention, including supplying personal protective equipment (PPE) for polling staff and voters at polling centres.

**The MTE found many strategic and adaptive management opportunities to address the internal and external factors that have affected the implementation and quality of delivery of the CPD**. Firstly, UNDP enjoys a popular mandate and reputation amongst donors, UN agencies, MDAs, and civil society organizations, which should be utilized. Most donors we talked to are supportive of UNDP work and ready to support projects implemented by the UNDP. Secondly, UNDP has access to an international network of human and financial resources, which should be harnessed in any situation to add value to the programming and implementation of the CPD. Thirdly, the UN has incorporated the UN Resident Coordinator office in its reforms. The incumbent sits in the UNDP office complex, which provides an opportunity for more vital coordination and engagement with other UN agencies. Fourthly, UNDP has a long history of working with government officials. This should place UNDP in a vintage position to understand and leverage the dynamics of the public sector to maximize sustainability and ownership of the programme. Another significant opportunity is that UNDP has a high quality of management and programme staff who can articulate development complexities outlined in the CPD and guide stakeholders appropriately.

# Efficiency

This criterion relates programme outputs to inputs. The critical issues under this criterion are whether the project was cost-efficient, whether outputs and outcomes were achieved on time based on project logframes; and identifying what could have been done differently to maximize the available resources. To what extent has UNDP applied portfolio management, taking advantage of opportunities?

The CPD has been implemented through two implementation methods. The direct implementation method (DIM) and the national implementation modality (NIM). The DIM is the modality whereby UNDP takes on the role of Implementing Partner. UNDP has the technical and administrative capacity to effectively mobilize and apply the required inputs to reach the expected outputs in DIM modality. UNDP assumes overall management responsibility and accountability for project implementation[[15]](#footnote-16). In this case, Implementing Partners are central-level MDAs, which represent the Malawi Government.

Under the DIM, the funds are managed by UNDP, and implementing partners request funds, and UNDP approves and funds as per each activity agreed in the annual work plan for a particular project. Under this model, UNDP pays suppliers directly, as it assumes the role of an implementing partner and because the de jure IP does not have a bank account. In some cases, the implementing partners act as a funding channel, with the budget going directly to District Councils. Under the NIM, the Implementing Partner now assumes the responsibility for the related output (or outputs) and carries out all activities towards achieving these outputs. When the capacities of the government Implementing Partner are proven and tested, as validated by the capacity assessment, the government regulations, rules and procedures shall apply to project implementation to the extent that they do not contradict the Financial Regulations and Rules principles of UNDP1.

Most RSG portfolio projects (such as ACRE, DRM4R, NCRP, most project documents indicate the implementation modality as being “Support to National Implementation (NIM) and Direct Implementation (DIM)’, implying that both modalities are being used. Under the NIM, a government MDA is the Implementing Partner and has a bank account where UNDP funds are deposited according to the agreed work plan. In terms of efficiency, the programme has mainly been implemented through DIM, which according to UNDP officials, ensures efficient implementation of interventions and minimizes leakages of resources. However, all implementing partners interviewed had strong reservations about this method because it causes long delays in implementing activities. The DIM is an activity-based funding system given the high number of projects under the CPD. It has been difficult for UNDP to process activities from many projects, using the same administrative and financial management capacity at the country office. As a result, it was reported that procurement, processing of payments, clearing of reports takes quite a long.

The MTE noted that the most significant internal setback on efficiency is that the annual Implementation cycle is cut by up to a quarter for most interventions. This is because the preparation of Annual Work Plans (AWP) and corresponding budgets start late. Instead of having them completed by December of the preceding year, the preparatory work is done during the first quarter of the implementation year. By the time the necessary approvals are obtained, up to 25Percentage of implementation time is lost. The delay in implementing partners with personal payments in the budgets causes downstream problems. In situations where UNDP has fiduciary responsibilities and is directly managing resources for project implementation, inefficiency in terms of delays or time lags in disbursing resources for activities was cited by several partners. For instance, the Access to Justice project's poor performance on attaining targets in the first two quarters of 2021 was attributed to delayed and inadequate funding[[16]](#footnote-17).

Among the external factors affecting efficiency is the political environment's uncertainty and unpredictability, which affect implementation. For example, for the MECS, some targets were achieved on time while others were achieved late. Many activities in the third quarter of the first year were not implemented because of various political developments[[17]](#footnote-18). Similarly, under the social cohesion, shuttle diplomacy as PAC’s preferred way of mediating and resolving political disputes was affected as disputants dug in to protect narrow interests. The experiences suggest that achieving efficiency in executing interventions that are political and controversial require that implementing partners become better at working politically[[18]](#footnote-19)

Wherever possible, implementation modality shows a series of attempts to maximize and leverage resources, thereby reaping efficiency gains from a resource use point of view. For instance, the Spotlight Initiative has reasonably demonstrated the economic use of human and financial resources.

* 4 UN agencies implement the individual SI outcomes according to their areas of specialization[[19]](#footnote-20). Following this, SI includes an Innovative accountability framework that allowed for the harmonization of Fuel S.O.Ps across implementing organizations and qualified for the collective use of one vehicle to achieve results across all pillars[[20]](#footnote-21). Furthermore, the SI also worked together with DFID funded Project Tithetse Nkhanza and leveraged each other’s resources to develop a handbook for training judicial officers in the frontline to assist GBV survivors[[21]](#footnote-22), which contributed to one of the outputs strengthening institutional capacity.
* Similarly, under the MECS, particularly in supporting efforts at electoral reforms, UNDP collaborated with the National Democratic Institute (NDI) to support the work of the task force on electoral reforms;

Some inefficiencies manifest because of inadequate design and envisioning of an entire intervention. A telling example in the RICE portfolio is the SHIA. Most of the activities were delayed[[22]](#footnote-23) , and initial approaches to surveys were ill-conceptualized and caused inefficiencies. Although progress reports lacked expenditure details, the expenditure pattern appears irregular and inefficient, with 100Percentage of the 2020 budget spent but 7Percentage in the first quarter and 23Percentage in the second quarter, suggesting a shallow absorption rate. A closer reading of the progress reports shows that similar achievements were reported with only slight changes from one quarter to another.

For most interventions, procurement is centralized in UNDP where the staff compliment is relatively too thin for the task. While procurement using the UNDP framework achieves cost efficiency and avoids procurement malfeasances prevalent in the MDAs, the process is perceived to cause operational inefficiencies for implementing partners who wait for more extended periods before supplies are delivered, thereby delaying implementation. Furthermore, some deliveries do not correspond well with the specifications for the procurement - a mismatch between requirements and what gets offered.

The sense-making process helped interventions under the RICE portfolio adopt politically sensitive approaches, especially under the Social Cohesion and MECS components, which may continue to deal with politically explosive and divisive issues. While this is commendable, political sensitivity should not mean a scale down or complete halting of essential work supporting the sustenance of democracy. Stakeholders observed that after the nullification of the 2019 presidential election, UNDP suspended or scaled-down its support to the electoral process and the civic space. In the words of one respondent:

“this was very unfortunate…among the UN agencies, it is only UNDP that has a broad mandate that fits the politics and governance spheres….all the others have particular mandates …population, children, food and so on…in fact, UNDP can be refocused as the United Nations Governance Program…they should never step away when they are needed most in the fragile political environment”[[23]](#footnote-24).

This suggests that achieving efficiency in being politically sensitive in approach could mean that UNDP should avoid direct implementation in areas that have a potential of divisive politics and should instead seek to support competent local partners. The following quotations from respondents suggest that there is a common perception of UNDP not being sufficiently politically sensitive in approach:

* UNDP must know and observe the limits of their advisory role and must slow down the inclination to take over decision making in the processes that they support[[24]](#footnote-25);
* UN system is replacing the public sector. They are competing with Government through grassroots implementation[[25]](#footnote-26);
* UNDP must remain in its lane. They are not implementers[[26]](#footnote-27).
* Sometimes they bypass the local institutions with appropriate mandates until they hit a snag. Sometimes the ability of their staff to take advice is low[[27]](#footnote-28).

Apparent duplication of efforts and resources: Several stakeholders observed apparent duplication of resources and efforts by some of the interventions. In particular, the digital data platform being developed under SHIA was seen to be duplicating the Local Government Information System (LAMISeHIN). The eHIN was seen repeating the District Health Information Management System (DHIMS), which also tracks drugs and medical supplies from the point and date of the supply request up to delivery to district pharmaceutical warehouses/stores. One common explanation for this is donor competition for visibility, as different donors support the systems.

Perhaps the biggest challenge for programming on governance for UNDP is a widely held expectation for UNDP to be politically neutral in an environment where every possible position on a governance or political issue identifies with a partisan stakeholder. It means that any advice on a topic is received, interpreted, and mapped onto a position of a partisan stakeholder. Malawi’s governance space is perhaps a typical scene where working politically and smartly is obligatory, and the use of rapid political economy assessments may be helpful.

The efficiency of CPD implementation is, to some extent, compromised or undermined because of the inadequate number of M&E staff within UNDP. The practice mainly depends on receiving and reviewing partners’ implementation reports or reports of program analysts. There are rare opportunities for occasional field visits by M&E staff. The MTE team extrapolated from their observations that beefing up the M&E unit would improve the timeliness of delivery of activities, allowing to better capture and document results to enable more comprehensive reporting on results.

# Implementation and partnership strategy

The implementation of UNDP Malawi's interventions depends on the quality of partnerships that UNDP can strike with various stakeholders central to achieving the desired results. UNDP is commended for identifying partners based on their institutional mandates, track record, and competitive advantages. Nonetheless, sometimes key potential partners were sidelined. For instance, under the Access to Justice intervention, the Legal Aid Bureau, despite its evident centrality to the achievement of results, was left out or was not in the mainstream of the intervention and had to be coopted or consulted erratically. The MTE team believed this was either because of a non-robust theory of change for the intervention or insufficient stakeholder analysis for the intervention or other reasons unrelated to programming.

In this regard, it was observed that the nature and quality of partnerships vary across interventions, suggesting that perhaps too much is left to the discretion of project staff. The following observations were made:

* Where the project intervention is with a structure downstream of a government ministry, stakeholders complain of lack of clarity, red tape, and an emphasis on instruction-taking rather than genuine involvement. For example, for the SHIA, the implementing partner is the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, while the sites for action are the Phalombe and Nsanje District Councils;
* Where UNDP has a fiduciary role and takes the space between a donor and an implementing partner, stakeholders expressed dissatisfaction with the way UNDP behaves, oscillating between being a fund manager and posturing like the donor, and the lack of sufficient information to the implementing partner on the agreement between UNDP and the back donor. In other cases, where a donor provides a donation such as money for resilient houses, stakeholders observed the lack of clarity on whether the donor gives to the Malawi Government and UNDP is a fund manager or whether UNDP mobilizes money to support a cause of the Malawi Government in which case UNDP becomes a second-tier donor to Malawi Government. The lack of clarity affects the nature and quality of partnerships, especially with Government MDAs

# Effects/Impact

Impacts are defined as the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. Impact addresses the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of the intervention. In terms of the CPD impacts, one respondent categorized CPD impacts at three levels, which the MTE agrees with: the upstream, the midstream, and the downstream. In terms of description, the upstream impacts relate to the work of UNDP in supporting the Malawi Government in formulating various policies, legal instruments, and strategies to address national development challenges, leading to creating a favorable policy, institutional and legislative environment to support service delivery and operational environment for other players to operate in the development space. Under this stream, much work was done before the current CPD. Still, because policies are dynamic instruments, UNDP has continued, for example, to support the Malawi Government to develop the Malawi 2063 and its first 10-year implementation plan. In the environment and natural and climate change subsections, UNDP support through the National Climate Change Resilience Project, which the Government views as a programme because of its scope and importance, has strengthened coordination between critical stakeholders through support provided for meetings of critical institutions and committees such as the National Technical Working Group on Climate Change.

At the midstream level, the MTE observed was improved institutional capacity to deliver resilience and poverty reduction programmes in CPD supported communities, districts, and nationally. Using Kabeers (2008) social relations approach to institutional analysis, which views institutions as occurring at household, community, market, and state levels, we noted that the CPD has contributed to more robust and more economically empowered households, better managed and prepared community institutions (such as VDCs, ADCs, DCPCCs, ACPCs, VCPC), improved access to markets for smallholder especially women and finally at the state level there is strong evidence that suggests enhanced capacity of local and national governments as CPD implementing partners. For example, CPD impacts have targeted decentralized institutions, including local governments, such as City and District Council, where UNDP has provided support to ensure that planning systems incorporate climate adaptation priorities, leading to adaptation priorities access public resources through the national budget. At the same time, CPD resources have been invested in the training of various government and community structures, which provide platforms for planning, implementation, and monitoring of development programmes that aim to improve service delivery.

Downstream impacts have been observed at the community and household levels. About CPD Outcome 1, “Advance poverty reduction in all its forms and dimensions, the MTE found evidence of CPD contributing to job creation and sustenance, improved income, food security and asset levels at the household level. For example, the MICF has created employment for 1,311 low-income, unskilled people have enabled 1,098 SME to access loans and improved financial services as a result of MICF Projects with MK1,224 million SME loans disbursed by MICF Projects. In addition, the MICF has reached 58,484 smallholder households who are now benefiting from new or enhanced income-generating or livelihood improvement opportunities as a result of MICF projects. About 40Percentage of the beneficiaries are women. Beneficiaries interviewed under the PSD reported that through improved access to dairy markets, they could sell more milk with limited daily losses due to the investment in the milk processing equipment paid jointly by the project and the Lilongwe Dairy Company. They could also sell more milk because they were also provided with more dairy cattle through the MICF project. Beneficiaries participating in the milk value chain in Chikwawa district are now using their land, which was previously idle land, as a source of income, having now used the same share capital in joint investment PRESCANE to produce sugar used to produce ethanol. From the ACRE project, we also got evidence that the communities and households connected with electricity are using electricity not only for domestic uses, which, on its own, empowers women and reduces women’s time poverty, but they are also using electricity to power small-scale industries and businesses, which improve household income, with upstream and incremental effects on food security, resilience building, and poverty reduction.

About CPD outcome 3, “Strengthening resilience and shocks to crises,” the MTE gathered evidence that the CPD is building resilience to disaster risk through improved adaptation to climate change. This is being done in multiple communities targeted by projects such as the NCRP, CRIM, Transform, MCLIMES, the Chinese supported houses, and the economic-oriented projects explained above. For example, we noted that through improved access to weather information, fishermen are better able to plan their fishing activities and reduce lake accidents, farmers are also able to access site-specific weather information, which they are using to make decisions about their farming, including when to plant, what to plant, decisions which reduce risk of crop failure due to weather risks and eventually improve food security and overtime improve resilience and reduced poverty. There are also interventions supported by the CPD that contract structures, such as multiple irrigation dams soil, and water conservation technologies that also contribute to disaster risk reduction, which improves residence to climate change at the community and household level. Under the CRIM Project, the CP has developed and implemented participatory micro-catchment management and action plans; including delineation and restoration of village forest areas and land and water management initiatives covering 240 hectares, which contributes to the resilience of households by reducing flood risks and improving soil fertility, through improved soil nutrient and water retention for over 3000 people that the project has reached.

Socially, the evidence the MTE gathered suggested that the CPD is reaching to the most vulnerable groups of the society, including women, youth, the elderly, and the rural poor. The CPD, for example has reached 100000 people with a community-based early warning system of whom 50Percentage are women through the MCLIMES. Figures for MICF have been reported above, but it is worth noting that by reaching these vulnerable groups, the CPD addresses poverty in generic terms, transforming gender relationships, and supporting progressive empowerment of vulnerable groups, which is critical in achieving SDGs. However, the evaluation team note that the CPD does not have an aggregated indicator that summarizes from all its projects the number of vulnerable groups, disaggregated by gender) as well as institutions supported by the programme. This is an opportunity to include this indicator. The indicator can also be a tool for accessible communication of UNDP support and a resource mobilization tool for the CPD.

While the CPD does not measure resilience and poverty reduction directly among its beneficiaries, because it uses national data from the National Statistics Office (NSO), the MTE asserts based on qualitative observations and narratives from program beneficiaries that the programme contributes to improved resilience, reducing poverty and vulnerability amongst beneficiaries. This also means that there are opportunities for the monitoring and evaluation team as well as the DIAT to use existing tools developed by NSO and nongovernmental organizations to measure resilience and poverty and the free track progress and impact of the programme on these development issues, not just nationally through NSO but specific to targeted households.

Through its work under the MECS and Social Cohesion, the RICE portfolio has made significant contributions to peace and security in the country. Interventions have shaped public policy on dress code in assisted schools in conflict resolution. Furthermore, a conflict early warning system and a practical framework for conflict management and transformation at the district level have been established and are functional. Disputes related to land grabbing, religious bigotry, and intolerance are addressed through peace committees.

**E-governance:** Through the NRIS, the RICE portfolio has significantly impacted the digitalization of services by using the national ID for citizens. The ID has catalyzed the efficiency and feasibility of so many other national development goals that rely on the accurate identity of Malawian citizens and other persons across the public and private sectors.

**Democratization and service delivery:** In the realm of democratization and service delivery, the RICE portfolio has contributed to strengthening the electoral framework to improve objectivity, impartiality, and quality of its outcomes; and has kept the inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups on the radar in many development programming initiatives. Despite ongoing challenges with access to justice, the RICE portfolio has contributed to decongesting prisons and institutionalizing alternative ways of dispute resolution.

The RICE portfolio has had impactful interventions. However, the success stories are muted or shared with less enthusiasm. The role of the Communications Unit in this regard is sub-optimal and. It needs enhancement and a better mechanism for sharing information with program analysts, implementing partners when available, and M&E staff..

From the above analysis, the impacts realized reflect the three pathways described or expected in the CPD. To the MTE team, the CPD is on the course, and the practice so far is consistent with the theory of change but with many opportunities for improvement around coordination, synergy, institutional capacity building, monitoring, evaluation, and measurement.

# Sustainability

The main concern for this criterion was to establish the potential of continuity of benefits of the programme after it has wound up in the key result areas and among implementing partners. Sustainability was understood as the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

Key questions that were explored under this criterion include:

1. What is the likelihood that UNDP's interventions are sustainable?
2. Are there exit strategies in place for different programmes and projects?
3. What mechanisms have been put in place by UNDP Malawi to support the government/ institutional partners to sustain improvements made through these CP interventions?
4. What changes should be made in the current partnerships to promote long-term sustainability?

Financially and economically, the MTE team noted that the MICF project and the ACRE projects are creating jobs at the local level and building the capacity of the private sector to grow and develop sustainable and economically mutual partnerships with the rural poor, including vulnerable men and women and youth. Other resilience and livelihood projects are implementing interventions that build productive capacities of vulnerable households through investments in agricultural technology, irrigation, disaster risk reduction structures, smart climate agriculture, and others. These interventions promote resilience in the medium term and long-term, breaking the cycle of humanitarian assistance allowing government and development partners to use resources to other priority sectors.

The MTE also noted that incorporation of the private sector projects had enabled communities to partner with private companies in different value chains, which has established sustainable access to high-value markets by the poor, has also increased community participation in value chains, which incentivizes communities to continue to participate in economic activities beyond the life span of the current CPD. The private sector approach is strongly consistent with the wealth creation, industrialization, and self-reliance objectives of Malawi 2063. The implication is that the CPD will continue to receive political support from the government, development partners, and the public; hence national ownership is guaranteed. Although not very advanced and uniformly applied in all projects, the MTE found that some projects collaborated and synergized with other projects. This also enhanced impact, which lasted longer than the project lifespan.

Institutionally and broadly, the MTE found that the current CPD has focused mainly on implementing policies, the formulation of which was the focus of the previous CPD. The focus on policy implementation is critical because it strengthens the capacity of the government to deliver effective services to the citizenry, which is vital for sustainability the continued participation of the community in government programmes. The focus on implementation, building on policies that the previous CPD formulated, establishes a continuum from policy formulation to implementation, which tackles development challenges that Malawi faces from a long-term perspective, which is required to address structural causes of vulnerability and pervasive inequalities. Within this policy and institutional context, the MTE noted that the CPD has contributed to the capacity building of MDAs at national, district, and community levels, which means that the skills left behind will enable MDAs to implement their mandates even without UMDP support continuously.

Socially, the CPD has been robust in targeting the most vulnerable, including women, children, and people with disabilities. The CPD, for example, through the NRIS has ensured that all Malawians eligible have a national ID, which has helped to improve access to social services by the poor. Through its various projects, the program has been responsive to the covid pandemic and has supported the Malawi Government and target communities in responding to prevention measures recommended by Government. The programme has an entire portfolio on resilience, livelihoods, climate change, and natural resource management in environmental sustainability. The overall objective of this portfolio is to promote environmental sustainability.

UNDP’s interventions in the sphere of governance have a high degree of sustainability, especially those whose implementing partners are government MDAs. However, a lot depends on the extent to which the intervention is standardized and integrated into the day-to-day functions of the MDA. Interventions that are seen as ‘short term projects’ will wither away after the project life has elapsed unless there are in-built mechanisms for perpetuation of practices, systems, and results instituted by the project;

The NRIS is perhaps the best example of sustainability built into its design and intermediate results. The project's goal is to establish a permanent and continuous national registration and identification system in Malawi. Output 2 emphasizes the transition of the project to a constant and permanent system and achieved milestones like assembling of the Prefabricated ID Card Production Facility (CPF) at Capitol Hill in Lilongwe to print Cards and training of NRB staff on the same, Refurbishment of post offices and MIM training for NRB management[[28]](#footnote-29) which would ensure continuity of NRIS. Under output 3, integrating the National ID into various services would ensure that there is always demand for the national ID, ensuring continuity. And under output 5, “Project is efficiently managed, staffed and coordinated, and is implemented with national ownership” the Steering Committee recommended the elevation of NRB to an essential service[[29]](#footnote-30) that would ensure the sustainability of the NRIS. However, the government is not resourcing the NRB sufficiently[[30]](#footnote-31) . Still, if the NRB Bill gets enacted with the provision on creating a Fund, the NRB will be largely self-financing with only minimal dependence on government funding.

Social cohesion interventions have been funded 100Percentage by UNDP since 2012, casting a shadow of doubt on whether Government was committed. However, the enactment of the National Peace and Unity Commission Bill , which the cabinet approved in late 2021 and is expected in early 2022; and the establishment of the cabinet portfolio on Civic Education and National Unity (CENU) are significant indicators of the government’s uptake and integration of the framework into the government establishment, hence guaranteeing long term sustainability. However, at the district level, the District Peace Committees remain unconnected to the District Councils. With the shift from the project from OPC to CENU and CENU’s micro assessment not supporting tranching of resources, the District Peace Committees have remained unfunded. UNDP cannot disburse the DPCs directly, while OPC can finance DPCs through individuals[[31]](#footnote-32).

Projects that appear to have sustainability include eHIN, SHIA and Foresight. Common elements that threaten sustainability include direct implementation by UNDP, which precludes integration of the interventions in the framework of work of the partner organizations, encourages the perception that intervention is a short-term project of UNDP.

In terms of threats to sustainability, the main ones include impacts of climate change, the DIM, the limited budget at the district level, abuse of public resources and capacity problems, especially amongst MDAs, the increasing levels of poverty, and the threats caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, the MTE noted that the participation of CSOs in implementing the CPD has been limited, which, if continued, could weaken the governance portfolio of the CPD and, therefore, also negatively affect the effectiveness of the CPD.

# Cross-cutting issues: Gender and Human rights

The ET analyzed the CPD using a policy design framework that categorizes policies to be gender-blind or gender-aware (Kabeer, 1996). Gender-blind policy design and analyses are implicitly premised on the notion of a male development actor. While often couched in apparently gender-neutral language, they are implicitly male-biased in that they privilege male needs, interests, and priorities in the distribution of opportunities and resources. Gender-aware policy design and analyses, by contrast, recognize that development actors are women as well as men, that they are constrained in different, and often unequal ways, as potential participants and beneficiaries in the development process, and that they may consequently have differing, and sometimes conflicting needs, interests, and priorities.

The CPD qualifies to be a gender-aware policy because it is based on solid gender analysis or the development context in Malawi. Therefore, it is also firm on addressing gender inequality, women empowerment, vulnerability, and inclusivity. For example, the CPD intends to achieve its primary objective of contributing to the reduction of poverty, inequality, and vulnerability to shocks by scaling up employment and sustainable livelihood opportunities for vulnerable groups, including women, youth, persons with disabilities and albinism, and communities living in areas prone to flooding, drought, and other shocks.

This analysis implies that the CPD prioritizes women and youth and other vulnerable groups, which according to Kabeers assessment of approaches to programme planning, means the programme was designed as a "gender-aware policy, "which recognizes that development actors are women as well as men, that they are constrained in different, and often unequal ways, as potential participants and beneficiaries in the development process and that they may consequently have differing, and sometimes conflicting needs, interests, and priorities.

Policies can be gender-neutral, gender-specific, or gender-transformative (Kabeer, 1996). The CPD has elements of both gender-specific or gender transformative approaches. It is gender-specific in that it has interventions targeting specific groups of vulnerable people. For example, the MCLIMES targets fishermen most because evidence shows that the men are the most vulnerable to lake weather risks. However, the Spotlight Initiative Programme on EVAWG specifically targets women and girls, focusing on shifting norms and attitudes and de-normalizing GBV, adopting gender inclusion in programming, and adopting institutional gender-responsive policy frameworks. The Chinese supported houses built in Chikwawa, targeted mainly women, the elderly, and people with disabilities because they could not build their own houses economically. When floods affect an area, they are the most affected.

The CPD has vital gender-transformative interventions across all portfolios. For example, targeting women and youth with innovative financing instruments as the CPD has done, through MICF, transforms the lives of vulnerable women and youth, which confirms the CPD as a gender-transformative programme, according to Kabeer's policy design framework. Resilience building projects such as CRIM, DR4M, NCRP, Transform, etc., empower households and communities by transforming their livelihoods through DRR and adaptation interventions. Progressively, such interventions are likely to change the structure of gender relations in the form of division of labor, access and control over resources, and decision-making at the household level. Projects reports also indicate that the participation of women in project activities, including in decision-making positions of project structures, is also transformative because it changes the norm that men are decision-makers. The improvement of disposable income, asset accumulation, and food security for women and other vulnerable in target communities are examples of the CPD transformative approach. There is evidence that these interventions change gender relations within the household by creating space for women to participate more effectively in decision-making. Gender-disaggregated data is critical to identify gender issues and design policies, programmes, and interventions. Through a review of reports, the MTE noted that the CPD uses disaggregated data and also requires projects to report using gender-disaggregated data, where this is required. The MTE found that gender issues and achievements are reported, focusing on outreach indicators.

# Capacity building

As part of policy implementation, the CPD has invested significant resources in the capacity building of central and local governments to ensure effective service delivery. For example, the CPD has invested in developing training material, training programmes, equipment, disaster-resilient structures, and infrastructure. Combined, these have enabled MDAs, communities, households, and individuals in targeted districts to gain significant capacities to withstand disasters even after the cessation of UNDP funding. Training of community-level structures and extension workers (e.g training of 20000 lead farmers and 20000 contact farmers in Participatory Integrated Climate Service Approach (PICSA) by MCLIMES in 10 districts) will ensure that they provide continued support to communities beyond the project, using training materials that have been developed with support from UNDP. To strengthen these elements, improved monitoring and supportive supervision are needed so that operational issues that disenfranchise beneficiaries and compromise progress along the theory of change are addressed and nipped in the bud promptly. In some districts, UNDP has supported the development of capacities for resilient disaster planning, which will enhance the integration of disaster resilience and risk reduction into the mainstream district development planning system. This would then strengthen the integration of mitigation and adaptation activities into the local government’s budget, therefore, into the national budget. For this to happen, the CPD will need more investments into district and national-level disaster risk reduction sensitive budget advocacy work, possibly CSOs.

Some activities undertaken with this CPD in capacity building lacked the benefits of an explicit theory of change. For example, training Members of Parliament on Gender Responsive Budgeting to improve budget allocations to prevent and eliminate VAWG was a significant output with only marginal direct effect given the dynamics in making Malawi’s National Budget[[32]](#footnote-33). Members of Parliament and their committees can at best raise voices but have very little influence to affect the allocations done by the Minister of Finance. Thus, besides targeting MPs, the program must seek to influence budget allocations during the estimates stage before the consolidated budget is brought to Parliament

According to many stakeholders interviewed during the review, the CPD helped improve policy and institutional capacity through various macro-level activities, including DIAT and project-specific policy advocacy work with MDAs at a national level. Additionally, interviewees have recognized that the CPD supported the capacity building of decentralized institutions, including District and City Councils, through training programmes, equipment, and infrastructural development.

Government partners have recognized the support provided by the DIAT as key in building the capacity of the National planning commission, the development of the Malawi 2063, and its first ten-year strategy.

# Lessons Learned

The following lessons have been learned from the implementation of the CPD activities over the period preceding this review:

1. The theory of change is essential for articulating the program's expected results and identifying synergies and cross-project/portfolio collaboration, learning, and adaptation areas.
2. Regular and participatory collaborative, planning, learning, and experience sharing events at the project level, programme level, and nationally, involving appropriate stakeholders are essential aspects of the CPD and individual project management, which have been weak hitherto and need to be prioritized.

1. The DIAT and the Monitoring and Evaluation Teams are essential to enhancing internal and external coherence. However, these units are currently understaffed, which impacts programme coherence.
2. The shift of the CPD from policy formulation to policy implementation can have significant tangible results at a local level. However, this shift needs approaches that are not the same as when focusing on policy formulation.
3. It is not appropriate to use the DIM across all partnerships. DIM should not be used universally; it should be limited to institutions where fiduciary risk is independently confirmed as high. Even where it is used, UNDP should support the implementing partner to build its capacity in a given period to return to NIM.

1. Regular supportive monitoring visits to project districts are critical in addressing operational issues that are implementing partners face that require action from UNDP. Delayed resolution of operational problems negatively affects the quality and efficiency of programme delivery.
2. Regular communication and engagement with implementation partners, especially those under DIM, is critical. A communication or engagement plan should continuously be developed for project management.

# Conclusions

The CPD is relevant to the development needs and policies of the Malawi Government, the local communities, women and men, boys and girls, and other vulnerable groups. These needs are many but include high levels and deep-rooted poverty, vulnerability, and inequalities, leading to weak capacities of individuals, households, communities, and the nation to achieve economic growth and sustainable resilience. The CPD's three pathways, which summarize the theory of change, reflect a realistic road map to reduce these widespread development challenges. The CPD builds bridges between national development strategies, sectoral policies, individual CPD projects, and sustainable development goals.

While the CPD is relevant and was well aligned with the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy at design in 2019, there is a policy shift in development planning in Government currently from poverty reduction to wealth creation through industrialization and urbanization, based on the new vision of the country, the Malawi 2063. The CPD will need to be aligned with this approach, including strengthening the ToC, including a diagrammatic presentation, to show linkages with policies and synergies between various CPD interventions.

Regarding coherence, the main findings are that the CPD projects have strong potential for synergies, but these are not appropriately taken advantage of. Portfolios and projects are mainly implemented in their compartments, with limited collaboration from others, learning, and adaptation. However, due to the active participation of DIAT in the policy space, external coherence is stronger than internal coherence.

The CPD has implemented many diverse projects at the effectiveness level, contributing to various outcomes and impacts at individual, household, community, and institutional levels. At the individual and household level, the CPD has improved income and food security levels for the targeted vulnerable groups, including women and youth, through various interventions. It has improved access to weather information to plan household-level farming and fishing activities, improve livelihoods, and create wealth. In addition, the CPD, has constructed various DRR structures and related adaptation interventions, which have increased household and community reliance on climate-related disasters. Through the support provided to SMEs, the programme has created jobs for vulnerable groups, improving household silence and responses to shocks.

Under access to justice, the interventions have consistently met or outpaced targets. For example, the decongestion of prisons through diversion and camp courts saw the release of about 92,329 inmates, which was 12.89Percentage above the target[[33]](#footnote-34). Contributions to strengthening national institutions to effectively discharge their mandates to deliver legal rights and services to citizens and catalyzing efficiency in many institutions and service systems are most pronounced for the NRIS, the MECS, the Spotlight Initiative, and Social Cohesion projects.

However, accomplishing results could have been even better if not for technical and operational problems related to some interventions. For example, under access to justice, support to structural change such as cooperation agreement to support and enhance paralegals and village mediators has not been forthcoming. Although the program document intimated that UNDP would work out a partnership with the Legal Aid Bureau (LAB) and the Judiciary, such a partnership was not explored yet. The two institutions are crucial to attaining results related to improving access to justice through paralegals.

While all interventions under the RICE portfolio have elements of citizen engagement with different degrees of emphasis, the social cohesion intervention has the farthest reach because of the kind of governance and political problems that engulfed the country between 2019 and 2021. However, results on national unity are slow despite achievements on binary conflicts such as the religious ones between Christians and Muslims. The more significant structural issues that fuel disunity are infused with politics, tribalism, and regionalism and are best addressed through the National Peace Commission or a similar body rather than a cabinet portfolio that can hardly rise above the political fault lines addressed. Thus it is necessary and urgent to harness energy and resources towards the legal establishment of the National Peace Commission.

In terms of efficiency, the programme has mainly been implemented through DIM, which according to UNDP officials, ensures efficient implementation of interventions and minimizes leakages of resources. However, all implementing partners interviewed had strong reservations about this method because it causes long delays during implementation. The DIM is an activity-based funding system. Given the high number of projects under the CPD, UNDP has had to process activities from many projects, using the same administrative and financial management capacity at the country office. As a result, it was reported that procurement, processing of payments, clearing of reports could take time.

Key impacts of the CPD have been observed at the upstream, midstream, and downstream levels. The upstream results have mainly been the improved policy and institutional capacity through various macro-level activities, including those done through DIAT and project-specific policy advocacy work with MDAs at a national level. At midstream, the main impacts have been the capacity building of decentralized institutions, including District and City Councils, through training programmes, equipment, and infrastructural development. The main focus of the CPD has been on contributing to poverty reduction and resilience building, and the MTE found evidence of functioning pathways at the household level as were planned in the ToC.

The programme shows potential for sustainability, both technically and institutionally. For example, most RSG projects aim to build the resilience of households by investing in adaptation and DRR interventions, which address the felt needs of communities. The communities are likely to continue implementing these projects because of their understanding of the impacts of climate change. For the PSD projects, the MTE also found evidence of financial sustainability. Once private sector companies are financed through matching grants, they can continue operating with the project's capital and funds profitably. The private sector companies have long-term agreements with smallholder farmers, which means that the benefits for both the company and the farmers will last longer than UNDP support. For example, some projects implemented under closed projects supported by the previous CPD, are still functioning at the same level as at the end of the matching grant agreement.

In terms of mainstreaming cross-cutting issues, the MTE found that the CP has effectively tackled gender issues, incorporating inequality, human rights, good governance and accountability, and environment and climate change.

Overall the main factors that have affected the implementation of the CPD and achievement of its objectives included internal factors such as stakeholder engagement during project design, limited flexibility of projects during implementation, the direct implementation method (DIM), which UNDP uses to implement its projects, weak internal coherence and the limited UNDP monitoring capacity (few people in the M and E team). External factors included the COVID19 pandemic and the political volatility after 2019 after the Tripartite elections and the Fresh Elections in 2020.

# Recommendations

The following is a list of strategic and operational recommendations to improve current programming and inform the design of the next CPD:

1. UNDP should review the CPD to identify or ascertain the alignment and complementarity of the CPD to MIP-1 priorities and, if possible, should do so jointly with the NPC. The MTE makes this recommendation because the Government of Malawi, through the NPC, hopes that UNDP may set a leading example to others so that the NPC can use the experience gained to support other development partners in aligning their country's development strategies to Malawi’s new vision and its implementation plan. By working with the NPC, UNDP will ensure its subsequent programs are perfectly aligned or are directly complementary to Government priorities while, at the same time, further strengthening the NPC's capacity to conduct a similar process with other development actors.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. As part of the alignment under recommendation 1 above, it is recommended that UNDP review the theory of change underlying the CPD and include its visual representation, showing clear nodes of synergy, which should be points of collaboration between and within portfolios. To enhance internal coherence, specific indicators should be developed and monitored to maximize synergies and coordination arrangements.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. It is recommended that UNDP establish a system for aggregating the number of households/farmers or beneficiaries reached across all RSG projects and replicate a similar system/indicator for RICE projects.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. UNDP should seek to complete project documentation for the long-term interventions in place in the RICE portfolio since all the projects in the RSG portfolio are already documented. Where a project document is not possible, a sufficiently informative write-up covering aspects such as the rationale, the theory of change, and the project's implementation strategy should be developed. This is particularly important because the Annual Work Plans do not sufficiently convey the interventions' rationale and theories or logic. As much as possible, annual Work Plans should be submitted and approved on time, based on project documents.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** Medium

1. UNDP should improve the clarity of the ‘SDG hotspot’ concept to enhance the empirical usefulness of the concept in programming and develop and document a theory of action and strategy for the SHAI project. While change that reflects the objectives of the project. Building the digital data platform and digitizing the VAPs are essential; they only create necessary conditions for achieving desired results (i.e., improvements on SDG indicators), which appear to have moved out of programming focus.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. In terms of implementation models, it is recommended that UNDP should be discussed thoroughly with its partners the implementation model that is to be for each of its new projects. In cases where a DIM model is used, UNDP should support the implementing partner to build its capacity in specific areas of capacity deficits to enable future projects using the NIM. Whichever implementation model is agreed upon, there must be regular sharing of information about any new developments or challenges that affect project implementation.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** Medium

1. At a project level, UNDP program staff and their implementing partner's staff should strengthen project monitoring site visits and address operational issues in a timely fashion to minimize unwarranted delays that affect the achievement of project objectives. All project staff should have a minimum number of M&E responsibilities embedded in references or job descriptions.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. The ‘Sense making’ protocol and process should be replicated in other portfolios to enhance holistic and coherent approaches to addressing development challenges rather than a silo approach. However, the replication should be without the protraction of the exercise beyond a maximum of three months. It is further recommended that the sense-making process should be institutionalized and used during project implementation to ensure that projects adapt to the existing operating environment.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High

1. The analysis of various stakeholders' power, interests, and attitudes (i.e., Political Economy Analysis) should become a regular practice in UNDP projects, not just at the project design stages but during implementation. This is because none of the variables are static or frozen in time. They are dynamic as people respond to changes in their environment. By doing so, UNDP will ensure that implementing partners work politically savvy through precise mapping of stakeholders and their interests and incentives that may block or propel reform or achievement of results and calibrate the support and opposition levels to the reform/initiative.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** Medium

1. To enhance the quality of relationships with its development partners, UNDP should regularly share progress reports on projects being implemented, including progress on CPD implementation. The sharing of information with the development partners should be institutionalized and regularized.

**Recommendation to**: UNDP

**Priority:** High
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**1. Background and Programme Context**

Malawi is a landlocked country, covering an area of approximately 118,000 km2. It is ranked among the Least Developed Countries in the world. Its population of approximately 18 million is predominantly rural with a rapidly urbanizing sector and with high population growth rates. Malawi’s GDP per capita is estimated at $411.60 (2019),[[34]](#footnote-35) with its Gini coefficient placed at 44.7[[35]](#footnote-36) (2016). Agriculture, which employs over 80Percentage of the Malawian population, is the mainstay of the economy. It drives livelihoods for two-thirds of the country’s population but contributes only a third to GDP3 and accounts for over 85Percentage of export earnings. The Human Development Index (HDI) value of 0.483 (2019) puts the country in a rank 174 out of the 189 countries and territories.[[36]](#footnote-37)

Malawi attained political pluralism in 1993 following a national referendum that resulted in the provisional adoption of a democratic Constitution of the Republic of Malawi (the Constitution) in 1994. This provisional Constitution was adopted in 1995. Since 1993 the country has held six general elections.

The Gender Equality Act (GEA) (2013) Section 11 provides for a 40-60 quota for recruitments in the public service. Malawi has seen an increase in appointment of women in decision making positions in recent years. There was also an increase of 23Percentage in women´s representation in the parliament in the 2019 election. However, the number falls short of the 30Percentage threshold.

In general, gender related indicators are not encouraging. For instance, Malawi’s Gender Inequality Index is 0.565 and ranks 142 out of the 162 among countries which have been assessed. Maternal mortality is relatively high at 349 deaths for every 100,000 births. The country records significant cases of gender-based violence and child marriages fueled by poverty. According to Human Rights Watch, 42 per cent of women are married by age 18 and 9 per cent by age 15.

Since 2017, Malawi has implemented the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS III) as its principal national development framework to achieving national development goals as well as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of Agenda 2030. The priority areas of the MGDS III include the following: agriculture, water development, and climate change management; education and skills development; Energy, industry, and tourism development; transport and information and communication technology (ICT) infrastructure; health and population. Other strategic areas of development include: vulnerability, disaster management, and social support; gender, youth development, and social welfare; human settlement and physical planning; environmental sustainability; HIV/AIDS management; peace and security; and nutrition.

While there have been notable developments in a number of sectors, the country has a daunting task to accelerate development to meet demands from a rapidly growing and young population including provision of jobs. The country needs effective solutions to address effects of climate change, which is eroding the resilience of many Malawians, which has been exacerbated by the COVID-2019 Pandemic. In the governance space, Malawi’s institutions are considered weak in the delivery of public services and foster transparency and accountability and performance management oversight functions.

Malawi has been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic since March 2020, when the first preventive measures were applied. Despite less stringent measures and a partial lockdown, economic activities slowed down resulting in substantial loss of household income, livelihoods, jobs, businesses, and markets for agriculture produce. The Malawian economy grew at only 0.9Percentage in 2020 and is projected to grow at 2.5Percentage in 2021. This trend is reflective of the growth patterns that have prevailed in many countries around the world due to the COVID-19 pandemic, including sub-Saharan Africa.

There were also significant adverse social effects associated with a long period of the partial lockdown, particularly in 2020, including an increase in gender-based violence and child abuse, increase in workload for care givers at home and teenage pregnancies due to closure of schools. The pandemic has also increased the disease burden for the health sector with government having to spend huge amount of resources to provide bed space and facilities for COVID-19 cases. [Ref. Assessment of Socio-economic Impact study].

At the time of writing these terms of reference, Malawi was experiencing a third wave of COVID-19 infections, which had seen a rise in the daily average infections from less than 10 cases in May to an average of over 500 cases during the month of July 2021. This prompted government to re-introduce stricter preventive measures such as a reduction of public gatherings from 100 to 50 people in closed places and reduction of public transport carrying capacity from 60Percentage to 50Percentage of existing capacity in addition to a requirement that people wear masks in all public spaces. Unlike the situation during the second wave, schools have remained open.

Existence of COVID-19 vaccines has offered hopes for a decrease in infections and an end to morbidity associated with the COVID-19. However, availability of vaccines in the country has so far been very limited mainly due global supply chain issues. Malawi received about 500,000 doses of Astra Zeneca vaccines under the WHO Covax scheme, which ran out in June. Today about 385,000 people have received one jab of the vaccine and only 43,165 have received both first and second doses. The country was expecting a supply of vaccines towards the end of July 2021.

Malawi launched its Vision Statement: Malawi 2063 (MW2063) in January 2021, which replaces the Malawi Vision 2020. The new vision has re-assessed Malawi’s priorities with a focus on inclusive wealth creation and self-reliance. MW2063 is built on three pillars, namely: agriculture productivity and commercialization; industrialization; and urbanization. The country is preparing an attendant 10-year implementation plan as a first step towards operationalizing the Vision.

1. **2. The UN and UNDP Response**

The UN system has been supporting the Government in the implementation of the MGDS III to achieve national development outcomes and the SDGs. The 2019-2023 UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), in short UNCF, is the main vehicle through which the UN system is supporting priority areas in the MGDS based on its mandates and capacities. The Malawi UNCF is structured around three pillars, namely: Pillar 1 – Peace, Inclusion and Effective Institutions; Pillar 2 – Population Management and Inclusive Human Development, and Pillar 3 – Inclusive and Resilient Growth. The UNCF has a total of nine development outcomes.

UN reforms require that UN agencies adopt relevant UNCF outcomes. In this regard, UNDP is contributing to four UNCF outcomes, which fall under pillars 1 and 3 as follows:

1. **Pillar I, Outcome 1**: Rights holders in Malawi access more accountable and effective institutions at the central and decentralised levels that use quality disaggregated data, offer integrated service delivery and promote civic engagement, respect for human rights and rule of law.

1. **Pillar I, Outcome 3**: Malawi has strengthened institutional capacities for Sustaining peace, inclusive societies, and participatory democracy.

1. **Pillar III, Outcome 7**: Households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to WASH and healthy ecosystems and resilient livelihoods.

1. **Pillar III, Outcome 9**: Malawi has strengthened economic diversification, inclusive business, entrepreneurship, and access to clean energy.

1. **3. UNDP Country Programme (CP)**

**3.1 UNDP Country Programme Document and Projects**

As expected, to operationalize the selected UNCF outcomes, UNDP developed a Country Programme Document (CPD) which elaborates outcome and output indicators, implementation arrangements and resources requirements, among other elements. Annex 1 presents a results matrix of the CP.

Eighteen development projects are contributing to the operationalization of the CP. Five of the projects are carried from the previous cycle.

**3.2 Implementation of the 2019-2023 Country Programme**

The principal objective of the programme is to contribute to reduction of poverty, inequality and vulnerability to shocks. Implementation of the programme has proceeded through three main pathways. The first strategy comprises interventions aimed at inclusive sustainable growth by enhancing economic innovation, inclusive business, job creation, entrepreneurship and access to renewable energy. Notable achievements in the area of inclusive sustainable growth since 2019 are outlined below.

UNDP has been supporting growth of the private sector and entrepreneurship through a suit of instruments. The Growth Accelerator (GA), the very first Business Acceleration programme in Malawi, is injecting risk capital into start-up companies led by young Malawian entrepreneurs with supplementary business acceleration technical support. Since 2019, the entrepreneurs supported have created more than 100 jobs, have developed more than 15 new products on the domestic market and have also had an average increase of about 30Percentage in revenue. About 50 entrepreneurs have received support from the GA. The GA is pushing small enterprises on a growth trajectory in readiness for more risk capital and growth. The Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund (MICF), a matching grant facility for the private sector providing risk capital that absorbs commercial risks in triggering innovation, speeding up new business models and/or technologies that have high social impact.

Since 2014, the fund has invested in over 50 companies having appetite for risk, import substitution and innovation and has created over 1,500 full-time jobs in new manufacturing facilities, improved the livelihoods of over 48,500 low-income people, leveraged more than 6.5 Million USD in external finance and mobilized more than 10.9 Million USD in private sector contributions. As a response to the COVID19 pandemic, the GA and MICF respectively launched specific challenge windows to cushion the private sector from effects of the pandemic. Through these special windows, the GA is supporting 28 entrepreneurs while the MICF is supporting 14 companies.

UNDP assistance has contributed to an increase of national cumulative installed generation capacity for rural population through mini grids from 379 kW in 2019 to 385 kW in 2020. Continuing this effort, the country will install greenfield mini grids at two sites of the following sites: Manoro in Mzimba, Mwansambi in Ntcheu or Chisi in Zomba district. This support will directly impact on the proportion of households benefitting from clean, affordable, and sustainable energy.

The second pathway encompasses interventions towards scaling up climate adaptation and resilience to shocks for vulnerable communities. Following a devastating cyclone, which resulted in loss of lives and extensive damage to properties, UNDP supported recovery initiatives that included construction of 430 houses for flood victims using more sustainable and more environmentally friendly materials than before. UNDP also provided essential disaster risk reduction and early recovery assistance that enabled the completion of five multi-purpose flood evacuation centres, each able to accommodate upwards of 300 people in flood zones.

The third pathway of the country programme focuses on strengthening governance and human rights institutions for development effectiveness, transparency and accountability, improved service provision and civic participation. Interventions include promoting civic engagement, respect for human rights, rule of law, peace and democracy and support to national and local development planning, coordination and monitoring capacities processes with special attention given to localization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Some of the key achievements in the area of responsive institutions and civic engagement are outlined below

Having successfully established a national registration and national identification system, UNDP has supported the use of the National ID ecosystem as a primary source of identification for the delivery of services to enhance accountability and effectiveness in over 10 institutions in the private and public sector. This has resulted to great efficiencies in provision of services and improvement in risk management. For instance, the use of national ID cards ensured the credibility of the voters’ roll during the Fresh Presidential Elections (FPEs) which was held in 2020 and clean-up of pensioners records leading to savings of $400,000 monthly [Source: Accountant General, Ministry of Finance, 2020].

UNDP has supported the installation of an Electronic Health Information Network (eHIN) - an innovative, easy to use mobile phone and web based application aimed at managing and tracking all health commodities at all tiers of health supply chain. eHIN was introduced as a response to Minisrty of Healths decision to have a system that would help in generation, transmission, collation, analysis and presentation of logistics data. So far the system is deployed in 3 districts, namely: Blantyre, Rumphi and Ntchisi. The platform has provided visibility for all transactions done across the last mile up to Central Medical Store. Over 90,000 transactions have currently been registered for stock counts; issuing, receipting and discards. The capacity of health workers to effectively deliver health services has also been enhanced. Over 668 health workers handling health commodities across the supply chain system were trained on the eHIN system in the 3 districts. The application is resulting in improved transparency and accountability in the management of health commodities.

UNDP has piloted digitalization of village physical and socio-economic information to enhance evidence based planning and decision making. The system provides an entry point for transformation of village and district planning processes by enhancing data collection and analysis, monitoring and coordinated service delivery and achievement of the SDGs. Building on the information system, UNDP is supporting the development of an integrated service coordination platform at the district level. The platform does not only enable efficient coordination of services but also has the potential for translating into a vehicle for donor basket funding of initiatives at the district level.

In the area of rule of law, UNDP has supported access to justice by the poor and marginalized people in conflict with the law. Between 2019 and 2020, UNDP’s assistance augmented the capacity of the Paralegal Advisory Service Institute (PASI), a non-state actor, to facilitate the release of a total of 64,762 poor and marginalized detainees. With paralegal officers' availability in places of detention, a total of 277,732 people (witness/sureties, accused persons, guardians, prisoners) were empowered with legal advice and assistance. [**Source:** Paralegal Advisory Service Institute, 2019 and 2020 Annual Reports].

In the wake of the COVID 19 pandemic, UNDP has rendered assistance to public universities to venture into production of personal protective equipment, face masks and shields and sanitizers. Apart from enhancing the supply of PPEs in targeted communities, engagement of universities allowed them to explore innovative ways of producing PPEs.

Right from early days, UNDP provided assistance to bring awareness of the Covid 19 pandemic to many sections of the Malawi citizenry. Different channels were used to reach the population at large and to specific groups such as persons with disabilities with Covid 19 messages. Among them UNDP supported the production of more than 4000 braille materials on Covid 19 awareness and prevention. In other interventions, in 2020, UNDP supported the Malawi Electoral Commission to provide Covid 19 prevention materials in all polling stations enabling fresh presidential elections to proceed with minimum concerns of contracting the virus. UNDP boosted the ICT infrastructure for Government Departments and key governance institutions including Malawi Parliament to ensure that critical service delivery is not interrupted during the pandemic. The support included over 186 laptops, 35 Zoom licenses, 186 MIFIs and data bundles. UNDP supported advocacy and paralegal services resulting in release of 782 detainees in an effort to promote access to justice by the poor and reduce congestion in Malawi prisons and hence risk of contracting the virus.

During the period, the CO has sought to promote efforts towards youth empowerment and innovation. The country joined several countries in implementation of a project on accelerator lab whose primary goal is to enhance country office capacity for introducing and promoting innovative concepts, systems, and projects. Youth development and innovation are adopted as cross-cutting issues in programming in addition to gender equality and women empowerment and human rights.

Malawi is among few UNDP COs which are pioneering application of a sense-making approach to planning and managing programme portfolios. Sensemaking is a process through which human beings generate insights, induce learning, and create meaning from experience. UNDP Malawi adopted the sense-making protocol with a double-edged intent. First, the intent was to articulate a coherent governance portfolio and accelerate it to bring about the three identified governance outcomes in Malawi – accountable institutions, engaged civil society, and effective service delivery. The process is at an advanced stage culminating into several policy options which will guide the CO in its interventions to achieve identified governance effects.

In 2019 and 2020, UNDP programme expenditures totaled $ 43,544,121 and $ 42,598, 175, respectively. About 45 Percentage of expenditures were in democratic governance (addressing decentralization, elections and national registration and identification systems, human rights and public sector reforms) and 57Percentage was in resilience and sustainable growth ( entrepreneurship, innovative business models, job creation, climate change resilience and adaptation and access to renewable energy).

The operating environment during the first two years of implementation of the country was beset by three major challenges. In March 2019, Malawi was hit by Cyclone Idai whose impact was modest on GDP (0.13Percentage) but significant and highest in districts with the poorest populations. The country experienced protracted political tension in the aftermath of the May 2019 general elections. The opposition contested presidential elections results in court, which was accompanied by widespread protests demanding electoral chair’s resignation resulting in considerable property damage and economic disruption.

Implementation of the country programme had been negatively affected by the COVID-19 pandemic particularly from March 2020 when government imposed a partial lockdown, which restricted travel and official gatherings. As a result of the preventive measures, some important meetings were delayed or not conducted at all, and project monitoring missions were limited. Some activities such as the roll out of mass child registration were suspended. Projects were compelled to divert resources to procure personal preventive equipment to reduce transmission of the corona virus where activities were allowed to take place.

COVID-19 has directly affected the amount of resources available to implement the country programme, as donor contributions were reprogrammed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, several partners have indicated that they would not be making new commitments to support Malawi programmes including UNDP’s programmes in the short to medium term.

The development context during the past two and half years of the CP and launch of **Malawi 2063** make it necessary for UNDP to evaluate its country programme to assess its relevance, focus and effectiveness of its strategies, among other areas.

1. **4. Purpose, Scope and Objectives of the Evaluation**

**4.1 Purpose of the evaluation**

The evaluation is being conducted to assess progress towards achieving CP outcomes. The evaluation will capture evaluative evidence on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of current programme, which can be used to strengthen it going forward and to set the stage for new initiatives. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results. The evaluation will provide an opportunity for UNDP to engage key stakeholders to discuss achievements, lessons learned, and adjustments required in response to an evolving development landscape including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and changing national priorities.

**4.2 Evaluation Scope**

The mid-term evaluation will be conducted between 1 September and 39 November, 2021, with a view to compiling what the programme has achieved so far while reviewing its strategic direction in view of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and other emerging priorities for the country. The evaluation will cover the period January 2019 to June 2021 and will specifically assess:

The relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP CO support to national development agenda, which has been articulated in the Malawi 2063 along with its first 10-year implementation plan.

1. The progress made towards achieving the CP outcomes and outputs through specific projects and advisory services including contributing factors and constraints.
2. The relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability of the Country Programme.
3. The extent to which cross-cutting issues including gender equality, youth development, innovation and human rights were considered.
4. The lessons learnt from the experience with the design and implementation of programmes.

The evaluation will take into account the findings of independent project evaluations and reviews conducted since January 2019. The evaluation will also consider the findings of the COVID-19 pandemic socioeconomic impact study and the UN Country Assessment report, 2020.

**4.3 Evaluation Objectives**

The objectives of the mid-term evaluation are to:

* Assess progress towards achieving outcomes and outputs in the Country Programme Document;
* Review of factors which positively and negatively influenced the achievement of results;
* Examine the strategic positioning and relevance of UNDP in the sectors covered by the CP – the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps - especially with regard to the appropriateness of their partnership strategy (including choice of beneficiaries), their Theory of Change (ToC), and any need for midcourse adjustments to meet the outcomes;
* Analyse and advise on the positioning and focus during the remaining period of the CP taking into account current Malawi’s development context, emerging national priorities and UNDP’s new direction;
* Assess the sustainability of results being achieved during the implementation of the Country Programme;
* Assess the internal coherence of the programme and the extent to which portfolio management was practiced;
* Assess the extent to which gender was mainstreamed in the design, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the country programme;
* Assess the extent to which youth development and innovation are being applied in planning, implementation and reporting processes;
* Assess and analyze the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Country Programme and its contribution to development results.
* Distil lessons learnt and provide recommendation for future programming, including to inform higher level evaluations and future decision-making and planning for the remainder of the programme cycle.

1. **5. Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The evaluation seeks to answer the following questions, focused around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability:

**Relevance**: The extent to which the programme design and implementation were suited to national priorities and realities and UN commitments:

* Are the intended outputs and outcomes aligned with the key development strategies of the country? Are they consistent with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries?
* Do the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the human development goals of the country?
* To what extent has UNDP Malawi selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context of the country?
* Has UNDP Malawi been influential in Country debates on CPD-related initiatives and has it influenced policies on any of the thematic areas?
* How effectively has the CP been structured? How has the surrounding structure in which the CP operates affected its delivery?
* To what extent did the CP incorporate the UNSDF principles?
* To what extent has UNDP applied the integrator role in the delivery of SDGs?

**Effectiveness**: the extent to which the CP is achieving its intended outcomes and outputs.

* Are the stated outputs being achieved? Are they contributing to the stated outcomes?
* What level of progress towards outcomes has been made as measured by the outcome indicators presented in the results framework. What evidence is there that UNDP support is contributing towards an improvement in the country’s capacity, including institutional strengthening in the thematic areas of the CP?
* What are the key strategic and policy advisory contributions that UNDP has made/is making in outcome areas, if any?
* Is UNDP utilizing innovative techniques and best practices in its programming initiatives and processes?
* Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP Malawi CO, is UNDP well suited to providing the respective thematic support in the country?
* What/How is the quality of expertise provided to the partner government institutions?
* To what extent have UN reforms influenced UNDP Malawi’s support in the country and in what sectors?
* What contributing factors and impediments are enhancing or impeding UNDP performance in various areas of the CP?
* How useful has the knowledge and skills transfer proven to be so far?
* How can the effectiveness of support to the CP be strengthened in remaining period?

**Efficiency:** measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.

* Are UNDP approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcomes? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?
* Are the results being delivered in a reasonable proportion to the operational and other costs?
* Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Could a different type of intervention lead to similar results at a lower cost? How?
* Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP Malawi CO has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?
* To what extent has UNDP applied portfolio management, taking advantage of opportunities?

**Sustainability:**

* What is the likelihood that UNDP’s interventions are sustainable?
* Are there exit strategies in place for different programmes and projects?
* What mechanisms have been put in place by UNDP Malawi to support the government/ institutional partners to sustain improvements made through these CP interventions?
* What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?

1. **Partnership strategy**

* Has the partnership strategy as indicated in the CPD and projects been appropriate and effective?
* Are there current or potential complementarities or overlaps with existing regional partners’ programmes?
* How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs/outcomes?
* Has UNDP worked effectively with donors to deliver on the CP initiatives?
* How effective has UNDP been in partnering with civil society (where applicable) and the private sector to promote its initiatives in the Country?

The evaluation should also include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

**Human rights – Leaving no-one behind.**

* To what extent have poor and physically challenged and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP CPD interventions?

1. **Gender Equality and Women Empowerment**

* To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of CPD interventions? Is gender marker data assigned the projects representative of reality
* To what extent has UNDP promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?

1. **Capacity Building**

* Did the CPD adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency?
* Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc. where applicable) delivered by different interventions adapted to country needs?

Based on the above analysis, the evaluator is expected to provide overarching conclusions on UNDP Malawi CO results in this areas of support, as well as recommendations on how the UNDP could adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that the CPD portfolio fully achieves current planned outcomes and is positioned for sustainable results in the future. The evaluation is additionally expected to offer lessons for UNDP support in country and elsewhere based on this analysis.

**6.**  **Methodology and approach**

The evaluation is taking place during a COVID 19 pandemic and the evaluation will be expected to fully comply with measures instituted by government authorities to contain and prevent its spread. The government has imposed restrictions on the number people who can gather, mandatory wearing of face masks in all public places and other measures concerning public transport. **No stakeholders, evaluators or UNDP staff should be put in harm’s way and safety is the key priority.**

The steps in data collection will include but not limited to the following:

**Desk reviews**: Evaluators will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following: i) national programme documents; ii) project documents and activity reports; iii) past evaluation/ selfassessment reports; iv) client surveys on support services provided to institutions if any; v) country office reports; vi) UNDP’s corporate strategies and reports; and viii) government, media, academic publications. Annex 2 has a list of some of the documents which will be available for review.

**Interviews and focus group discussions**: In view of COVID 19 restrictions, it is expected that as far as possible interviews will be conducted virtually. Only in exceptional cases and under strict COVID 19 preventive measures are observed will evaluators be allowed to conduct face-to-face interviews.

The evaluation team will be comprised of international and two national consultants. COVID 19 preventive measures permitting, national consultants will conduct data collection field visits. In case of travel restrictions even for local experts options for remote interviews such as through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.) will be explored. The international consultant will work remotely with national evaluators. Stakeholders to be interviewed by the evaluators will include: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) at the Country Office; and ii) programme coordinators, policy makers, beneficiary and target groups; iii) donors/development partners and iv) UN agency staff. Focus groups may be organized as appropriate. Annex 3 provides a preliminary list of stakeholders.

**Field visits**: COVID 19 preventive measures permitting, the evaluator will visit selected programme sites to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. A case study approach may be used, as appropriate, to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the programme. The evaluation team will determine the approach best suitable to conduct the evaluation.

**7. Deliverables**

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

* Inception report
* Draft CP Evaluation Report
* Presentation at virtual validation workshop with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
* Lessons Learned report
* Final report on the CP Evaluation
* Evaluation audit trail detailing how comments, questions and clarifications have been addressed.

One week after start date of the consultancy, the evaluation team leader will produce and submit an **inception report** containing the proposed theory of change for UNDPs work under the different outcomes. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. Annex 4 provides a simple matrix template.

The inception report will include any special arrangements or methods aimed at ensuring collection of adequate data in a COVID 19 pandemic restrictive environment. It will clarify the division of labour between the consultants.

The evaluator will also propose a rating scale for assessment the performance of UNDP in each of four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability.

The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Interview protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The inception report will be approved by the Evaluation Manager in consultation with the Senior Management of CO and taking into account comments of the evaluation reference group.

The **draft evaluation report** will be shared with stakeholders/reference group members and presented in a validation workshop (if applicable). Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluator will produce an ‘audit trail’ indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the **final report**.

A **lessons learnt report** will also be produced and discussed during the validation workshop. Feedback received should be taken into consideration when preparing the lessons learned report. The lessons learned report should cover the different facets country programme implemented by the CO. This reports should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

A lump sum amount payable modality is envisaged upon submission of deliverables and acceptance/approval by UNDP CO for each identified deliverable.

The lump sum amount is inclusive of all the costs related to the assignment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable/ activities** | **Proposed Payment (Percentage)** |
| Payment upon submission and acceptances of an **Inception Report** | 20Percentage |
| Payment upon submission and acceptances of draft report. | 40Percentage |
| Payment upon submission of an acceptable of assignment and endorsement of the evaluation report by UNDP Country Office | 40Percentage |

8. **Proposed Work Plan and Indicative Timeline**

It is planned that the evaluation starts in October, 2021 and shall expire on the satisfactory completion of the services of the services described above by 30 November, 2021.

The following schedule of activities is only illustrative, and a final timeline will need to be refined and presented by the evaluator to the Reference Group:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMELINE - Tentative** | **ACTIVITY** |
| By end of 1st week | Contract Signature and Submission of Inception Report |
| End of 4th week | Data collection |
| End of 6th week | Preparation and Submission of Draft report |
| End of 8th week | Review of draft report and comments |
| End of 9th week | Stakeholders workshop |
| End of 10th week | Submission of final report |

**9. Evaluation Required Competencies**

The evaluation will be conducted by three evaluators: a principal evaluator who will be team leader and team members who will focus on aspects of the Country Programme as follows, Team Member I: Inclusive business, access to clean energy and climate adaptation and resilience to shocks, and Team Member II: inclusive governance, accountable institutions and civic engagement*.* The team members will be national experts while the team leader will be searched globally.

**9.1 Required Qualifications and Experience of the Principal Evaluator/Team leader**

* Minimum Master’s degree in economics, political science, public administration, development studies, international relations or other related social sciences;
* Minimum 10 years of professional experience in at least three subject areas of UNDP Malawi’s work: i) inclusive governance and public sector management; ii) civic engagement; iii) inclusive business models and private sector development, iv) climate resilience and adaptation to shocks; and v) access to clean energy;
* Proven experience in conducting evaluations of national policies, strategies or programmes of government and international aid organisations with a **minimum of three of those evaluations in a leading role**.
* At least 3 years of knowledge and experience in gender mainstreaming
* Fluent in written and spoken English.

The evaluator will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of the draft and final evaluation report.

**9.2 Required qualifications and experience of team members:**

**Team member 1 – inclusive and sustainable growth:**

* Minimum of Master’s degree natural, applied sciences or social science.
* Minimum of 7 years’ experience in any two of the following fields: resilience building, entrepreneurship development, renewable energy.

**Team member 2 – Inclusive governance, citizen engagement and effective institutions:**

* Minimum of Masters’degree in political science, public administration, law, development studies, international relations or other related social sciences.
* Minimum of 7 year’s experience in the following areas: democratic governance and human rights, accountable institutions and civic engagement.

**9.3 Evaluator’s competencies:**

* Team work skills
* Work planning skills
* Strategic thinking
* Strong analytical, reporting and communication skills
* Result oriented

**10. Evaluation Ethics**

The evaluation must be carried out in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’ and sign the Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations. In particular, evaluators must be free and clear of perceived conflicts of interest. To this end, interested consultants will not be considered if they were directly and substantively involved, as an employee or consultant, in the formulation of UNDP programme documents relating to the outcomes under review. The code of conduct and an agreement form to be signed by each consultant

11. **Management and conduct of evaluation:**

The UNDP CO will select the evaluator through an open process, and will be responsible for the management of the evaluation exercise. The UNDP M&E Specialist will be the evaluation manager. He will work closely with two Programme Portfolio Managers. Each programme portfolio will assign a Programme Analyst to support the M&E Specialist including:

* Compilation of documents and background materials for the review team;
* Stakeholder mapping of the main partners;  Preliminary Itinerary of field visit;
* Linking and liaising within UNDP CO as well as with Implementing Partners and other stakeholders.

The M&E Specialist will arrange introductory meetings within CO and the two Programme Portfolio Managers and will establish initial contacts with partners and project staff. The evaluators will take responsibility for setting up meetings and conducting the evaluation, subject to advanced approval of the methodology submitted in the inception report. The Management of the CO will develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations within two weeks of report finalization. The evaluation mission will be facilitated by Operations and Programme Sections for other logistical support along the process.

An evaluation Reference Group will be set up in order to ensure a quality evaluation report. Specific tasks of the Reference Group will be to review and provide guidance to the evaluation process, review and comment on draft inception and evaluation reports, facilitate access to information, among others. The evaluation Reference Group will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluator is required to address all comments of the reference group completely and comprehensively using an audit trail matrix. The Evaluator will provide a detail rationale for any comment that remain unaddressed.

The composition of the Reference Group:

* Debt and Aid Management Division, Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development o Ministry of Economic Planning and Development o Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining; o Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development o Ministries of Industry, Trade and Tourism Development o Ministry of Gender, Child Welfare and People with Disabilities o Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
* Public Sector Reforms Management Unit, Office of the President and Cabinet o National Statistics Office
* UNRCO
* UN Agencies (UNFPA, UNWomen and UNICEF)
* At least three development partners (two bi-lateral and 1 multi-lateral partner) o Civil Society Organization (CSO) o Academic institution o Malawi Confederation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (MCCCI).

Availability: The consultant should be available between 1 September and 30 November, 2021.

**12. Criteria for Selection of Best Offer**

Offers received will be evaluated using a Combined Scoring method, where the qualifications and proposed methodology will be weighted 70Percentage, and combined with the price offer, which will be weighted 30Percentage.

Criteria to be used for rating the qualifications and methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The proposals will be evaluated using the cumulative analysis method with a split 70Percentage technical and 30Percentage financial scoring. The proposal with the highest cumulative scoring will be awarded the contract. Applications will be evaluated technically, and points are attributed based on how well the proposal meets the requirements of the Terms of Reference using the guidelines detailed in the table below:

When using this weighted scoring method, the award of the contract may be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

1. Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weighting; 70Percentage
* Financial Criteria weighting; 30Percentage

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points in the Technical Evaluation would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Points** | **Percentage** |
| **Qualification** |  | **10Percentage** |
| A. Minimum Master’s degree in social or applied sciences, development studies or international relations. | 10 |  |
| **Experience** |  | **45Percentage** |
| B. Minimum 10 years of professional experience in at least two subject areas of UNDP Malawi’s work: democratic governance and public sector management; environment, natural resources, disaster risk and climate change management; inclusive and sustainable growth | 15 |  |
| C. Proven experience in conducting evaluations of national policies, strategies or programmes of government and international aid organisations, with a minimum of three of the evaluations in a leading role; | 20 |  |
| D. At least 3 years of knowledge and experience in gender mainstreaming | 10 |  |
| E. Proposed evaluation methodology - not more than 2 pages. | 15Percentage | 15Percentage |
| **Technical Criteria** |  | 70Percentage |
|  |  |  |
| **Financial Criteria – Lowest Price** |  | 30Percentage |
| **Total** |  | **100Percentage** |

**13. Documents to be included when submitting Consultancy Proposals**

The following documents may be requested:

1. Latest updated Curriculum vitae (CV) or Resume
2. Duly executed **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP. **Template of Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability can be accessible from this**
3. **UNDP Malawi Procurement page**

**c) Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided. If an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must stipulate that arrangement at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

**14. Lump-sum contracts**

The financial proposal shall specify a total lump-sum amount, and payment terms around specific and measurable (qualitative and quantitative) deliverables (i.e. whether payments fall in instalments or upon completion of the entire contract). Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR. In order to assist the requesting unit in the comparison of financial proposals, the financial proposal will include a breakdown of this lump-sum amount (including travel, living expenses, and number of anticipated working days).

**15. Travel**

In general, UNDP should not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy return class ticket; should the IC wish to travel on a higher class, they should do so using their own resources.

In the case of unforeseeable travel, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging, and terminal expenses should be agreed upon, between the respective business unit and Individual Consultant, prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

**16. Submission Instructions**

Proposals should be submitted on or before the deadline as indicated below. Proposals must be submitted using this generic email etenderbox.mw@undp.org, **with the Mandatory email subject: Individual Consultancy for Team Leader for Mid Term Evaluation of UNDP Malawi Country Programme 2019 to 2023 - IC/MWI/033-2021 (bids will not be considered, if failed to adhere to this instruction)** address only.

Incomplete proposals and failure to comply with proposal submission instruction will not be considered or will result in disqualification of proposal.

Completed proposals should be submitted using no later than **31st August 2021 (Malawi Time).**

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to Tirnesh Prasad on procurement.mw@undp.org CC: tirnesh.prasad@undp.org. Only written communication will be responded.

UNDP looks forward to receiving your Proposal and thank you in advance for your interest in UNDP procurement opportunities.

**This TOR is approved by**:

Name and Designation Shigeki Komatsubara

Resident Representative UNDP Malawi

# Evaluation workplan

The following workplan was used for this evaluation:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Start date** | **End date** |
| **Design of the inception report** | Oct 24 | Oct 31 |
| **Submission of the inception report** |  | Oct 31 |
| **Arrival Team Lead in Malawi** |  | Fri Nov 5 |
| **Coordination meeting between ET members** |  | Sat Nov 6 |
| **Introductory Meeting with UNDP Evaluation Manager** |  | Nov 8 |
| **Meeting between ET and Evaluation Reference group** |  | Nov 8 |
| **Finalization of the Inception report** |  | Nov 8 |
| **Interviews in Lilongwe and in the field** | Nov 9 | Nov 13 |
| **Interviews UNDP Lilongwe** |  | Nov 14 |
| **Debriefing UNDP** |  | Nov 15 |
| **Team lead departure from Malawi** |  | Nov 15 |
| **National team members field work- Continued** | Nov 15 | Dec 20 |
| **Data analysis** | Dec 20 | Dec 30 |
| **Submission Evaluation Draft report** |  | Jan 14 |
| **Stakeholders workshop** |  | Jan 20 |
| **Final report submission** |  | Jan 25 |

# Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevant Evaluation Criteria | Key Evaluation Questions | Sub-questions | Sources of data | Data collection methods |
| 1.Relevance | **1.1.** How relevant and appropriate has been the UNDP interventions to national policies and strategies? | **1.1.1**. To what extent were project stakeholders including beneficiaries involved in the formulation and design of the project | Grant Agreement, Appraisal Report, feedback from IPs/RPs | Project documents review and analysis, interviews with UNDP Projects Staff, face to face interviews beneficiaries, and officials |
| 1.1.2 Were projects or key interventions consistent and complementary with other interventions in the main areas of private sector development, renewable energy access, climate adaptation and resilience to shocks, and effective, accountable and inclusive governance in the country? | UNDP AWPs, Evaluation reports and Feedback from Ips and stakeholders | Document review, project progress reports and analysis and stakeholder interview |
| 1.1.3 To what extent has UNDP's selected approach /method of delivery appropriate to the development context? | UNDP AWPs, Evaluation reports and Feedback from Ips and stakeholders | Document review, project progress reports and analysis and stakeholder interview |
| 1.1.4 To what extent have UN reforms influenced the relevance of UNDP support to the Government of Malawi? | Projects documents- Appraisal, Projects Evaluation reports, Progress reports | Documents review and face to face interview with project implementation team |
| 2. Effectiveness | **2.1** What are the main contributions to development for which UNDP is recognized in Malawi? | 2.1.1 What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP performance in this area? | Projects Reports, Projects Evaluation reports, Project completion report, Private Sector and, UNDP | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| 2.1.2 Is UNDP well suited and well perceived to support Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives in Malawi? | Project Reports, UNDP UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
|  | **2.2** How has the programme achieved expected outcomes? | **2.2.1** How effective have been practices and tools used in the programme? (support to local initiatives, best practices, institutional strengthening) | Projects Reports, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| **2.2.2** How effective has UNDP been in partnering with development partners, civil society and private sector in Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development? | Projects Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| **2.3** What are the unexpected outcomes or consequences it yielded? What are their implications? | **2.3.1** What challenges were experienced and how did it affect the achievement of the desired outcomes | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| **2.3.2**. Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming in these areas? | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| 3.Efficiency | **3.1. To what** extent was the management adequate to the planning and execution requirements? | **3.1.1** Was the management Arrangements, Work Planning appropriate? Finance and co-finance, value for money, Timing and delays, Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, Stakeholder Engagement, Reporting, Communications). | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Documents review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| **3.2** Strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the CP interventions? |  | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| **3.3**.Critically analyse the implementation, coordination and feedback mechanisms for  Integrating lessons and recommendations into the CP decision making cycle. | **3.3.1**. what were the systems and mechanisms used for tracking performance of the project How did the project monitoring and evaluation frame work influenced co-ordination and decision making | Project beneficiaries, UNDP PMU, Project Reports, Aide Memoires, UNDP staff, Project Stakeholders | Document reviews and analysis  Stakeholder interviews |
| **3.4.** Assess the CP flexibility to respond to opportunities and challenges encountered during implementation | **3.4.1.** To what extent were findings and recommendations from projects reports, lessons learnt and feedback from stakeholders and partners integrated into projects planning and implementation | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Documents review and analysis  Stakeholder interviews |
| 4. Sustainability | **4.1**.Assess the sustainability of the CP interventions in terms of the likelihood of continuation after completion of UNDP funding; | **4.1.1**. Will the CP interventions benefits and results be sustained after the expiration of the UNDP funding | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Documents review and analysis  Stakeholder interviews |
| 5. Partnership and Coordination | **5.1** Aassess effectiveness and appropriateness of the collaborations and partnerships that were established to deliver support on the CPD and UNDAF. | Partnership with Government | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| Partnership with development partners | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| Partnership with NGOs and non-profit associations | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| 6. Human Rights | **6.1** Assessment of UNDP's promotion of Human Rights in its program design and implementation | **6.1.1** To what extent do the poor, vulnerable, indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP's work? | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| 7. Gender Equality | **7.1** The extent to which UNDP has promoted positive changes in gender equality in its Governance, Inclusive Growth and Sustainable Development initiatives? | **7.1.1**To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring and reporting? Is gender marker data assigned to projects representative of reality (focus should be placed on gender marker 2 and 3 projects)? | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholder interview |
| **7.1.2** Are there any unintended effects? Information collected should be checked against data from the UNDP country office' Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period 2018 - 2021. | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholders interview |
| 8.Coherence | 8.1 How are UNDP Malawi interventions aligned with Malawi Development agenda? | 8.1.1 To what extent are UNDP interventions coherent with other interventions which have similar objectives in Malawi? | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholders interview |
| 8.1.2 To what extent are the interventions, promoted by UNDP Malawi coherent internally? | Projects Reports, Aide Memoires, Projects Steering Committee Meetings Minutes, UNDP Project staff, UNDP Beneficiaries, Officials | Document review and analysis stakeholders interview |
| 8.1.3 To what extent are the interventions supported by UNDP Malawi coherent with Malawi Development priorities and policies? | Project Reports, UNDP PMU, UNDP staff, Aide Memoires and Mission Reports. Stakeholders | Document review and analysis stakeholders interview |

# Data collection tools

## Interview Guide with UNDP Management team

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What are the key changes in the country context that have affected your programme?   1. From the beginning of the CPD (excluding COVID) 2. From the effects of the COVID pandemic in 2020?  * How did they affect your programme? * What do you propose can be done? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. What are the key results that have been achieved thru the project portfolio?   1. From the beginning of the CPD (excluding COVID) 2. Since the UN SEF is the reference?  * Are you satisfied with these results [can further probe this by using rating scale] rating 1 - 5 - What factors have affected results achievement? * Are there any unintended results? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Has implementation gone according to plan?   1. From the beginning of the CPD (excluding COVID) 2. From the effects of the COVID pandemic in 2020?  * What challenges have been faced? * What can be done to mitigate them? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. What do you see as the major risks that will affect sustainability of results achieved by the projects? a) From the beginning of the CPD (excluding COVID)  b) From the effects of the COVID pandemic in 2020?  - What can/should be done about it? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. What are the major lessons you have learned to date; and what changes in the programme would you want to see to address challenges? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Do you find the CPD still relevant to the current context? If not, why? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. In which areas is UNDP demonstrating its comparative advantage? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Who are your main partners? What is their added value for UNDP? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. How strong is your partnership strategy – explain why? | | | | | 1 to 5 | | |  | | | | | | |
| 10. How much have you been able to development our partner’s capacity – | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 to 5 | |  |
| 11. How much is gender responsiveness embedded in your interventions – | | | | | | | | | | | 1 to 5 | |  | |
| 12. How much have you been able to influence policy making? Why? | | | | | | | | | 1 to 5 |  | | | | |
| 13. How much are your interventions catalytic? Why? | | | | 1 to 5 | |  | | | | | | | | |
| 14. How much is resilience used in implementation of your interventions? A) at individual/household | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| level b) at local institutions/systems level | | | – 1 to 5 scale | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. Does UNDP have a good geographical coverage for its interventions? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. Should UNDP develop area-based programming in Malawi? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. Is there sufficient coordination and communication amongst the three CO pillars | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. Are the government priorities clear? Why or why not? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. How important is UNDP’s role as SDG integrator in Malawi – | | | | | | | 1 to 5 | |  | | | | | |
| 20. Are you able to obtain funding for those interventions UNDP see as a priority? Why or why not? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21. Are you using the 5 accelerators (equity and inclusiveness, gender responsive recovery, digital transformation, environmental sustainability, preparedness and prevention) as a specific brand or approach of UNPD and the UN? If so, which of the five and in which manner? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22. How good is the relationship with the UNRCO and the UNCT? Why? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23. How visible is UNDP in Malawi? | 1 to 5 |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24. Is there a good collaboration with the other actors in the HA-Development-peace nexus? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25. Do you have the necessary tools to report and inform on the results you achieve? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26. Any other comments/suggestions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Monitoring and Evaluation staff

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name:** | **Title of the person interviewed:** |
| **Institution/Partner:** |  |
| **Date:** |  |
| **Questions** | **Response** |
| 1. How relevant have UNDP’s programmes in Malawi and the projects been aligned with the needs and priorities of the government of Malawi, the SADC, the target institutions and the focal beneficiaries? |  |
| 1. Are the interventions consistent with UNDP’s development policies (UNSCDF, CPD)) and priorities? |  |
| 1. Are the interventions consistent and complementary with activities supported by other programmes in the UN and/or by other donor organizations? |  |
| 1. Are the interventions, including the assumptions on which the project's intervention logic and outputs, consistent with the intended impact? |  |
| 1. Are the projects’ logic and design consistent with the development priorities and policies of Malawi and UNDP? |  |
| 1. Do all UNDP projects have a clear and comprehensive M&E system? |  |
| 1. To what extent do UNDP project have SMART targets with appropriate, unambiguous performance indicators? |  |
| 1. Do UNDP and its staff regularly track and document the performance of each indicator? |  |
| 1. How is the UNDP M&E framework being used in the Country programme and across projects? |  |
| 1. Does each project have to produce regular progress reports? Any annual performance report? |  |
| 1. To what extent is the information in the progress reports analyzed, aggregated and shared with stakeholders? |  |
| 1. To what extent is the information from the programme/projects M&E systems, used to make decisions regarding the Country programme? |  |
| 1. How flexible has the management of the projects adapted to unforeseen external factors? |  |
| 1. What has been the impact so far? (Intended and unintended, positive and negative)? |  |
| 1. Were the identified risks effectively addressed, resulting in minimal impact to the program? |  |
| 1. To what extent have cross-cutting issues such as gender and social inclusion and environmental impact been integrated into the project activities? |  |
| 1. Have you learned any lessons from UNDP programming, which could be helpful to improve future implementation of development interventions? |  |
| 1. Would you have any suggestions on how to improve the implementation of future UNDP Malawi projects? |  |
| 1. Other comments including potential key documents to review: | |

## Other UNDP Project staff (Non-M&E)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name:** | **Title of the person interviewed:** |
| **Institution/Partner:** |  |
| **Date:** |  |
| **Questions** | **Response** |
| 1. Name of the project |  |
| 1. Are the interventions consistent with the partner priorities? |  |
| 1. Are the projects’ logic of intervention still relevant to the needs of the final beneficiaries? |  |
| 1. Are the objectives still relevant, valid and consistent with the different needs of the direct beneficiaries? |  |
| 1. Are the interventions, including the assumptions on which the project's intervention logic and outputs consistent with the intended impact? |  |
| 1. Are the interventions consistent and complementary with activities supported by other programmes in UNDP and/or by other donor organisations? |  |
| 1. Were the identified risks effectively addressed resulting in minimal impact to the program? |  |
| 1. Are the projects’ logic and design consistent with the partner's development priorities and policies and the country? |  |
| 1. What are the nature, quantity and quality of results against those intended? What difference was made in the life of the intended beneficiaries? |  |
| 1. To what extent have the project's interventions contributed to institutional strengthening for the partner? |  |
| 1. Which capacities of stakeholders were changed? Are there systemic changes? |  |
| 1. If gender mainstreaming targets were set at the programme’s inception, did the programme achieve the targets; if not were there any significant achievements regarding addressing gender issues? 2. Is there any significant evidence to demonstrate that if the project had not taken place, the results achieved would not have been attained? |  |
| 1. To what extent have cross-cutting issues such as gender and social inclusion and environmental impact been integrated into the project's activities? |  |
| 1. How flexible has the management of the projects adapted to unforeseen external factors? |  |
| 1. How efficient have the projects been? What is the average proportion of cost to management and oversight versus direct delivery? |  |
| 1. To what extent do the project set-up, team competence and organizational structure support the collaboration between projects stakeholders |  |
| 1. What innovations or best practices have been used during the delivery? |  |
| 1. With hindsight, could the projects have been delivered more cost-effectively and efficiently? |  |
| 1. What has been the impact so far? (Intended and unintended, positive and negative)? |  |
| 1. How did UNDP and its partners mitigate the impact of the negative intended and unintended results? |  |
| 1. Is there any evidence that there will be the sustainability of the project outcomes and impact as well as institutional capacity and sustainability after the end? Has there been sustainable capacity built among the partners who could be built on in the case of a future partnership? |  |
| 1. Other comments including potential key documents to review: | |

## Partner staff

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name:** | **Title of the person interviewed:** |
| **Institution/Partner:** |  |
| **Date:** |  |
| **Questions** | **Response** |
| 1. Name of the project |  |
| 1. How does the interventions under this project address your needs? |  |
| 1. Are the projects’ logic of intervention still relevant to your needs? |  |
| 1. Are the objectives still relevant, valid and consistent with the different needs of the direct beneficiaries? |  |
| 1. Were the institutional partnerships selected the most appropriate for attaining the programmes objectives? Were all the required partners adequately engaged? |  |
| 1. Which capacities of stakeholders were changed? Are there systemic changes? |  |
| 1. If gender mainstreaming targets were set at the programme’s inception, did the programme achieve the targets; if not were there any significant achievements regarding addressing gender issues? 2. Is there any significant evidence to demonstrate that the results achieved would not have been attained if the programme had not taken place? |  |
| 1. What innovations or best practices have been used during the delivery? |  |
| 1. What has been the impacts of your project so far? (Intended and unintended, positive and negative)? |  |
| 1. How did UNDP and your institution/enterprise mitigate the impact of the negative intended and unintended results? |  |
| 1. To what extent have cross-cutting issues such as gender and social inclusion and environmental impact been integrated into the project activities? |  |
| 1. Is there any evidence that there will be sustainability of the project outcomes and impact as well as institutional capacity and sustainability after the end? Has there been sustainable capacity built among the partners who could be built on in the case of a future partnership? |  |
| 1. How flexible has the management of the projects adapted to unforeseen external factors? |  |
| 1. To what extent do the project set-up, team competence and organizational structure support the collaboration between projects stakeholders |  |
| 1. What innovations or best practices have been used during the delivery? |  |
| 1. With hindsight, could the project have been delivered in a more cost-effective and efficient manner? |  |
| 1. What has been the impact so far? (Intended and unintended, positive and negative)? |  |
| 1. How did UNDP and your institution/enterprise/group mitigate the impact of the negative intended and unintended results? |  |
| 1. Is there any evidence that there will be the sustainability of the project outcomes and impact as well as institutional capacity and sustainability after the end? Has there been sustainable capacity built among the partners who could be built on in the case of a future partnership? |  |
| 1. Other comments including potential key documents to review: | |

## Interview Guide for Donor Personnel

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CPD Outcome** | **Donor partners and their contributions** |
| Enhancing economic innovation, inclusive business, job creation, and renewable energy access; | DfID, GDC,UNIDO, IFAD, Government of Norway; GEF Agencies; |
| scaling up climate adaptation and resilience to shocks; | UNICEF; WFP; World Bank; GEF; Green Climate Fund; Government of China |
| Strengthening effective, accountable and inclusive governance that promotes civic engagement, respect for human rights, rule of law, peace and democracy. | EU, USAID, GDC, DfID, Irish Aid, Royal Norwegian Embassy |

**Introduction**

Consultants introduce themselves

Consultants state the objectives of the evaluation generally and of the interview specifically;

Consultants seek consent for the interview.

Representatives of the Donor partner introduce themselves and describe their specific roles/designations;

Representatives of the implementing partners grant consent for the interview.

**Entry Questions**

You have a financing partnership with UNDP under which you are supporting interventions aimed at contributing to achieving outcomes under the UNDP Country program (2019-2023):

To what projects are you making your contributions?

What UNDP country program outcome (s) are you contributing to?

What are the specific results (output level) that you are most interested in?

What is the size of your financial contribution?

What is the lifespan of your financial contribution?

**Relevance**

What attracted you to finance development and governance interventions through UNDP given that you could do so through other partners?

Half in the lifespan of the UNDP country program, do you feel the design and implementation of the UNDP programs that you support are ‘fit for purpose’ in relation to Malawi’s priorities and realities? (probe)

What areas of the program that you support, do you think will require adjustments to adequately align with the MW 2063 and the Ten year plan?

So far, how would you describe the influence of UNDP in sectoral or national debates on the thematic areas/issues for which you provide financing?

In the last two and half years, what are the key strategic and policy advisory contributions that UNDP has made/is making in the area that you support?

**Effectiveness:**

In your view, is the UNDP country program achieving its intended results especially in the area for which you provided finances?

What would you cite as evidence that UNDP support is contributing towards an improvement in the country’s capacity, including institutional strengthening in the thematic area of your work/project?

In your view and based on the experiences of your project/program, is UNDP using innovative techniques and best practices in its programming initiatives and processes?

**Efficiency: measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.**

Based on what you have seen so far, how adequate are the resources available to achieve the planned results?

Do the conceptual framework (ToC) and UNDP’s approach to achieve the planned outcomes to which you are contributing, sufficiently catalyze efficiency?

Are the conceptual framework (ToC) for the outcome to which you are contributing and UNDP’s approach sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?

In your view are the results being delivered in a reasonable proportion to the operational and other costs?

How could the resources available be optimized to achieve more and better (i.e. Maximize results) in your sector?

Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP Malawi country office has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?

In your view, and based on what has happened in your sector of work, how has UNDP applied portfolio management, taking advantage of opportunities?

**Sustainability**

What sustainability mechanisms are built into your financing arrangement with UNDP?

What exit strategies have been put place for your financing?

**Partnership strategy**

What elements of your partnership with UNDP do you like most? Why?

What elements of your partnership with UNDP don’t you like? Why? What would you suggest to improve them?

How do you relate or collaborate with other donors that support interventions under UNDP Country program? In your view, what aspects need improved coordination and why?

What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?

**Capacity Building**

In your view and based on your experiences, did UNDP support adequately invest in, and focus on capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency?

In your view, how well does UNDP use knowledge products (reports, studies, etc. where applicable) delivered by different interventions to adapt to country needs in their programming?

\*\*\*\*

## Interview Guide for Implementing partners

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CPD Outcome** | **Implementing partners** |
| Enhancing economic innovation, inclusive business, job creation, and renewable energy access; |  |
| scaling up climate adaptation and resilience to shocks; |  |
| Strengthening effective, accountable and inclusive governance that promotes civic engagement, respect for human rights, rule of law, peace and democracy. | OPC, Malawi Electoral Commission, Public Affairs Committee; local councils;Multi-Party Liaison Committees, UN-Women, District peace committees; CMD, National Registration Bureau  CSOs. |

**Introduction**

Consultants introduce themselves

Consultants state the objectives of the evaluation generally and of the interview specifically;

Consultants seek consent for the interview.

Representatives of the implementing partners introduce themselves and describe their specific roles/designations;

Representatives of the implementing partners grant consent for the interview.

**Entry Questions**

You have a partnership with UNDP under which you are carrying out work aimed at contributing to achieving outcomes under the UNDP Country program (2019-2023):

Under what project are you making your contributions?

What UNDP country program outcome (s) are you contributing to?

What are the specific results (output level) that you are working to achieve?

What is the size of your project/program in terms of budget? Coverage?

What is the lifespan of your project/program?

**Relevance**

From the perspective of your project or program:

Is the design and implementation of the UNDP program ‘fit for purpose’ in relation to Malawi’s priorities and realities? (probe)

How the results you seek to achieve together with UNDP aligned to or responsive to the MGDS III? SDGs?

What areas of your program, do you think will require adjustments to adequately align with the MW 2063 and the Ten year plan?

In your view, how appropriate is UNDP’s method of delivery on the desired results given Malawi’s development context as you know it?

Drawing on the experiences in your sector of work, how would you describe the influence of UNDP in sectoral or national debates on any of the thematic areas/issues? What are the key strategic and policy advisory contributions that UNDP has made/is making in outcome areas, if any?

Based on your project/program, what are your observations on how the UNDP country program has been structured? How does the structure facilitate and enable your work as well as learning? How does the structure constrain your work and learning? Does the structure permit integration and holistic approach? How does the structure allow or encourage a silo approach?

**Effectiveness:**

In your view, and based on your project/program, is the UNDP country program achieving its intended outcomes and outputs? How?

Based on your program/project, are the outputs you have achieved so far logically linked to the relevant desired outcomes under the UNDP country program? (Probe if discrepancies are reported)

What would you cite as evidence that UNDP support is contributing towards an improvement in the country’s capacity, including institutional strengthening in the thematic area of your work/project?

In your view and based on the experiences of your project/program, is UNDP using innovative techniques and best practices in its programming initiatives and processes?

Given the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP Malawi, how would you describe UNDP’s suitability in providing support in your area/sector of work? Is UNDP fit for purpose? What factors would you say enhance or impede UNDP performance’s in your sector of work?

How would you describe the quality of expertise provided by UNDP to your institution or sector of work? How useful has the knowledge and skills transfer proven to be so far?

How can the effectiveness of support by UNDP to your institution/sector be strengthened in remaining period of the CP?

**Efficiency: measurement of the outputs in relation to the inputs.**

Based on your project, how adequate are the resources available to achieve the planned results?

Do the conceptual framework (ToC) and UNDP’s approach to achieve the planned outcomes to which you are contributing, sufficiently catalyze efficiency?

Are the conceptual framework (ToC) for the outcome to which you are contributing and UNDP’s approach sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?

In your view and based on the experiences of your project/program, are the results being delivered in a reasonable proportion to the operational and other costs?

How could the resources available be optimized to achieve more and better (i.e. Maximize results) in your sector?

Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP Malawi CO has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?

In your view, and based on what has happened in your sector of work, how has UNDP applied portfolio management, taking advantage of opportunities?

**Sustainability**

What sustainability mechanisms are built into the project /program you are implementing with UNDP’s support?

What exit strategies have been put place for your program or projects

What program design or implementation factors shape sustainability of the interventions and results supported by UNDP in your sector?

**Partnership strategy**

What elements of your partnership with UNDP do you like most? Why?

What elements of your partnership with UNDP don’t you like? Why? What would you suggest to improve them?

How do you relate or collaborate with other UNDP implementing partners in the sector? In your view, what aspects need improved coordination and why?

How have partnerships enabled or constrained progress towards achieving the desired results (outputs/outcomes)?

What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?

**Cross cutting issues**

How is the human rights mantra of ‘Leaving no-one behind’ behind being operationalized under the projects you are implementing with UNDP support?

How are the poor and physically challenged and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitting from UNDP-supported interventions that you are implementing?

In your view, and based on the project/program you are implementing with UNDP support, how are gender considerations addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project/program?

**Capacity Building**

In your view and based on your experiences, did UNDP support adequately invest in, and focus on capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency?

In your view and based on the experiences in your sector, how well does UNDP use knowledge products (reports, studies, etc. where applicable) delivered by different interventions to adapt to country needs in their programming?

\*\*\*\*

## FGD/Key informant Interview for community level beneficiaries

Introduction and Consent

My Name is …………………….I have been contracted, as part of a three-person team to conduct a midterm evaluation of UNDP’s Country Programme, which started in 2019 and will end in 2023. The objective of the midterm evaluation is to assess progress towards achieving the outcomes as stipulated in the Country Programme. The evaluation focusses of on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the current programme, which can strengthen it going forward and set the stage for new initiatives. The evaluation serves a vital accountability function, providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results. The evaluation will provide an opportunity for UNDP to engage critical stakeholders to discuss achievements, lessons learned, and adjustments required in response to an evolving development landscape, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and changing national priorities.

Being a beneficiary that is participating in a programme supported by UNDP, I would like to interview you to understand more about the project/programme you are implementing. I will take about an hour of your time and the information you will provide will be confidential and will not be shared with any-one except the evaluation team. So feel free to explain the programme to the best of your knowledge.

Should I continue with the interview?

Yes/No

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Beneficiary |  | | |
| Gender |  | | |
| Phone |  | | |
| Name of District Council |  | | |
| Traditional Authority |  | | |
| GVH and Village |  | | |
| Name of the UNDP Project being implemented |  | | |
| Related CP Outcome | UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #1: By 2023, Malawi has strengthened economic diversification, inclusive business, entrepreneurship, and access to clean energy  UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #2: By 2023, households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to healthy ecosystems and resilient livelihoods.  UNDAF (OR OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #3: By 2023, rights holders in Malawi access more accountable and effective institutions at the central and decentralized levels that use quality disaggregated data, offer integrated service delivery and promote civic engagement, respect for human rights and rule of law.  UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #4: By 2023, Malawi has strengthened institutions for sustaining peace, inclusive societies and participatory democracy. | | |
| Interviewer name |  | | |
| Date of interview |  | Consent given? (Y/N) |  |
| General notes/ observations |  | | |

Part A: Project activities

What activities of the UNDP supported programme is your household participating in?

Since when did you start participating in these activities?

In you household, who is specifically participating?

Explain how your household participates in the programme?

Part B: Relevance

How and why was your household selected to participate in the programme?

What problems does the programme address at your household level? Would these problems be addressed still, if there was no UNDP support?

How has the UNDP support therefore helped you address these issues?

Overall, how has the UNDP support helped or not helped you address structural and operational issues that affect livelihoods in your household?

Looking beyond, how would you structure the UNDP programme and its methods of delivery to your household to ensure effectiveness, high impact and sustainability?

How has COVID affected your organisation and the programme? To what extent was the UNDP programme able to support to your household to respond to COVID-19?

Part C: Coherence

Are your participating in any other project that implements similar activities as those of UNDP?

How did the UNDP programme work with similar projects or programmes that your household is also participating in?

Part D: Effectiveness

You have indicated that you have implemented a number of activities:

Could you explain what key benefits/achievements (short and medium term), that the UNDP programme that you are implementing has made to your household?

How have these benefits been made? Who else was involved?

What strategies worked so well and resulted into your household achieving these?

Which ones did not work that well?

What lessons can we learn from the programme so far?

What factors positively and negatively affected achievement of these benefits?

Part E: Impact

You have indicated that you have participated in a number of activities and achieved a number of outputs:

Could you explain, what changes or impacts has the UNDP supported programme made to your household?

What things are your household doing now that you would not be doing had you not been enrolled in the UNDP supported programme?

What evidence do you have that justifies that the changes you have mentioned are as a result of UNDP support? Explain how you justify causality.

Are there specific bundles of activities of activities that when combined created the most impact? In other words, which combinations of activities helped to achieve these outcomes?

Part G: Sustainability

What mechanisms has your MDA put in place to ensure that the impacts the programme supported by UNDP has delivered continue to be enjoyed by your household members beyond the UNDP support?

What risks are there that can negatively affect sustainability?

What type of support on interventions can UNDP provide in the remaining period of the CP would be required to ensure sustainability?

Part H: Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues

How have women, men, boys and girls participated in the programme?

How do you ensure that the project activities do not expose you to HIV and AIDS and COVID?

How do you make sure that project activities do not destroy the environment?

Part I Context analysis

Looking beyond the current support from UNDP, scanning the current context, what do you think UNDP should be doing to help you become resilient and wealth?

Thank you very for your participation. If you have any questions, please ask.

## Key informant Interview Guide for Ministries, Departments, Agencies (MDAs) and District Council Officials

Introduction and Consent

My Name is …………………….I have been contracted, as part of a three-person team to conduct a midterm evaluation of UNDP’s Country Programme, which started in 2019 and will end in 2023. The objective of the midterm evaluation is to assess progress towards achieving the outcomes as stipulated in the Country Programme. The evaluation focusses of on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the current programme, which can strengthen it going forward and set the stage for new initiatives. The evaluation serves a vital accountability function, providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results. The evaluation will provide an opportunity for UNDP to engage critical stakeholders to discuss achievements, lessons learned, and adjustments required in response to an evolving development landscape, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and changing national priorities.

Being an MDAs that is implementing programmes supported by UNDP, I would like to interview you to understand more about the project/programme you are implementing. I will take about an hour of your time and the information you will provide will be confidential and will not be shared with any-one except the evaluation team. So feel free to explain the programme to the best of your knowledge.

Should I continue with the interview?

Yes/No

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of the MDA |  | | | |
| Name of District Council |  | | | |
| Name of the UNDP Project being implemented |  | | | |
| Related CP Outcome | UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #1: By 2023, Malawi has strengthened economic diversification, inclusive business, entrepreneurship, and access to clean energy  UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #2: By 2023, households have increased food and nutrition security, equitable access to healthy ecosystems and resilient livelihoods.  UNDAF (OR OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #3: By 2023, rights holders in Malawi access more accountable and effective institutions at the central and decentralized levels that use quality disaggregated data, offer integrated service delivery and promote civic engagement, respect for human rights and rule of law.  UNDAF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP #4: By 2023, Malawi has strengthened institutions for sustaining peace, inclusive societies and participatory democracy. | | | |
| Respondent | Name |  | | |
| Title |  | | |
| Gender |  | | |
| Phone |  | | |
| Email |  | | |
| Interviewer name |  | | | |
| Date of interview |  | | Consent given? (Y/N) |  |
| General notes/ observations | The outcome was less. She negatively responded. Even the house she mentioned to have plastered with cement was suspicious because her income level did not change much. The house might have been coated with cement by the husband. | | | |

Part A: Project activities

What activities is your MDA implementing with financial support from UNDP?

Since when did you start implementing these activities?

In which districts are you implementing the activities?

Who are the direct beneficiaries of the project?

Explain how you implement these activities, who else is involved?

Part B: Relevance

What is the policy mandate of your MDAs?

What particular challenges affect implementation of your policies and programmes? What particular problems does the UNDP support address?

How has the UNDP support helped your MDAs to address these issues and support implementation of the policies?

Specifically, how has the UNDP programme supported you to implement the priorities of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy and the Malawi 2063?

Overall, how has the UNDP support helped or not helped your MDA address structural and operational issues that affect effectiveness of your MDAs?

Looking beyond, how would you structure the UNDP programme and its methods of delivery to your MDAs to ensure effectiveness, high impact and sustainability?

How has COVID affected your organisation and the programme? To what extent was the UNDP programme able to support to your organisation to respond to COVID-19? How satisfied were you with the response by the UNDP Programme?

Part C: Coherence

How did the UNDP programme work with similar projects or programmes that your MDAs is already or expected to implement?

How did the UNDP programme work with similar projects or programmes that other projects being implemented or expected to implement within your sector? What are the synergies?

How has the UNDP programme supported the sector to coordinate better and maximise synergy, given the saying that together everyone achieves more?

Part D: Effectiveness

You have indicated that you have implemented a number of activities:

Could you explain what key achievements (short and medium term), that the UNDP programme that you are implementing has made?

How have these achievements been made? Who else was involved?

What strategies worked so well and resulted into the MDAs achieving these?

Which ones did not work that well?

What lessons can we learn from the programme so far?

What factors positively and negatively affected achievement of your project objectives?

Part E: Efficiency

How did you implement the programme to ensure efficient use of resources and value for money?

What measures were used to ensure value for money during implementation of activities? Did you implement any costing cutting measures to achieve the same quality of implementation?

Part F: Impact

You have indicated that you have implemented a number of activities and achieved a number of outputs:

Could you explain, what changes or impacts has the UNDP supported programme made to the beneficiaries of the programme?

If the beneficiaries are institutional, what behaviours changes to the organisation has the UNDP support made or contributed to?

What evidence do you have that justifies that the changes you have mentioned are as a result of UNDP support? Explain how you justify causality.

Are there specific bundles of activities of activities that when combined created the most impact? In other words, which combinations of activities helped to achieve these outcomes?

Part G: Sustainability

What mechanisms has your MDA put in place to ensure that the impacts the programme supported by UNDP has delivered continue to be enjoyed by beneficiaries beyond the UNDP support?

What risks are there that can negatively affect sustainability?

What type of support on interventions can UNDP provide in the remaining period of the CP would be required to ensure sustainability?

Part H: Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues

Explain how you mainstreamed 1) gender, 2) HIV and AIDS, 3) climate change and resilience building, 4) youth issues, 5) disability issues and 6) COVID-19?

To what extent and how has the UNDP supported your organisation to build technical capacity for mainstreaming the 6 issues above?

Part I Context analysis

Looking beyond the current support from UNDP, scanning the current context, what do you think UNDP should be doing to help Malawi Government deliver the Malawi 2063

What should UNDP not be doing?

How should UNDP position itself amongst development partners? What should UNDP be doing to maximise synergy and do better?

What are the key contextual and strategic opportunities for UNDP to build on, even beyond the current CP?

Thank you very for your participation. If you have any questions, please ask.

# Rating system

The following table presents an evaluation rubric that will be applied by the evaluation team during the data analysis phase to both the country programme overall and to the top 50Percentage of projects under each of the UNDP Malawi practice areas (budget wise).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Highly Unsatisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Moderately satisfactory** | **satisfactory** | **Highly satisfactory** |
|  |  | *Clear evidence of non-implementation or laid back approach; serious weaknesses across the board on crucial aspects. About 80Percentage-100Percentage of findings fit with description to a considerable or high degree.*    *The project logic is either undefined or untested . It is mostly impossible to see the relationship between most of 1) the expected outcomes from short term through to longer term; 2) between outputs and outcomes. Assumptions are not included . Where assumptions are noted they do not appear relevant.*  *Most project implementers have no understanding of the programme logic, or of the problem being addressed and cannot or can only weakly explain the logic and reasoning to others.* | *Clear evidence of unsatisfactory functioning; serious weaknesses across the board on crucial aspects.  About 80Percentage-100Percentage of findings fit with description to a considerable or high degree* | *Adequate performance overall; some serious, but non-fatal weaknesses on a few aspects. About 80Percentage-100Percentage of findings fit with description to a considerable or high degree* | *Good performance overall; might have a few slight weaknesses but nothing serious. About 80Percentage-100Percentage of findings fit with description to a considerable or high degree* | *Very good or excellent performance on virtually all aspects; strong overall; no weaknesses of any real consequence. About 80Percentage-100Percentage of findings fit with description to a considerable or high degree* |
| **RELEVANCE** | Project clarity and logic |  | The project logic is undefined or has several missing elements.  It is mostly impossible to see the relationship between most of 1) the expected outcomes from short term through to longer term; 2) between outputs and outcomes. There may be large leaps in logic between outputs and outcomes e.g. leap from an output to a long term outcome.  Few or no outcomes appear realistic. Assumptions are not included or only minimally outlined. Where assumptions are noted they do not appear relevant.  Most project implementers have a poor understanding of the programme logic, a weak or superficial understanding of the problem, and the relationship between the parts and cannot or can only weakly explain the logic and reasoning to others. | The project logic is partially explained (with quite a few exceptions). It is possible to see only some of the relationships between most of 1) the expected outcomes from short term through to longer term; 2) between outputs and outcomes. There are some leaps in logic between outputs and outcomes. Outcomes do not always appear realistic. Assumptions are only sometimes included or when included do not always appear entirely appropriate or relevant.  Most project implementers have a basic understanding of the programme logic and the problem being addressed, and the relationship between the parts and cannot fully explain the logic and reasoning to others.  Perhaps only the project leader can describe fully the project, rationale and problem. | The project has a solid logic. It is mostly clear and easy to understand the relationship between 1) the expected outcomes from short term through to longer term; 2) between outputs and outcomes. However, there are some points that could be strengthened. Outcomes appear realistic. Assumptions are mostly included. Most outputs appear necessary and sufficient to achieve the desired outcomes, taking into account the assumptions. Most project implementers have a good understanding of the programme logic, the problem being addressed and the relationship between the parts and can explain the logic and reasoning to others. | The project has a strong logic, which is a clear and easy to understand relationship between 1) the expected outcomes from short term through to longer term; 2) between outputs and outcomes. Outcomes appear very realistic. Assumptions are explicit and relevant.  The outputs appear necessary and sufficient to achieve the desired outcomes, taking into account the assumptions. All project implementers have an excellent understanding of the programme logic, the problem that is being addressed and the relationship between the parts and can convincingly explain the logic to others. |
| Contribution to UNDP and Malawi development strategy | The outputs and outcomes appear to have very limited or no relevance to the strategies of UNDP, the partner organisations, the SADC, the government of Malawi and target beneficiaries, as applicable. They are not consistent and complementary with activities supported by projects in UNDP and/or by other donor organizations. | The outputs and outcomes appear to have very limited or no relevance to the strategies of UNDP, the partner organisations, the SADC, the government of Malawi and target beneficiaries, as applicable. They are not consistent and complementary with activities supported by projects in UNDP and/or by other donor organizations. | Most outputs/outcomes appear to have only partial relevance to strategies of UNDP, the partner organisations, the SADC, the government of Malawi and target beneficiaries, as applicable. It is not very clear how they contribute to UNDP’s aggregate strategic outcomes. Where there are discrepancies in the relevance to the various actors, the organisations have an adequate understanding of this. Interventions are partially consistent and complementary with activities supported by projects in UNDP and/or by other donor organizations. | Most expected outputs/outcomes are relevant the strategies of UNDP, the partner organisations, the SADC, the government and target beneficiaries, as applicable. It is mostly clear how they contribute to aggregate strategic outcomes and contribute to a coherent UNDP strategy. Where there are discrepancies in the relevance to the various organizations, the organisations have a good understanding of the issues and implications for the organisations. Interventions are mostly consistent and complementary with activities supported by projects in UNDP and/or by other donor organizations. | The expected outcomes are highly relevant to the strategies of UNDP, the partner organisations, the SADC, the government and target beneficiaries, as applicable. It is clear how they contribute to aggregate strategic outcomes and contribute to a coherent UNDP strategy. Interventions are fully consistent and complementary with activities supported by projects in UNDP and/or by other donor organizations. |
| **EFFICIENCY** | Adaptive management of plans and budgets | The project team rarely identifies and understands operational issues concerning the project. Actions taken or recommended actions to overcome implementation issues are often not well founded but provide few or limited insights. The project manager and team are nearly always reactive at monitoring implementation and progress towards results (mostly outputs, very rarely outcomes) and rarely implements actions to avert or overcome them. The donor is infrequently alerted to potential issues or issues in a timely manner; and the project team often does not follow funder management (financial and otherwise) guidelines. The project implementation context and problem to be addressed is rarely analysed and project plan adjusted. Monitoring rarely occurs and is frequently not based on updated and complete MPs. There is no evidence that innovations or best practices have been used during project management. | The project team rarely identifies and understands operational issues concerning the project. Actions taken or recommended actions to overcome implementation issues are often not well founded but provide few or limited insights.  The project manager and team are nearly always reactive at monitoring implementation and progress towards results (mostly outputs, very rarely outcomes) and rarely implements actions to avert or overcome them. The donor is infrequently alerted to potential issues or issues in a timely manner; and the project team often does not follow funder management (financial and otherwise) guidelines. The project implementation context and problem to be addressed is rarely analysed and project plan adjusted. Monitoring rarely occurs and is frequently not based on updated and complete MPs. There is no evidence that innovations or best practices have been used during project management. | The project team identifies and understands a few of the strategic and some of the operational issues concerning the project. Actions taken or recommended actions to overcome implementation issues are sometimes well founded but provide few insights. The project manager and team are normally reactive at monitoring implementation and progress towards results (mostly outputs and sometimes outcomes) and sometimes implements actions to avert or overcome them.  The funder is sometimes alerted to potential issues or issues in a timely manner; and the project team sometimes follows funder management (financial and otherwise) guidelines. The project implementation context and problem to be addressed is only sometimes analysed and project plan adjusted accordingly. Monitoring occurs on an ad-hoc basis and is not always based on updated and complete Management Plans (MP).There is limited evidence that innovations or best practices have been used during project management. | The project team identifies and understands some of the strategic and most of the operational issues concerning the project. Actions taken or recommended actions to overcome implementation issues are usually well founded and provide some insights.  The project manager and team are normally proactive at monitoring implementation and progress towards results (mostly outputs and sometimes outcomes) and usually implements actions to avert or overcome them.  The funder is mostly alerted to potential issues or issues in a timely manner; and the project team usually follows funder management (financial and otherwise) guidelines. The project implementation context and problem to be addressed is periodically analysed and the project plan adjusted as necessary to ensure activities, outputs and outcomes are relevant and realistic. Monitoring occurs on a regular basis and is mostly based on updated and complete MPs.There is moderate evidence that innovations or best practices have been used during project management. | The project team identifies and understands all of the strategic and operational issues concerning the project. Actions taken or recommended actions to overcome implementation issues are well founded and insightful.  The project manager and team is always proactive at monitoring implementation and progress towards results (outputs and outcomes) and implementing actions to avert or overcome them, enlisting others support where necessary.  The funder is alerted to potential issues or issues in a timely manner; and the implementing organisation always follows funder management (financial and otherwise) guidelines. The project implementation context and problem to be addressed is regularly analysed and the project plan adjusted as necessary to ensure they are relevant and realistic. Monitoring occurs systematically and is based on updated and complete MPs. There is strong evidence that innovations or best practices have been used during project management. |
| Relationship management and communication | Mostly, the project team manages relationships with key stakeholders and donors poorly and infrequently and there is not a clear or agreed understanding of the others roles and responsibilities. The parties put limited effort into building and maintaining working relations. Face-to-face communication occurs infrequently and verbal and written communications often does not provide useful implementation insights, lessons learned, recommendations and actions to address any issues raised. Regular project monitoring reports are always late and incomplete, with many inaccuracies. Follow-up is always needed. Reporting against the monitoring plan is very partial or does not occur at all. It is difficult to get a picture of performance. | Mostly, the project team manages relationships with key stakeholders and donors poorly and infrequently and there is not a clear or agreed understanding of the others roles and responsibilities. The parties put limited effort into building and maintaining working relations. Face-to-face communication occurs infrequently and verbal and written communications often does not provide useful implementation insights, lessons learned, recommendations and actions to address any issues raised. Regular project monitoring reports are always late and incomplete, with many inaccuracies. Follow-up is always needed. Reporting against the monitoring plan is very partial or does not occur at all. It is difficult to get a picture of performance. | Mostly, the project team manages relationships with key stakeholders and funders adequately and face-to-face communication occurs on a mostly periodically basis (e.g. less than quarterly). There is not always a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities and the parties put in mostly adequate effort into maintaining working relations. Verbal and written communications sometimes provide useful implementation insights, lessons learned, recommendations and actions to address any issues raised. Although, quite often elements are incomplete. Regular project monitoring reports are often late, and have a number of inaccuracies or are incomplete. Only a partial picture of performance and achievements against monitoring plans are presented. Often follow-up or clarification is needed. | Mostly, the project team manages relationships with key stakeholders and funders proactively and face-to-face communication occurs on a mostly regular basis (e.g. quarterly). Stakeholders and the project team have a good and common understanding of theirs, and each other’s, roles and responsibilities. Most parties take time to build and maintain effective working relations. Communication is fairly open and mostly constructive. Verbal and written communications generally provides useful implementation insights, lessons learned, recommendations and actions to address any issues raised. Regular project monitoring reports are mostly received on time, are mostly accurate, and usually results orientated in that they provide a picture of performance and achievements against monitoring plans. Only little follow-up or clarification is needed. | The project team manages relationships with key stakeholders and funders proactively and face-to-face communication occurs on a regular basis (e.g. monthly). Stakeholders and the project team have a good and common understanding of theirs, and each other’s, roles and responsibilities. All parties put in considerable effort to build and maintain effective working relations. Communication is open, trusting and constructive.  Verbal and written communications systematically provide useful implementation insights, lessons learned, recommendations and actions to address any issues raised. Regular project monitoring reports are always received on time, are accurate, informative and results orientated in that they provide a clear picture of performance and achievements against monitoring plans. |
| Translating inputs into outputs | The planned (original or agreed readjusted) outputs are often of inadequate quality and rarely produced in a timely manner. Produced outputs sometimes do not appear relevant. The targets are not or only very partially achieved. The project is completed or expected to be completed more than 6 months after originally planned. | The planned (original or agreed readjusted) outputs are often of inadequate quality and rarely produced in a timely manner. Produced outputs sometimes do not appear relevant. The targets are not or only very partially achieved. The project is completed or expected to be completed more than 6 months after originally planned. | The planned (original or agreed readjusted) outputs are only sometimes of adequate quality and sometimes produced in a timely manner. Produced outputs sometimes do not appear relevant. The targets achieved are only partially the same as planned (originally or agreed adjustments to the monitoring plan). The project is completed or expected to be completed between 3 and 6 months are the original end date. | The planned (original or agreed readjusted outputs) are produced in a mostly timely manner, are of a good quality and mostly remain relevant to the desired outcome. The targets achieved are almost the same as planned (originally or agreed adjustments to the monitoring plan). The project is completed or expected to be completed between 1 and 3 months of the original planned date. | The planned (original or agreed readjusted outputs) are produced in a timely manner, are of a very good quality and remain relevant to the desired outcome. The targets achieved are those that are planned (originally or agreed adjustments to the monitoring plan). The project is completed or expected to be completed early or within 1 month of the expected completion date. |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | Translating outputs to outcomes, including gender, social inclusion | Few (> 10Percentage) outcomes/targets achieved (at project-level and/or in UNDP’s results framework and theory of change). Achievement peaks at short-term outcomes (or below - outputs only). Where implementation is on-going, there is little evidence of outcomes being achieved. No consideration has been taken of gender and social inclusion issues. | Few (> 25Percentage) outcomes/targets achieved (at project-level and/or in UNDP’s results framework and theory of change). Achievement peaks at short-term outcomes (or below - outputs only). Where implementation is on-going, there is little evidence of outcomes being achieved. No consideration has been taken of gender and social inclusion issues. | Some (25 to 50Percentage) outcomes/targets achieved (at project-level and/or in UNDP’s results framework and theory of change). Achievements mostly focus on short term outcomes. Where implementation is on-going there is partial evidence that some short term outcomes are being achieved. Limited consideration has been taken of gender issues and social inclusion, even if superficially. | A majority (50 to 75Percentage) of outcomes/targets are achieved (at project-level and/or in UNDP’s results framework and theory of change). Achievement predominantly focuses on short- and medium-term outcomes. Where implementation is on-going, there is good evidence that short term outcomes are being achieved. Moderate consideration has been taken of gender issues; if implementation is advanced some social inclusion and gender-positive changes have been observed. | Most (e.g. 75Percentage +) outcomes/targets are achieved (at project-level and/or in UNDP’s results framework and theory of change). Achievement peaks at long-term outcomes and changes have occurred at short and medium term outcomes also. Where implementation is still occurring, there is good evidence that short and medium term outcomes/targets are being achieved. Strong consideration has been taken of gender issues; if implementation is advanced many social inclusion and gender-positive changes have been observed. |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | Additionality | There is NO evidence that the project or initiative would have occurred even without UNDP funding | There is evidence that the project or initiative would have occurred even without UNDP funding. | There is unclear evidence on whether the project or initiative would have occurred even without UNDP funding. | There is evidence that the project or initiative would not have occurred without UNDP funding. | There is strong evidence that the project or initiative would have not occurred without UNDP funding. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** | Sustainability addressed; sustainability of outputs and outcomes achieved | No activities are included to address sustainability. The project doesn’t clearly articulate changes beyond outputs. And an exit strategy does not exist. | A few activities are included to address sustainability although they are not always clear. Only a few outcomes are being monitored for sustainability. A relatively clear exit strategy exists and is periodically updated and includes a description of how some project activities or the benefits thereof will be sustained on completion. Some responsibilities are outlined. Several on-going maintenance or operational costs have been estimated and the organisation has a broad plan of how to fund these, although plans may not always be realistic. | Several activities are included to address sustainability and are mostly clear and relevant. Monitoring of the sustainability of some of the outcomes is planned or undertaken.  A relatively clear exit strategy exists and is periodically updated. The strategy includes a broad description of how some project activities or the benefits thereof will be sustained on completion. Some responsibilities are outlined. Most on-going maintenance or operational costs have been estimated and the organisation has a broad and realistic plan of how to fund these. | Many clear, specific and relevant activities have been included to address sustainability. Monitoring of the sustainability of outcomes is undertaken (or planned). In the best examples, monitoring of outcomes goes beyond the project timeframe. A clear and comprehensive exit strategy was included in the design and is fully up to date. The strategy includes a clear description of how project activities or the benefits thereof will be sustained on completion. Responsibilities for implementing the exit strategy are outlined. All on-going maintenance or operational costs have been thoroughly costed and the organisation has set aside funds to pay for these (or has a plan in place to secure funds in adequate time before project funds are completed). For advanced or completed projects, there is evidence of responsibilities having been fully institutionalized. |
| **IMPACT** | Achieving long-term outcomes | There has been no or limited intended or unintended progress (0-25Percentage) towards long-term outcomes (i.e., CPD Outcomes), or this is very unlikely to occur in future. Little or no measurement of the project’s contribution to these outcomes has been completed, and the results chain does not articulate the linkage to these ultimate impacts. No consideration has been taken of differential impacts for men and women. | There has been some intended or unintended progress (25-50Percentage) towards long-term outcomes (i.e. CPD outcomes), or this is moderately likely to occur in future. Some measurement of the project’s contribution to these outcomes has been completed, and the results chain articulates the linkage to these ultimate impacts (whether convincing or not). Limited consideration has been taken of differential impacts for men and women. | There has been strong intended or unintended progress towards impacts (50-75Percentage) on long-term outcomes (i.e CPD outcomes), or this is likely to occur in future. Measurement of the project’s contribution to these outcomes has been completed, and the results chain convincingly articulates the linkage to these ultimate impacts. Moderate consideration has been taken of differential impacts for men and women. | There has been substantial intended or unintended progress towards impacts (75Percentage+) on long-term outcomes (i.e CPD Outcomes). Measurement of the project’s contribution to these outcomes has been completed, and the results chain convincingly articulates the linkage to these ultimate impacts. Strong consideration has been taken of differential impacts for men and women. |

# List of people met and structures visited

Dr Bright : Nov 1 \_ Nov 8 - Nov 20-Dec 20

Dr henry : Week 2 Nov 9\_ -Nov 20 Nov 20- Dec 20

List of people consulted

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | **Designation** | **Organization** |
| 1. Shigeki Komatsubara | Resident Representative | UNDP |
| 1. Challa Getachew | Deputy Resident Representative | UNDP |
| 1. Jullie VanDassen | Portfolio Manager RICE | UNDP |
| 1. Rabi Narayan Gaudo | Portfolio Manager RSG | UNDP |
| 1. Sothini Nyirenda | Program Analyst (Climate change &Disaster Risk Reduction) | UNDP |
| 1. Cinzia Tecce | Private Sector Development Specialist | UNDP |
| 1. Chionetsero Chingoli | Program Officer (Private Sector Development) | UNDP |
| 1. Agness Chimbiri | Advisor, RICE | UNDP |
| 1. Christina Maseko | Program Analyst (Public Sector Management and Accountable Governance) | UNDP |
| 1. Ted Nyekanyeka | Project Coordinator (Climate Change) | UNDP |
| 1. Patrick Kawendo | Economics Specialist | UNDP |
| 1. Shamiso Kacelenga | Program Analyst (Renewable Energy) | UNDP |
| 1. Hideichiro Nakamura | Program Analyst (Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery) | UNDP |
| 1. Richard Cox | Chief Technical Advisor, Elections | UNDP |
| 1. Fatsani Nyambi | Human Rights Analyst | UNDP |
| 1. Fatuma Silungwe | Legal Analyst | UNDP |
| 1. Taonga Nuka | Director | Environmental Affairs Department |
| 1. Jane Swira | Project Coordinator | NRCP |
| 1. Baxton Nkhoma | Project Manager | Citizen Coalition |
| 1. Kizito Tenthani | Executive Director | CMD |
| 1. Chrsitina Maseko | Programme Analyst | UNDP |
| 1. Mercy Chirambo | Programme Analyst | UNDP |
| 1. Dr Thomas Munthali | Executive Director | NPC |
| 1. Dr Joseph Nagoli | Researcher | NPC |
| 1. Austin Chingwengwe | Researcher | NPC |
| 1. Hirotsugu Ikeda | Deputy Head of Mission | Chinese Embassy |
| 1. Yuko Hanada | Researcher | Chinese Embassy |
| 1. Sofie Geerts | Deputy General Representative | Embassy of Belgium |
| 1. Mr. Arnold Kadzapanje | Director | Malawi Energy Generating Agency |
| 1. Navine Kumar | Fund Manager | MICF |
| 1. Mr. Tambulani Chunga | Deputy Fund Manager | MICF |
| 1. Mr. Amos Mtonya | Meteorology Expert | DCCMS |
| 1. Mr. Mathews Chirwa | Lecture and Acting Principal | Malawi College of Fisheries |
| 1. Mrs. Clara Mwamadi | Lab Attendant | Malawi College of Fisheries |
| 1. Mrs. Doris Msukwa | Technician | Malawi College of Fisheries |
| 1. Mrs. Dyna Chumula | Head of Community Outreach | Malawi College of Fisheries |
| 1. Mr. Salim M’balika | Principal Fishing Officer | Fishing Research Center |
| 1. Mr. Hills Kabula | Research Technical Officer | Fishing Research Center |
| 1. Mr. Vincent Chikwanda | Intern | Fishing Research Center |
| 1. Mr. Watson M’bonongo | Chief Engineer | Fishing Research Center |
| 1. Mr. Omega Manase | Engineer | Fishing Research Center |
| 1. Joseph Nyirongo | Chairman | Mwitha Farm |
| 1. Thoko Kulinji | Treasurer | Mwaitha Farm |
| 1. Hudson Kabango | Programme Manager | PRESCANE |
| 1. Bryson Nkomaaanthu | CEO | PRESCANE |
| 1. Masaki Watanabe | Country Representative | UNFPA |
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