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# Executive Summary

**Objective and Criteria**

The overall objective of the evaluation was to carry out an assessment of DCP III’s implementation, management, achievements, and challenges. The evaluation used standard criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. In addition, since DCP III was based on the realisation of human rights, the evaluation added the criteria of availability, accessibility, affordability, and acceptability to gauge the progress of the project in facilitating benefits from public goods and services.

**The Evaluation’s Methodology**

The appreciatively inquiry-based methodology of the evaluation undertook case studies, observed gender considerations, and followed participatory methods. In addition to documentary review, the evaluation held key informant interviews, and implemented 14 community interactions and observations in 7 districts. In those 7 districts, chosen to ensure representation of programmatic themes, geographic coverage, implementation partners, and initial appreciative progress and challenges, the evaluation facilitated 7 district-level evaluation focused group discussions. These were complemented by 3 regional level focused group discussions.

**Programme Context and Description**

The context of DCP III was characterised by unsteady progress on development, democracy, and good governance. As a continued response to the deficits, DCP III built on the successes of DCP II and well-aligned itself with the Constitution, Vision 2020, the MDGs, the MGDS, and UNDAF to root itself on the demand side of human rights enjoyment as human rights-based and results-based project. The project’s outcome was: “increased and more effective participation of communities in decision-making and in advocating changes to policies, laws, practices which affect their livelihoods and rights and holding public bodies accountable” Outputs 1, 2, 3, and 4 were respectively about demand for the right to development; demand for fair trade, labour and consumer protection; demand for public services and good governance from District Assemblies and other public functionaries, and effective and efficient management, monitoring and evaluation.

**Programme Design**

The project enjoyed a very clear organisational structure and modality, which avoided conflation of roles and political interference. However, insufficient funding led to the project’s thematic and geographic phased implementation. The choice of implementation partners was strategically and soundly based on capacities in human rights-based programming, results-based management, effectiveness, and efficiency.

**Programme Implementation**

The strong relevance-related attributes of the project were that the results framework was based on the synergy of causes identified during the situation analysis and that the project’s focus was in tandem with both national and community level aspirations/needs. Although the activities employed by community members rarely reflected the direct significance of the MDGS, DCP III was highly relevant mainly because of its results framework’s attempted response to the synergy of causes of poor enjoyment of the right to development. There was however little special attention to vulnerable groups and no critical mass relating on access to employment, provision of affordable energy sources and the enjoyment of cultural and political rights guaranteed by section 30(1) and (2) of the Constitution. .

DCP III’s was generally perceived as highly efficient amongst its comparators. This was because of the project’s open competition and focus on effectiveness and results, stringent reporting requirements, reliance on cascaded animation and skills transfer through training, catalytic use of media activities, and invocation of volunteerism and social interdependence. The efficiency was however diluted by the project’s initial lack of timeliness due to the overlap with DCP II, low budgets, delayed disbursement by UNDP, late procurements by, and late take-off by its intended counterpart project, the LOGSIP.

The effectiveness of the DCP III, much improved from that of DCP II, was enhanced by team/group working and strategic use of empowering knowledge. Most activities under Output 1 were implemented as planned and activities under Outputs 2 and 4 were implemented as planned. With no unplanned activities implemented, the results made a significant contribution to the creation of a growing critical mass per community but not across the districts. Compared to other outputs, activities and inputs under Output 3 were the least effective. Although the PMO was well appreciated in professionalism, its effectiveness was often interrupted by delayed disbursements from UNDP.

The outcome-related positive results were very much about availability and acceptability of services and goods, but very little on accessibility. There was strong evidence of “increased and more effective participation of communities in decision-making” and in advocating changes to practices and holding public bodies accountable, but mainly with regard to the allocation of public goods and services, as community members made demands on service providers. The only changes to “policies and laws” pertained only to informal norms. The most significant unintended positive result was evidence, albeit not uniform, of social transformation especially in gender relations and stereotypes, cultural attitudes and practices, team work, traditional leaders' styles and, reduction of corrupt practices. There was varied evidence on DCP-created structures helping to develop the capacities of lower level local government structures, but the DCP III-created structures focus on quick results may ironically be making, unwittingly, already weak local government structures even weaker.

The strong desire to sustain the activities and results of DCP III was qualified by a continued need for technical and logistical support. Output 1 activities and results were more likely to be sustained having been in implementation longest, while Output 2 activities and results were generally nascent but exciting for the communities. Output 3 activities were the most fragile due to weak synergy with the LOGSIP and duty bearers’ low responsive capacities, while Output 4 activities were the most dependent.

**Main Findings and Recommendations**

DCP III was sufficiently relevant, efficient and effective, and had sufficient potential for sustainability of its activities and results to justify the initiation and implementation of a successor programme with outcomes and outputs similar to those of DCP III, taking full account of the findings and recommendations in this report.

DCP III was highly relevant as it was based on the synergy of causes of poor enjoyment of the right to development identified during the situation analysis and had outputs that were fully aligned to both national and community level aspirations/needs. It is recommended that the successor programme to DCP III should maintain the focus on the right to development ,with a clearer focus on the constituent of the right listed in section 30 of the Constitution; be fully aligned to UNDAF, Vision 2020, and MGDS II; and maintain a clear separation between the demand and supply sides of human rights enjoyment. Building on the best practices of DCP III, a successor programme should not only focus on the aspects of the right to development that relate to the availability of public goods and services, and also address their accessibility, affordability, and acceptability.

DCP III was highly efficient mainly due to its focus on effectiveness and results, stringent reporting requirements, reliance on cascaded animation and skills transfer through training, catalytic use of media activities, and invocation of volunteerism and social interdependence. The efficiency was however impeded by the Programme’s initial lack of timeliness due to its overlap with DCP II, low budgets, delayed disbursement by UNDP, delays in procurement and late take-off by its intended counterpart project, the LOGSIP. In order to address the efficiency challenges found with DCP III, it is recommended that its successor programme address the causes of implementation delays experienced in DCP III and that implementation partners be chosen based on their efficiency, effectiveness and skills in the human rights-based approach to programming and results-based management. In order for the PMO to be able to maintain efficiency in the successor programme it is recommended that its staff complement be reviewed with a view to a possible increase in the number of programme and support staff.

DCP III was largely effective mainly because of team/group working, interactive methods, and its results-based approach. Most activities under Outputs 1, 2 and 4 were implemented as planned and generated results that made a significant contribution to the creation of a growing critical mass in the targeted communities. In contrast, activities and inputs under Output 3 were the least effective mainly because of institutional gaps and capacity weaknesses in the formal system of local government which had been intended to complement DCP III under the Output. It is recommended that the successor programme to DCP III partner with duty-bearers who have the institutional capacity to effectively meet the demands created by the programme.

Activities and results of DCP III are very likely to be sustained, with Output 1 activities and results being the more likely to be sustained having been in implementation longest, Output 2 activities and results being exciting for the communities despite being nascent and Output 4 activities and results being the most dependable. Output 3 activities were the least likely to be sustained in the absence unless the LOGSIP is strengthened. In order to create the conditions for sustainability of the programme, it is recommended that the successor programme to DCP III shoulddeliberately facilitate the integration of lessons gleaned from patterns of demands by communities into national policy and programme development and reviews; taking DCP results, animation, and transfer of skills to scale district-wise and deepening experiences and results in geographic areas covered under DCP III through a focus on accessibility, affordability and accessibility of the public goods and services covered by the right to development.

Monitoring and evaluation of DCP III was its weakest component mainly because its framework was too generic and not sufficiently tailored to the needs of a RBM-based and human rights-based approach project; because no post-implementation monitoring, mid-term review and programme audit(s) were undertaken and since there was more emphasis was on capturing relevant results than monitoring of the results chain.

**Key Lessons**

DCP III generated many key lessons for future programming. The project left no doubts that processes, work dynamics, and results that change power relationships progressively to improve the quality of life are in high demand. Stressed also was that knowledge accompanied by skills transfer and animation generates energy and demand for change to improve the quality of community and individual life. The uniqueness of DCP III was in its human rights-based approach and focus on results and effectiveness. On the negative side, a conventional M and E Framework is not adequate for a human rights-based project.

**Possible Features of a Successor Project/Programme**

As implemented, DCP III produced results warranting deepening and taking to scale. A successor programme or project to DCP III is well justified mainly because of the objectives and strategies on improved governance in MGDS II. Such a project could be characterised by:

* Continued linkage of the right to development and good governance as a fulcrum for the realisation of other human rights in Malawi’s Constitution;
* Non-conflation with work on the supply side of human rights enjoyment;
* Clear focus and dedication on the aspects or components of the right to development;
* A possible change of the name without unnecessary loss of good will and image;
* Enhancement of the results, animation, and transfer of skills;
* Consolidation of DCP III’s results and activities through greater capacity and opportunity for DCP-created structures to animate other communities;
* Deepening of experiences and results in geographic areas under DCP III through a thematic extension to accessibility;
* Choice of implementation partners based on efficiency, effectiveness, and skills in the human rights-based approach to programming and results-based management;
* Use of lesson gleaned from patterns of demands by communities for input into national policy and programme reviews and development programmes;
* A specialist guided human rights-based and results-based monitoring and evaluation system; and
* Possible use of DCP-created structures to advance interactive civic and voter education for the democratic choice and development*.*

# Objectives and Conceptual Framework

## Introduction

This report is an output of the end-of-project evaluation of the Democracy Consolidation Programme (DCP) III, which was undertaken between 12 August and 30 September 2011. The report is organised to reflect the objectives of the evaluation. This part introduces the objectives and scope of the evaluation. The next deals with the evaluation’s methodology. The third chapter describes DCP III’s context and its justification.

Chapter 4 starts to introduce evaluation findings and aspects, examining the project as designed. Chapter 5 examines the project as implemented and its results. The next chapter evaluates the project’s monitoring and evaluation, before Chapter 7 consolidates the lessons learnt and the evaluation’s recommendations. The last chapter is a compilation of annexes related to the evaluation, including the names of people who participated in the evaluation and the tools used to assess and analyse the data.

## The Objectives of the Evaluation

The overall objective of the evaluation was to carry out an assessment of the DCPIII implementation, management, achievements and challenges. The specific objectives were to:

* Examine the relevance of the design of the Programme to priorities set;
* Assess the degree of efficiency and effectiveness of the programme in meeting the objectives for which it was designed;
* Identify challenges that faced the implementation of the Programme;
* Make recommendations on possible way forward;
* Identify unintended results achieved by the programme and determination of whether or not such unintended results positively or negatively impacted on programme implementation.

The evaluation covered all activities carried out by the Project. Its tasks included analysis of the Project’s Outcome and Outputs, according to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability; assessment of the roles and responsibilities of various Project stakeholders; assessment of the results of the activities implemented compared to the Project’s key outputs in its workplans; assessment of the Project implementation strategy and design including the adequacy of results framework and factors outside the scope of the Project which impacted on its performance; assessment of the impact of the Project on the institutions, groups, individuals that benefited from its support; assessment of the management modality of the Project; assessment of the Project’s monitoring and evaluation system; and assessment of the cumulative impact of the Project.

The evaluation was also tasked to make general recommendations as well as recommendations for a possible future programme and provide guidance on its major design features; draw lessons that will improve the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and impact of the programme; assess if the programme design and implementation sufficiently addressed the cross cutting themes of gender, human rights and HIV/Aids; evaluate the programme’s monitoring and evaluation system; and assess whether the programme can demonstrate the impact of its interventions.

The expected outputs of the evaluation were an inception report outlining the evaluation’s approach, methodology and details of field visits, among other elements; a Draft Evaluation Report; and an End-of-Project Evaluation Report containing both narrative and qualitative data.[[1]](#footnote-2)

## The evaluation’s Conceptual Framework

The overarching conceptual framework guiding the evaluation was the interface of the notions of democracy, good governance, human rights and public goods delivery. This framework was regarded as appropriate and adequate since, in its focused design and implementation, DCP III was guided by the right to development whose realisation is largely dependent on processes and values of democracy and good governance, and the availability, access, affordability and acceptability of public goods and services.

The evaluation focused on the Project’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Relevance was assessed primarily in terms of the cogency and logic of the Project’s results in relation to the causes of the challenges that were identified in the situation analysis on which it was based; the propriety and feasibility of indicators, and propriety of the targets identified for each output of the Project; the relevance of activities chosen; the appropriateness of review mechanisms; and the external factors affecting the degree of relevance over the duration of the Project.

The evaluation of efficiency concentrated on how well the various activities transformed the available resources into intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness.

With respect to effectiveness, the evaluation primarily related to the Project’s design and the extent to which its stated objectives correctly addressed identified problems, real needs or aspirations; the extent to which the results of the Project achieved the actual Project purpose and how assumptions affected project achievements.

An examination of the Project’s impact focused on the relationship between the purpose and overall objectives of the Project and assessed the extent to which the benefits of the Project had a wide overall effect on both the lives of large numbers of people in the country and the wider policy or sector objectives.

Assessing sustainability involved evaluating whether the positive outcomes of the Project were likely to continue after external funding ended. This included examination of questions of ownership, policy support, economic and financial factors, socio-cultural aspects, gender equality, appropriate technology, environmental aspects and institutional and management capacity.

**Questions Related to the Delivery of the Right to Development as a Human Right**

* Did the project facilitate the availability of public services and goods associated with the right to development?
* Did such available public services and goods become more accessible?
* Can all people afford the rendered services and public goods?
* To what extent and why were the public services and goods acceptable by those intended to benefit from them?

In addition to these standard evaluation criteria, the evaluation considered that the DCP III was to deliver on the realisation of a human right – the right to development – and implemented using a human rights-based approach. In this regard, the evaluation used criteria from General Recommendations on availability, accessibility, affordability, and acceptability of public services and goods.

## Conclusion

This is a report of the evaluation of DCP III, a project intended to improve the right to development especially for marginalised Malawians. The evaluation is intended to ascertain achievements, challenges, and lessons of DCP III. Following this evaluation, the plan is to use the distilled lessons and recommendations for improved future programming.

The conceptual framework guiding the evaluation has been the interface of the notions of democracy, good governance, human rights and public goods and service delivery – concepts that were intended to underpin the development, implementation and the monitoring and evaluation of the project. In addition to the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of the activities and results of the project, this evaluation considered the human rights-based standards with regard to service delivery and pubic goods and services: availability, accessibility, affordability, and acceptability.

# 2. The Evaluation’s Methodology

## 2.1 Introduction

The inception report submitted by the consultants proposed a methodology that was to be followed in this evaluation. The members of the Reference Group made useful inputs to the proposed methodology, which was intended to be human rights-based and in pursuit of the evaluation’s terms of reference.

This chapter presents the methodology and the activities that were carried out to produce the findings and recommendations contained in this report.

## Aspects of the Methodology

The approach of the evaluation stressed Appreciative Inquiry combined with Force-Field Analysis technique, intended to ignite aspirations and then examine the forces for and against the attainability of such aspirations. The evaluation also employed a case study approach, involving in-depth study of a representative sample of the Project’s activities. In addition, the approach was participatory and gender-and-age sensitive. The evaluation not only highlighted gender issues, but also observed gender relations and dynamics among community members during focussed group discussion and community interactions.

To avoid gender-based and age-based inhibitions, separate focused group discussions were held with women, children, and men, where necessary. The value of separating men and women was particularly proved during interactions with members of Takondwa Radio Listening Club in Nsanje and Tithokoze RLC in Salima. Before going into separate groups, both female and male community members reported that the Programme had contributed to significant improvement in gender equality and had led to a significant decline in domestic violence. When discussions were conducted separately with men and women, the latter reported that gender inequalities were declining but had not yet been eliminated and that domestic violence was still widespread.

## Activities of the Evaluation

The evaluation relied on a mixture of methods and techniques in the collection and analysis of relevant data, including review of programme documentation and legal and policy literature;[[2]](#footnote-3) key informant interviews of programme stakeholders, including grassroots beneficiaries; focused group discussions with staff of implementing partners and community members and interactions with the latter; qualitative analysis of data collected and its validation through interactive discussions with relevant stakeholders and project’s tripartite partners. The implementation of the methods and techniques was conducted in line with a workplan that specified activities undertaken, their geographic location and timing.

Key informant interviews, focussed group discussions, and interactions with stakeholders and communities as well as observations were undertaken with a sample determined by the use of a number of general principles. In addition to sampling activities that covered all components of the Project, the evaluation sought to reflect its appreciative inquiry approach by selecting districts based on the indicated appreciated level of performance and the time when the respective district joined the implementation of DCP III.

## Sampling of Communities

The evaluation team, with inputs and guidance from the Reference Group, applied Appreciative Inquiry to select the communities the evaluation team would visit. In doing this, the Evaluation Team and Reference Group followed a set of principles to sample the communities that were visited. The Team and the Reference Group took care to ensure balance among DCP III’s many implementation partners, Malawi’s regions, and implementation methods. Table 2.1 presents the principles used, the areas visited, and associated justification.

**Table 2.1: Sampling Principles and Sampled Communities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principles | Districts  | Communities | Justifications |
| 1. *Select and examine communities, rather than districts*
2. *Ensure representation of examined activities and communities according activity implementation commencement year*
3. *Ensure regional representation among selected communities*
4. *Ensure representation of type of implementing partner*
5. *Examine area considered to be among the best regarding implementation and results and another considered to have the greatest challenges*
 | Nsanje:  | Takondwa RLCs, GVH Mbenje, and Chididi VRCTakondwa RLC, TA Mbenje and Chididi VRC, TA Malemia | * A geographic areas considered as a cause of the most programmatic pride, district-wide; implemented by a human rights education and paralegal NGO, compared with a media-based project
 |
| Machinga | Mposa CRC and Madalitso RLC, Lisanjala, MachingaMposa CRC, TA Mposa and Madalitso RLC, TA Nkula | * An area regarded as a cause of programmatic pride on fair trade, Output 2 of DCP III; implemented by a an NGO working to empower children, youth, and women. Compared with a media-based project
 |
| Mangochi | Nkata VRC, TA Jalasi and Lungwena RLC, STA Namabvi | * A district with pockets of excellence on all outputs; implemented by an NGO working to empower children, youth and women; compared with a media-based project
 |
| Salima:  | Chamwabvi VRC and Tithokoze RLC, Makiyoni CommunityChamwabvi VRC, TA Maganga and Tithokoze RLC, TA Mwanza | * A district agreed as having the greatest challenges during implementation; implemented by a general human rights NGO working to empower children, youth, and women; compared with a media-based project
 |
| Nkhotakota:  | Benga VRC and Chinong’o VRC, GVH PaulosiBenga VRC, TA Mwadzama and Chinungu VRC, TA Kafuzira | * A district in which DCP III’s activities were implemented by a youth organisation on all outputs
 |
| Mzimba:  | Chigoma RLCs, T.A EmbangweniChigoma RLC, TA Mzukuzuku | * A Northern Region community where DCP III’s activities were implemented by through a RLC, focusing on Output 1
 |
| Rumphi:  | Mulungoti CRC and Chindikani CRC, BoweMulongoti and Chindikani CRCs, TA Chikulamayembe | * A Northern Region community where activities were implemented by a faith-based NGO through a CRC, with emphasis on Output 3
 |

The evaluators visited the districts from 29 August to 9 September 2011. In each of the districts studied activities covering all the Outputs of the Project. At the inception stage, the evaluators had also planned to include a district where the Project had not been implemented and which was not bordered by a district where implementation had occurred. However, as it proved in practice, none of the country’s districts could meet this criteria and no control district was included in the sample.

The synthesis and analysis of the data collected was undertaken using tools developed by the evaluators to address each of the key questions of the evaluation, namely the Project’s process of development and design; logic between the goal, purpose and strategy; organisational structure; results framework; partnership formation and propriety; relevance; efficiency; effectiveness; impact; sustainability and monitoring and evaluation. The tools are at Annex 2 of this report.

After the synthesis and analysis, the evaluators drafted and wrote this report using an outline whose structure was aligned to the specific tasks prescribed by the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation and whose content was guided by United Nations minimum standards for the content of evaluation reports.[[3]](#footnote-4)

## Constraints in the Evaluation

At the inception of the assignment, it had been anticipated that the evaluation would encounter two constraints. The first was the lack of fuel to enable the evaluators to travel to the districts where the programme had activities and within the cities and towns where key informants were located. In practice, this constraint did not materialise as the fuel shortage that had affected the country subsided during the period of the field work and the evaluators were able to travel without hindrance.

The second anticipated constraint had been impossibility to undertake research in all the project’s geographical areas within the time allocated to the evaluation. This was mitigated by use of the case study approach, which entailed in-depth examination.

In the course of the evaluation, an unanticipated constraint emerged in the form of the declaration of a public holiday on 31 August 2011, to enable Muslims to celebrate Eid ul Fitr. Coincidentally, this was the date on which the evaluators had planned to visit the district of Mangochi, the majority of whose population is Muslim. The evaluators had to reschedule the visit and consequently revised their overall travel plans.

The writing of the report suffered due to exacerbated frequent prolonged power cuts in Zomba due to a damaged electrical transformer. Although the evaluation team took much effort to mitigate this problem, it was not possible to have a complete narrative draft report as scheduled in the workplan.

From a technical perspective, the greatest constraint was the lack of updated baseline-related data. This was a special problem because DCP III had used very specific indicators from baseline to set its definite targets. As this evaluation was being completed, the updated baseline survey was at preliminary stages. The result has been that evaluative judgments on the contributions of the project have been largely qualitative. Some of the conclusions of this evaluation may accordingly have to be viewed in the light of the results of updated baseline-related data, when such data becomes available.

## 2.6 Conclusion

The approach of this evaluation has been human rights-based. This explains the appreciative and participatory nature of the evaluation. The human rights based approach and Appreciative Inquiry influenced the sampling, assessment, analysis, and reporting.

Those who participated in this evaluation made it successful. This was despite the constraints from a declaration of a holiday, prolonged power cuts during the writing of the report, and lack of updated baseline-related data as a follow up to the 2006 baseline..

# 3. Programme Context and Description

## 3.1 Introduction

The evaluation of DCP II recommended a third phase of the Programme, which was later to be the project known as DCP III. The recommendation was based on the lessons learnt from DCP II and the need to extend, deepen, and refine the type of encouraging results under DCP III. The Project was designed based on a situation analysis to respond to certain challenges and aspirations on governance.

This chapter describes the context within which DCP III was developed and describes the project.

## The Democratic Deficit and Quality of Life in 2007

Malawi has made some progress towards the attainment of human development. However, challenges remain with regard to the reduction of poverty and improvement of the quality of life. The country was ranked 160 out 182 countries in 2009, with an HDI of 0.493, based on 2007 data..[[4]](#footnote-5) The country remained one of the poorest countries in the world. The population was largely fairly young, with a median age of 17. The population was still largely rural, with 84.7% residing in rural areas. Too many people could not read or write, as the literacy rate was 64% in 2008. Although poverty decreased from 50% to 40% between 2005 and 2007, it remained at that rate in 2008, the year DCP III was to start being implemented. Similarly, although the proportion of the ultra poor decreased from 22% to 15% between 2005 and 2007, it remained as such in 2008.[[5]](#footnote-6)

The poor levels of human development were compounded by limited enjoyment of human rights and inadequate accountability by public functionaries and other service providers. The Government’s own 2007 assessment on governance-related progress showed that challenges remained in 2005, when the third post-1994 government came to power, as Table 3.1 shows.

**Table 3.1: GoM Assessment on Progress on Governance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | 2001-02 |  2002/03 |  2003/04 |  2004/05 |
| Political Will |  Poor | Poor | Poor | Better |
| Anti-Corruption |  Poor  | Poor | Poor | Strong |
| Security |  Poor  | Poor | Poor | Better |
| Justice (Access) |  Weak | Weak | Better  | Better |
| Decentralization |  Weak | Weak | Weak | Weak |
| Democratization |  Weak | Weak  | Better | Good |

*Source: Republic of Malawi, Brussels Programme of Action (BPoA) for LDCs: Comprehensive Mid-Term Review for Malawi, Decade 2001-2010, at 6*

Other indicators on governance showed lack of steady progress in 2007, as Figure 3.1 shows.

Although Malawi enjoyed significant goodwill from its development partners by 2007, it was clear that many of the country’s development partners on governance were placing more emphasis on economic governance, with a shift from democratic governance. The untested explanation was that the Government then could be trusted on democratic governance.

It was the case therefore in 2007 that more effort would be needed to enlist other partners in a development initiative that had already completed two phases. Figure 3.2 shows the dominance of aid on economic governance, compared to democratic accountability in Malawi in 2007.

*Source: Malawi Aid Atlas for 2007/2008[[6]](#footnote-7)*

## Responses to the Democratic and Development Deficits

Malawi’s Vision 2020 embodied the long-term development vision of the country. Among other aspects, it identified weak governance structures and systems as one of the core challenges facing the country and identified the following as some of the Strategic Options for addressing them: forming groups or fora where local people could communicate their views on public issues and exert pressure on decision makers; decentralizing functions and devolving powers to local communities; enhancing civic education on women and the law in Malawi; creating a culture that is hostile to and exposes corruption; protecting and rewarding those who expose corruption.

One response to address the challenges of poverty, limited enjoyment of human rights and inadequate accountability by public functionaries and other service providers has been the setting of relevant legal and policy norms. Thus the Constitution includes, in its underlying principles, the obligation of the Government to be transparent and accountable and the entitlement of every person to enjoy human rights.[[7]](#footnote-8) Section 13 of the Constitution further prescribes principles of national policy, which oblige the state to direct its policies and legislation to the attainment of certain goals, including gender equality, adequate nutrition, adequate healthcare, improvement of the quality of rural life, adequate resourcing of the education sector, support for people with disabilities, conducive conditions for child development, and respect and support for the elderly. The Constitution also guarantees every person the right to development, the right to equality, the right to education, the right to economic activity, the right to fair labour practices, the right to have access to justice and legal remedies.[[8]](#footnote-9) Further, the Constitution guarantees the rights of women and the rights of children.[[9]](#footnote-10)

The other response to the challenges of poverty, limited enjoyment of human rights and inadequate accountability by public functionaries and other service providers at the start of the programme in 2008 was the country’s overarching policy framework, the MGDS.[[10]](#footnote-11) The strategy sought to attain poverty reduction through economic growth by, among other approaches , promoting tenets of good governance, including protection of human rights and accountability.

The development partners that displayed goodwill towards the Malawi Government included the United Nations, which had developed a UNDAF that identified areas where it could add value to national policy dialogue and advocacy or programme implementation. The areas identified included advocacy for UN core values, including human rights, gender equality, human security and the MDGs; normative and technical advisory support, setting standards and ensuring quality control, in addition to providing technical advice according to the agencies’ respective mandates; support to national scale-up of evidence-based programmes; bringing the voice of the civil society to the table and building partnerships among all stakeholders. These commitments created a conducive environment for securing UN support in mobilising resources and other support for the development of the Programme.

The goals and priorities of the MGDS also reflected the country’s international commitments as reflected in the MDGs and were aligned to those of the UN as spelled out in the UNDAF whose Outcome 5 was good governance, gender equality and rights-based approach to development enhanced by 2011, with the intended result of the outcome being “an informed public actively claiming good governance and human rights.”

In order to operationalise its policy and constitutional commitments to reduce poverty through the improvement of governance, the Government established the Democracy Programme (DCP) in 1997. The first phase of the Programme (DCP I), which run from 1997 to 2001, was aimed at building capacity across four strategic areas of focus, namely; civic education and human rights, parliamentary mechanisms, elections and legal reform and administration of justice. The second phase (DCP II), which started in 2002 and ended in 2007, had three major components: civic education on governance and human rights, especially for vulnerable groups; legal reform and administration of justice, mainly aimed at providing channels for adequate redress to resolve disputes equitably and efficiently; and parliamentary and institutional strengthening. The third phase (DCP III), which is the subject of this evaluation, run from 2008 to 2011 and was aimed at promoting the realisation of the right to development and activating more responsive and accountable delivery of public goods and services.

The conduciveness of the context for international support for a project such as DCP III- which sought to respond directly to the country’s challenges of poverty, improve the performance of public institutions responsible for service delivery and enhance the accountability of duty bearers- was reinforced by **the** **fundamental principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005),**[[11]](#footnote-12) **especially those which** provide thatdeveloping countries should set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption; and, together with donors, shift focus to measurable development results. The goal and objectives of DCP III sought to support these aspects of the Paris Declaration.

## Conclusion and Recommendation

DCP III was to build on the foundations and lessons provided by DCP I and DCP II to focus on the linkage between the realisation of the right to development and good governance. Considering the duration of DCP III, it was unlikely from the start that Malawi’s democratic and development deficits would be fully addressed by 2011, when the implementation of the MGDS was to have been completed. The MGDS itself anticipated a successor framework, which has been developed in 2011, to continue, consolidate, and widen its gains as well as take the country to new development dimensions. DCP, as an initiative that focuses on democracy, good governance, and the right to development is still in need in Malawi, subject to its contribution to these goals.

In view of the likely continuing democratic and development deficits, this evaluation makes the following recommendation:

* Recommendation No. 1: The Governments of Malawi, Norway, the UNDP should consider inviting other development partners to continue collaboration on the programmatic themes of DCP III

# 4. DCP III as Designed

## 4.1 Introduction

The final evaluation of the latter had, among other aspects, recommended building on the successes of DCP II by designing a successor programme that would focus on the realisation of the right to development. DCP III was formulated in line with this recommendation.

This chapter examines “the relevance of the design to priorities set”, including an assessment of “the roles and responsibilities of various programme stakeholders: Programme Office, Programme Steering Committee, UNDP, Stakeholder Consultative Forum, Implementing partners”, and others.[[12]](#footnote-13) As DCP III was intended to be results-based, particular attention is paid to the relevance of the results framework designed for the project.

##  DCP III’s Formulation Process

The evaluation of DCP II recommended a focus on the right to development, which is enshrined in section 30 of Malawi’s Constitution. DCP III was placed within an already developed UNDAF, with a life span of up to 2011 in line with the MGDS. One of UNDAF’s output became DCP III’s outcome.

The process itself involved the engagement of a consultant to design a logical framework and the first annual workplan with the inputs and validation, and general participation by stakeholders, including the Government, constitutional bodies involved in governance, and civil society. However, potential beneficiaries, in the form of community members do not appear to have participated adequately in the process. This had also been the case with the process of formulating DCP II and was pointed out in its end of that project’s evaluation. It was not clear that the omission affected the final design of the Programme significantly.

One tool used to develop DCP III was a situation analysis that showed the levels and synergies of key causes of poor enjoyment of the right to development disadvantaging women, the young, and rural people and small benefits to the poor” or poverty levels not abetting. The results of DCP III were to be based on that situation analysis, using an *if-then logic*.

##  The Nature and Components of DCP III

DCP III was aimed at contributing to the production of the following outcome: increased and more effective participation of communities in decision-making and in advocating changes to and implementation of policies, laws and rights and practices which affect their livelihoods and their ability to hold public bodies accountable.

DCP III results appear to have responded to the situation analysis, but assumed that its counterpart project, the LOGSIP and other partners would adequately address some of the key causes. The following table shows DCP III intended contribution towards addressing the causes of poor enjoyment of the right to development in Malawi.

**Table 4.1: DCP III’s Situation Analysis and the Project’s Response[[13]](#footnote-14)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Identified Manifestation or Cause | DCP’s Intended Contribution or Omission |
| *Manifestation Level* |
| *Poor Enjoyment of the Right to Development (Satisfaction Levels)* | * Increased and more effective participation of communities in decision-making and in advocating changes to policies, laws, practices which affect their livelihoods and rights and holding public bodies accountable
 |
| *Small benefits to the poor” (poverty levels not abetting)* | * Though intended to be addressed by the LOGSIP, DCP III contributed through increased skills and more communities demanding the right to development and other human rights
 |
| *Immediate Cause Level* |
| *Lack of or disjointed demand of rights at all levels*  | * An informed public actively claiming good governance and human rights by 2011
 |
| *Helplessness*  | * An informed public actively claiming good governance and human rights by 2011
 |
| *Unfair markets and poor access to basic social services* | * An informed public actively claiming good governance and human rights by 2011
 |
| *Underlying Cause Level* |
| *Poor responsiveness at all levels*  | * An informed public actively claiming good governance and human rights by 20110
 |
| *Disparities in knowledge about human rights*  | * Considered not significant
 |
| *Low understanding of human rights* | * Increased understanding of human rights from % to % and from % to % and correlative duties in rural areas with a focus on the right to development)
 |
| *Low skills to demand*  | * Increased skills and more communities in demanding rights at all levels
 |
| *Poor linkage of human rights to development in a market context* | * Awareness on consumer and fair trade rights
 |
| *Low understanding of democracy principles* | * Increased understanding of key democracy principles
 |
| *Neglect of duties*  | * Expected to e addressed by LOGSIP and other partners
 |
|  *Poor service delivery systems and processes*  | * Expected to be addressed by LOGSIP and other partners
 |
| *Non-functional decentralised structures [Not chosen]*  | * Assumed to be addressed by
 |
| *Basic Cause Level* |
| *Urban/male/age biases* | * [Not chosen]
 |
| *Condescending approach to development/low knowledge of development as a human right*  | * Increased skills in human rights-based approach to development for key public service providers and implementers
 |
| *Low relevance effectiveness and accessibility of national democratic institutions* | * Not chosen
 |
| *Poor human rights and democracy*  | * State of National and Local Governance Report
 |
| *Weak Policy Linkages*  | * Civil society-generated policy changes on basic social services and fair trade
 |

Source: See Note 12

Put in the language of outputs related to the project’s outcome, the following were the components of DCP III and its selected indicators:

**Table 4.2: DCP III’s Outputs and Indicators**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Output | Indicators |
| *Output 1*: At least half of the population demanding the realisation of the right to development at all societal levels. | Percentages of rural and urban females and males satisfied with service delivery |
| *Output 2*: At least half of the population demanding fair trade, labour and consumer protection. | Percentages of rural and urban females and males demanding fair trade, labour and consumer protection |
| *Output 3*: At least 40% of the population demanding public services and good governance from District Assemblies and other public functionaries. | Percentages of rural and urban females and males turning to service providers, public functionaries and CSOs and other functionaries |
| *Output 4*: Effective and efficient management, monitoring and evaluation of the Programme. | * + A more efficient DCP III
 |

The strategy of the Project was to support the development and implementation of specific projects by the Government, constitutional bodies and civil society organisations. Further, the strategy would include the facilitation of joint community action for the solution of governance and human rights challenges. The Programme had one type of project, namely that involving use of the media, that was implemented nationally, while the rest were implemented in the districts of Salima, Nsanje, Mzimba, Mwanza, Neno, Nkhotakota, Mangochi, Rumphi, Chikhwawa, Zomba, Nkhotakota, Mchinji, Machinga, Ntchisi, Nkhata Bay, Phalombe, Dedza, Karonga and Mulanje.

There was correspondence between the timeframes for DCP, which was designed to run from 2008 to 2011 and UNDAF which was also scheduled to commence in 2008 and end in 2011. However, in reality, the start of DCP III was delayed for almost five months due to a number of reasons, including late disbursement of funding by the UNDP. However, this was mitigated by extending the completion date of the Programme from 31 December 2011 to 1 June 2012. The result of this was that part of the Programme would be implemented after the expiry of UNDAF 2008-2011 and would extend into a period covered by UNDAF 2012 to 2016. The impact of this mis-alignment between DCP III and UNDAF processes on the management and efficiency of the former will only become evident during the 5-month period of extension.

##  Alignment of DCP III to National Development Needs

The outcome and outputs of DCP III were fully aligned to national development goals as prescribed in the principles of national policy set out in the Constitution. The intended outcome of the programme, namely, increased and more effective community participation for the improvement of their livelihoods and ability to hold public bodies accountable was in line with the obligation placed upon the government to act in the interests of the people and to be accountable. On its part, Output 1 of the Programme was aligned to the Constitution’s express guarantees of the right to development in section 30 and the right to access remedies for injustice in section 41. Output 2, which is at least half of the population demanding fair trade, labour rights and consumer protection is consistent with the guarantee of the right to fair labour practices guaranteed under section 31 of the Constitution, although the protection of fair trade and consumer protection may be said to be inconsistent with the national policy goal of “nurturing a market economy”.

Output 3- At least 40% of the population demanding public services and good governance from district assemblies and other public functionaries- is in line with the duty to be accountable that section 12 of the Constitution imposes on public officials and, more specifically, section 146 which places on local government authorities the responsibility to: promote infrastructural and economic development through the formulation and execution of local development plans; consolidate and promote local democratic institutions and democratic participation; and perform such other functions including participation in the delivery of essential and local services as may be prescribed by any Act of Parliament. Output 4 is necessarily aligned since it is facilitative of the production of Outputs 1, 2 and 3.

DCP III was also aligned to the overarching national policy framework, the MGDS, as well as the UNDAF[[14]](#footnote-15) and the MDGs.[[15]](#footnote-16) The alignment of DCP III to the MGDS was evident in the match between the former’s outputs and outcome, which essentially seek to promote participatory governance and rights-based approaches to development, and the expected outcomes of Theme 5 of the MGDS which sets out national goals aimed at promoting improved governance. The goals include improved delivery of quality public goods and services, local assemblies in full control of development planning and implementation and enhanced awareness and practice of human rights and responsibilities among all Malawians, particularly the most vulnerable groups.

There was also a high degree of alignment between DCP III and the UNDAF 2008-2011. Outcome 5 of the latter was good governance, gender equality and rights-based approach to development enhanced by 2011. The intended result of the outcome was “an informed public actively claiming good governance and human rights.” Evidently, there was clear correspondence between this outcome and intended result, on the one hand, and the outputs of DCP III, especially Outputs 1 and 3. It is also important to note the degree of alignment between DCP III and global development targets, such those in the MDGs. DCP III’s focus on the right to development, which the Constitution particularises to access and equal opportunity rights to basic resources, education, health services, food, shelter, employment and infrastructure, with emphasis on the rights of women, children and people with disabilities clearly aligns it to the UN MDGs, especially those that aim at eradication of extreme hunger and poverty, promote gender equality and empower women, reduce child mortality and improve maternal health and combat diseases.

For the most part, then, the project’s outcome and outputs were aligned to the country’s priorities and needs. The 2010 UN Country Assessment Report reported poverty to be deep and severe, with most households having limited, unsecured or un-assured, or even no access to adequate food, health care and education. The majority of people were also reported often not to participate in making important public decisions affecting their lives.

##  Organisation and Management

The organisation and management scheme of the Project was based on a tripartite arrangement among the Malawi Government, the UNDP and the Kingdom of Norway.[[16]](#footnote-17) Within the scheme, the Malawi Government, through the Office of the President and Cabinet, was the implementing agency; the Kingdom of Norway, through its embassy to Malawi, was a major funder to the Programme, with the other financial contributors to the project being the UNDP itself, and the Government of Malawi.

The tripartite arrangement was appropriate for the project since it brought together national policy formulation and implementation, promotion of international development norms and bilateral financial support. The tripartite arrangement of the Project was duplicated in other tripartite agreements involving the same parties and aimed at facilitating the implementation of activities also aimed at improving accountability by duty bearers, access to justice and enjoyment of human rights. Such agreements included those for supporting the Malawi Human Rights Commission and the Office of the Ombudsman. There was limited information-sharing, cooperation and coordination across the various tripartite agreements. The absence of a governance sector-wide policy framework only compounded the situation.

The management structure of DCP III consisted of the Programme Steering Committee (PSC), which was composed of representatives of all stakeholders, namely the Government, constitutional bodies of governance and civil society, and had an advisory, policymaking and controlling role; the Programme Management Office (PMO), which was responsible for the coordination, planning, implementation and monitoring of sub-contracted projects; and the Stakeholders’ Consultative Forum (SCF) which was an advisory and consultative forum to assist the PSC and also acted as a discussion partner to the PMO.

The PSD spelled out the organogram of the Project clearly and defined the roles of the institutions precisely.[[17]](#footnote-18) This reduced the confusion of roles and created a highly functional institutional framework which contributed significantly to the attainment of Output 4 of the Project.

However, DCP III operated with one programme members of staff less than DCP II. A member of staff who joined the Malawi Electoral Commission was not replaced. The phased nature of DCP III entailed progressively increased work for the PMO. Further increase of coverage, work, and depth might require increase in both programme and support staff.

##  The phased Approach of DCP III

By design, DCP III was to be phased in nature. The main determinant of this aspect of the project was lack of sufficient funding to get to all the country’s 28 districts with all the components of the project in the first year of implementation. The result was that the geographic scaling up would be in phases, with Output 1 of the project implemented in 7 districts in the first year and an additional 7 to be added in Year 2, when Output 2 would be added for implementation.

In addition to the logical framework, the 2008 annual workplan was key in this phased approach.[[18]](#footnote-19) That workplan, being results-based, was not as broad as DCP II. Thematically, its focus was on skills development for the demanding of the projects 3 key intended key outcome-related results: the enjoyment of the right to development, fair markets, and the performance of public service-related duties at all societal levels. In its design, the 2008 workplan intended, with a strong inclination for programmatic convergence. Of the chosen 7 districts, 3 were to be used to pilot the nascent collaboration between DCP III and the MoLG&RD for DCP-level Output 3.

The phased nature of the project had significant implications on the management of DCP III. Having substantially developed the skills needed to implement Output 1, there was not much skills development work with regard to the implementation of activities under Outputs 2 and 3. The phased nature of the project further entailed that the project was likely to need more finances as it spread to other districts each year and as Output 2 became added for implementation in districts implementing Outputs 1 and 3. The project’s phased nature though meant that the level of programmatic experiences for communities and the likelihood of attaining DCP III’s outcome would vary significantly.

At the design stage, it was realised that Output 3 had critical assumptions and risks. These were proven true because the LOGSIP was implemented amidst its own challenges, such as the absence of functioning elected councillors at the community level. The other logical framework assumptions and risks were “effective decentralised structures” and “strengthened policy linkages.”

Owing to the phased nature of the project, the assumptions and risk associated with Output 4 at the design stage affected the management of the whole project and the degree of attainment of DCP III’s outcome. The assumptions under Output 4 were as follows:

* Steady flow of financial resources from GoM, RNE and UNDP
* Other donors additional contributions
* UNDP’s increased efficiency
* No donor pull-out
* Stakeholders are supportive of report process
* Readily accessible public information

All these fears materialised during the implementation of the project, except the one assumption that stakeholders would be supportive of the reporting processes under the project. In particular, the fears related to the need for sufficient and uninterrupted flow of financial resources materialised despite one of the project’s key design requirement: the need to raise more funds and improve efficiency in disbursements.

##  Choice of Implementing Partners and Districts in DCP III

**Criteria for the Choice of Implementation Partners and Districts Under DCP III**

* Presence of both the MLGRD and DCP operations in the district.
* Regional balance/representation.
* High poverty levels - using the latest Household survey.
* Human rights principles,

And additionally for the partnership with the MLGRD;

* Opportunities for synergies and complementarities with other UN supported programmes

*Source: DCP Records*

As the choice of indicators and targets was meant to be human rights-based, the Project attempted to make the selection of implementation partners accordingly. Preference was for the human rights-based approach to programming, interactive methodologies and abilities to ensure realisation of the right to development for the vulnerable and marginalised.

In addition to considerations related to the human rights-based approach to development programming and potential programmatic efficacy, the choice of partners and districts for DCP III also took into account regional balance and representation. As DCP III was to be implemented as a complementary project to the LOGSIP, the presence of both projects in a district was another consideration. For the output related to the LOGSIP, a further consideration was “opportunities for synergies and complementarities with other UN supported projects.”

The operative paragraph in a standard advert calling for proposals from potential partners under DCP III would be formulated as follows:

“The Programme is inviting project proposals from local institutions withexperience in implementing projects on governance and human rights. Implementing institutions will be required to strictly comply with the project implementation modality described above and the programme’s guidelines for project implementation. Applicants with proof of existing grass root structures and/or experience in creating them will have an added advantage.”[[19]](#footnote-20)

The criteria for choice of partners reflect regard for potential equity, efficiency and effectiveness, and regional balance. Although the criterion of regional balance was not programmatically objective, it was programme-related in view of the importance of this consideration in the MGDS and other policy documents.

Implementing partners joined the Project at different stages of its duration. The following table indicates DCP III partners, districts, and thematic focus at the time the project was drawing to an end in 2011.

**Table 4.3: Geographically-Specific Project per Districts, Region, Partner, and Year**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Northern Region | Central Region | Southern Region |
| Year 1 |
| District | **Partner** | **Theme** | **District** | **Partner** | **Theme** | **District** | **Partner** | **Theme** |
| *Mzimba* | Church and Society, Livingstonia Synod | Promoting Citizen Participation in Development through Rights Based Approach | *Mchinji* | Malawi Centre for Advice, Research and Education on Rights | Ufulu wa Chitukuko | *Nsanje* | Malawi Centre for Advice, Research and Education on Rights | Ufulu wa Chitukuko |
|  |  |  | *Ntcheu* | Youth Net and Counselling | Stimulating Citizen’s Power: Mobilising Communities to demand the Right to Development | *Machinga* | Youth Net and Counselling | Stimulating Citizen’s Power: Mobilising Communities to demand the Right to Development |
|  |  |  | *Nkhotakota* | Nkhotakota Youth Organisation | Promotion of Citizen Participation in Governance | *Mwanza* | Women’s Legal Resource Centre | Enhancing the Capacity of Communities to demand the Right to Development |
| *Year 2* |
| *Rumphi* | Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, Mzuzu Diocese | Community Empowerment on the Right to Development | *Salima* | Centre for Human Rights and Rehabilitation | Enhancement of Citizen’s Participation in Local Governance and Demand for their Right to Development | *Chikhwawa* | Blantyre Synod Development Commission | Community Participation and Advocacy for Satisfactory Public Service Delivery |
|  |  |  | *Ntchisi* | Ntchisi Organisation for Youth and Development | Community Participation in Decentralisation and Local Governance | *Phalombe* | Institute for Policy Interaction | Promoting Community Phalanxes {Umunthu} |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | *Neno* | Women’s Legal Resource Centre | Enhancing the Capacity of Communities to demand the Right to Development |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | *Mangochi* | Youth Net and Counselling | Stimulating Citizen’s Power: Mobilising Communities to demand the Right to Development |
| *Year 3* |
| *Nkhata Bay* | Centre for Legal Assistance | Increased Community Participation in Demanding for the Right to Development from Duty Bearers | *Dedza* | Women’s Legal Resource Centre | Enhancing the Capacity of Communities to demand the Right to Development | *Mulanje* | Churches Action in Relief and Development | Right to Development: A democratic Discussion Forum – Khonde La Tilitonse |
| *Karonga* | Evangelical Lutheran Development Service | Building Grassroots Capacity on Good Governance & Human Rights for Sustainable Development |  |  |  | *Zomba* | Malawi Centre for Advice, Research and Education on Rights | Ufulu wa Chitukuko |

In addition to sub-projects with geographically-specific activities, DCP III had media sub-projects each of which covered the whole country. Table 4.4 shows DCP III’s media sub-projects.

**Table 4.4: DCP III’s Media Sub-Projects**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | Partner | Name of Sub-Project |
| 1 | Centre for Development Communication  | Promotion of a More Democratic Culture in Malawi |
| 2 | Development Communication Trust | Ndizathuzomwe III |
| 3 | Capital Radio Malawi | Mau a Kumudzi (Rural Voices) |
| 4 | Boma Lathu | Civic Education on Good Governance and Human Rights |

Only two new partners joined the Project in the third year, namely Churches Action in Relief and Development and Evangelical Lutheran Development Service. All partners selected in Year 1 to implement the civic education component of the programme were engaged to continue the implementation through the subsequent years of the Project. The main factor that determined the extension of participation by Women’s Legal Resource Centre and YONECO beyond the first year was the positive assessment of their institutional performance and the results of annual audits.

##  Partnership Formation and DCP III

Much as there were criteria for the choice of implementation partners and districts, there were no criteria for partnership formation. Inevitably, however, DCP worked with other partners, from the national to the community level.

At the community level, DCP III’s implementation partners often worked with other civil society organisations and public bodies. Many of these were treated as duty bearers by RLCs, CRCs, VRCs, and CBRCs. Examples of such organisations included Total Land Care. A public body that emerged a key partner was the Malawi Bureau of Standards, MBS, whose services were required in the implementation of Output 2, especially in relation to training about expiry dates of commodities and inspection of trade scales and other measuring tools.

At the district level, increasingly, the project forged partnerships with various district level duty bearers, without losing community members ability to demand services and accountability from duty bearers. This was especially the case in those districts, such as Mzimba, where CSLS worked with the district assembly under Output 3 of DCP III.

At the national level, DCP III formed partnership for knowledge sharing in three key ways. The first way was that as a GoM project, DCP participated in governance-related processes, such as the conversion on the National Initiative for Civic Education into a trust, the development of a governance sector in the country, and the Public Service Charter Programme. The second way was through DCP III’s leadership of organisations that adopt a human rights-based approach to development programming. The third way was through the project’s position within UNDAF. As a UNDP-supported project, DCP III’s key partner, the LOGSIP, with which it had logical framework links. Further, the DCP PMO often liaised with UNICEF and had to work with the MLG&RD to deliver on Output 3.

Output 3, on which DCP III was partnered with LOGSIP through the logical framework, was the slowest in delivering results, mainly because of structural gaps in the institutional framework of local governance due to the absence of councillors and weak capacities of VDCs and ADCs. In addition, the implementation partner appeared not to be very strong in grounding its programmes in human rights-based approaches. A lesson for future partnerships is to ensure that partners have a functional and fully-capacitated institutional framework and programmatic approach that reflects human rights-based approach, especially if the partnership is key to producing the project’s key result such as an output spelled out in the logical framework.

##  Planned Monitoring and Evaluation

The Programme Support Document envisaged a monitoring and evaluation framework, this aspect of programming having been the weakest under DCP II. As the logical framework and workplans were indicator and target-based, monitoring of progress had to track attainment of the targets, as disaggregated in both the logical framework and the workplan. Under Output 4, the logical framework required this type of monitoring, whose foundation was laid through the 2008 workplan’s result of a monitoring and evaluation framework. This was to be in addition to oversight and inputs from the PSC and the Stakeholder Forum. A new monitoring for DCP was added in the following terms: DCP Web-based database for existing data on governance. This result never materialised.

Overall responsibility for monitoring the Programme was vested in the PMO within the framework of participatory mechanisms which, in the case of funded projects, would involve monitoring by implementing organisations based on agreed monitoring systems. The design also provided for direct participation in monitoring and evaluation by the parties to the tripartite agreement, mainly through tripartite review meetings.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

DCP III, as designed, was an attempt to respond to some of the key recommendations following the review of DCP II. Like DCP II, DCP III was intended to be a contribution to the realisation of the MDGs and the MDGS while contributing to the realisation of some of the key provisions in Malawi’s Constitution. The project was also a fair example of compliance with the Paris Declaration on part of the Government of Malawi, the RNE, and UNDP. In particular, the pooling of resources under the project and the alignment to UNDAF, which was itself aligned to the MGDS, were sterling examples of collaboration and alignment of donor support to national priorities.

It was clear from the design stage, however, that the project would struggle to raise sufficient funds, as exemplified by its phased nature. Despite that the project was to start with 7 districts, to develop a skill base for the project and gradually deepen and widen, the project’s phased nature was bound to cause implementation strain, if sufficient funds were not raised. Although the deleterious nature of such a shortcoming could have been mitigated by the project’s careful selection of implementation partners, the steady implementation of the project was bound to suffer, especially at the start of a year, when partner budgets would have to be re-adjusted.

In view of these observations, this evaluation makes the following recommendations:

* Recommendation No 2: Continue to align any successor project to MGDS II, UNDAF 2012-2016 and any sector wide policy that may be developed on democratic governance.
* Recommendation No. 3: Maintain the PMO as an autonomous and lean implementation office, advised and supervised by the PSC, and implementing projects through organisations that are proven or have the potential to be efficient and effective in implementing a results-based and human rights-based project.
* Recommendation No. 4: Mobilise more funding, including from the budget/basket funding allocated within the governance sector policy framework that may be developed in time.
* Recommendation No 5: Be cautious if any successor project was to aim at attaining reforms in local government legislation or policies that require action by councillors as councillors will only come into office in 2014.
* Recommendation No. 6: Be cautious to join or partner similar initiatives through a logical framework, but instead work with such initiatives based on proven or potential efficiency and effectiveness and congruence in using a human rights-based approach and results-based management.
* Recommendation 7: Consider reviewing staffing at various levels with a view to a possible increase in the number of programme and support staff.

# 5. DCP III as Implemented

## Introduction

One key recommendation from the evaluation of DCP III was that implementing partners should be selected on the basis of programmatic efficiency and effectiveness.[[20]](#footnote-21) Having chosen its partners, the implementation of DCP III started well into 2008. As the MGDS and the UNDAF came to an end in 2011, it was expected that DCP III would also be drawing to an end.

This chapter assess the degree of efficiency and effectiveness of the project in meeting the objectives for which it was designed and identifies challenges to programme implementation. The chapter further identifies unintended results achieved by the programme and determine whether or not they positively or negatively impacted on programme implementation. Lastly, the chapter concludes with recommendations.

## The situation Analysis and the Relevance of DCP III

The situation analysis which provided the basis for the design of the DCP III revealed that the poor enjoyment of the right to development, especially by the youth and rural people was a major cause of poverty. This was found to be caused by, among other things, the following: low skills to demand rights and inaccessible redress channels, poor linkage of human rights to development in a market economy, lack of or disjointed demand of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights at all levels, poor access to basic social services, reverence for service providers and public functionaries, neglect of duties, poor service delivery systems and processes, and non-functional accountability to rights holders.

In design and implementation, DCP III addressed most of the causes of poor enjoyment of human rights associated with the capacities of rights holders. This made the project to be firmly rooted on the demand side of human rights enjoyment, where there were few similar initiative in 2007 and during the implementation of the project. DCP III was highly relevant in design and implementation.

## The Cogency of DCP III Results Framework

The situation analysis had pointed to the need for a project that would, among other aspects, enhance people’s skills to demand rights and animate such demand; improve the linkage between human rights and development; and facilitate the accountability of service providers and public functionaries for the delivery of basic services. For the most part, results in relation to the causes of the challenges that had been identified in the situation analysis were cogent and logical.

However, DCP III had five weaknesses that affected the cogency and comprehensiveness of its results chain. The first was that despite the situation analysis indicating that the youth were disproportionately affected by the lack of enjoyment of the right to development, none of the Project’s activities or results explicitly related to the situation of youths as such.

The second was that two causes about the demanding of the right to development and its associated rights in the programme were to be addressed merely through the tracking of indicators and targets. These causes were: “disparities in knowledge about human rights” and “urban/rural/age biases.” The relevance of the project on this aspect would therefore depend on the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation system in tracking progress. As implemented, although DCP III was stronger than DCP II in its monitoring and reporting activities, the reporting was often not with reference to the targets set in the logical framework. This made the relevance of the project, on this aspect, hazy.

The third gap in the results chain was the project’s lack of direct results about the low relevance, effectiveness, and accessibility of national democratic institutions. At the design stage, the assumption was that the demand created for the services of such institutions would make them more relevant. As it turned out, many communities continued to find these institutions largely irrelevant. As their primary concern was the improvement of their lives, community members often ignored or by-passed these institutions, preferring those duty bearers or actors that were likely directly to provide the demanded services or public good.

The fourth weakness in the cogency of the results chain was with regard to causes of poor enjoyment of the right to development that were to be addressed by DCP III’s counterpart project, the Local Governance and Local Economic Development Programme (LOGSIP). These causes all related to the creation of capacity on the demand side of the enjoyment of the right to development and other associated rights. The assumption of the DCP III was that the risks associated with results connected to such causes would not materialise. These assumptions and risks were:

* Effective decentralised structures,
* Strengthened policy linkages; and
* Functioning elected councillors.[[21]](#footnote-22)

As of October, 2011, these remained challenges. The consequence though was greatly to reduce the relevance of DCP III especially in relation to the responsiveness of service providers and public functionaries in the local government system.

The fifth weakness was that the activities employed by community members, CBEs, CBFs, and key implementers of the project rarely reflected the direct significance of the MDGS and MDGs. Partners choices of areas of intervention were not based on the priorities of the policy framework. Such was the case in Nsanje with regard to activities facilitated by both DCT and CARER. This may be a reflection of the mismatch between national policy priorities and local development ones.

## External Determinants of DCP III Relevance

In addition to the weaknesses connected with the design and implementation of DCP II, the relevance of the project was also adversely affected by policy shifts at the national level. National development agendas and priorities never remain the same over any given period of time. This was also the same for Malawi over the period since the Programme was initiated in 2008. Since the Programme was designed to be responsive to national development needs and priorities, it’s relevance was directly affected by any shifts in those needs and priorities.

A second factor that adversely affected the relevance of DCP III in so far as governance is concerned was the increasing political dominance of the ruling political party, following national elections in 2009. During the design of the programme, it was noted that the lack of democracy in political parties was a basic cause of poor responsiveness by duty bearers. There was evidence during the evaluation that DCP III attempted to make political functionaries accountable; but only with regard to the delivery of needed public services.

## The relevance of dcp iii’s indicators and targets

DCP III’s indicators and targets were broadly appropriate and capable of facilitating accurate measurement of results. The indicators were chosen from DCP’s own earlier work, the *Baseline on Civic Education*.[[22]](#footnote-23) Subject to the accuracy of that baseline survey, DCP III’s indicators and targets were based on a scientific and verifiable source.

**Table 5.1: DCP III’s Indicators and Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DCP III Outcome | Indicators | Baseline | Targets |
| DCP Outcome: Increased and more effective participation of communities in decision-making and in advocating changes to policies, laws, practices which affect their livelihoods and rights and holding public bodies accountable. | * %s of rural and urban females and males understanding key democratic principles
 | Females: 29%; Male: 46.5%; Urban: 50.5%; Rural: 35% | Respectively 50%, 60%, 60%, 50% |
| * %s of rural and urban females and males able to understand human rights
 | Female: 16%; Male: 19%; Urban: 20%; Rural: 17% | 50% for each |
| * %s of people indicating improvements for specific groups having improved access to public services
 | Women: 27%; Men: 27%; Children: 24%; The elderly: 14%; Rural people: 13%; Urban: 39%; PLWHA: 17%; Disabled people: 14%; the unemployed: 5%; The mentally ill: 7%;  | 50% for each |
| * %s of rural and urban females and males doing something to demand better services
 | Female: 27%; Male: 32%; Urban: 22%; Rural: 31% | 50% for each |

*Source: DCP III Logical Framework*

However, the propriety and feasibility of some of the indicators chosen for results aimed at measuring Outputs 1, 2 and 3 were problematic. Some of the indicators were too precise and consequently not feasible. Although, this was noted during a review by at least one Tripartite Meeting, there was no evidence to suggest that they were revised to make them more feasible.

## The relevance of the Name “DCP III”

There have been arguments that the name “DCP III” entailed lack of progress, as the indication was given that the programme was in a third phase but still trying to achieve its goal, the consolidation of democracy. On this basis, a conclusion is made that the programme’s name should be changed.

It is not correct to argue that DCP III has been an unmodified continuation of DCP I, expect in its set up structure. DCP III was very different from DCP I, which focused on the development of Malawi’s democracy institutions. DCP II combined a focus on institutional capacity development and reform with civic education. Upon evaluation, the civic education component was the most effective and efficient. Based on what had proven to be effective, efficient, and demand, DCP was developed. Further, it is not in dispute that democracy is still in need of consolidation in Malawi. In retrospect, indeed, it appears too optimistic to have expected democracy to have been fully consolidated within ten years.

Before the name is change, it is also important to consider the goodwill, image, and the communicative brand of “DCP” that could be lost. In communities, DCP has now become associated with human rights-based work and demanding of the right to development, other human rights, fairness, participation, and accountability.

Further, the argument about the inappropriateness of the name DCP III becomes weak if DCP is understood, as it has always claimed to be, a programme. From this perspective, DCP I, II, and III are just projects within a long term programme to consolidate democracy.

Nevertheless, it is also fair to stress that DCP III was more about contribution to human dignity using the linkage between the right to development and good governance as a fulcrum. A name that more accurately reflect this focus could have indeed been appropriate.

## The pooling of Resources and DCP III Efficiency

The three phases of DCP so far have financially been organised around the concept of the fund. This has allowed resources to be pooled for specialised management and effectiveness. The UNDP-managed fund received resources principally from UNDP, the Government of Norway, and the Government of Malawi. The Government of Sweden, which had channelled its funding through the RNE during DCP II, stopped its contribution under DCP III. In 2010, however, the fund received unused funds under DCP I from the Governments of the Netherlands and Finland.

Despite the apparent shortage of donors, with only UNDP and the Government of Norway having been with DCP from DCP I, the pooling of resources widened economies of scale and rendered the funds to dedicated management and accountability. Under DCP III, the holding of the fund was in UNDP, which dealt with donors and the PMO. The management of the project though was in the PMO, with the control and power to review vested in the PSC and the stakeholder forum respectively.

The separation of functions in relation to the fund and the project allowed the exercise of specialised roles and skills. In addition to providing checks and balances, the modality for the delivery of DCP III allowed a pooling of ideas and energies at low cost.

## Respected Efficiency amidst Budgetary Constraints

Ironically, despite the use of the modality of the fund, DCP III was budget-constrained from its design. During the design, it was apparent that DCP III would not have sufficient resources to reach and deepen programmatic experiences throughout Malawi. Despite such a realisation, DCP III’s initial budget could not be fully mobilised. The financial aspirations at the start of the programme were dashed when the project mobilised only 59.9% of its planned budget, with no additional donors.

Consequently, DCP III’s ambitions were significantly scaled down in subsequent years. Although the budgeted amounts were mobilised from 2008, it is well-acknowledged that DCP III was not able to satisfy the demand it had ignited from implementing partners and communities. The following table shows DCP III’s annual budgets, revealing UNDP as the largest contributor to the DCP III fund.

**Table 5.2: DCP III’s 2008-2010 Budget and Expenditure**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Budget | Mobilised | Expenditure | Balance |
| 2008 | US$3,197,821 | All | US$1,702,108 | US$1,357,163 | US$344,945 |
| Balance from Previous Year | US$0.00 |
| RNE | US$395,257 |
| UNDP | US$1,300,744 |
| Rental (GoM) | US$70,710 |
| 2009 | US$2,223,230 | All | US$2,387,168 | US$2,242,933 | US$144,235 |
| Balance from Previous Year | US$344,945 |
| RNE | US$621,250 |
| UNDP | US$1,420,973 |
| Rental (GoM) | US$70,710 |
| 2010 | US2,513,326 | All | US$ 2,636,645 | US$ 2,413,710 | U$222,935 |
| Balance from Previous Year | US$ 144,235 |
| RNE | US$974,015 |
| One UN Fund | US$ 260,270 |
| UNDP | US$803,575 |
| Netherlands (DCP I Balance) | US$168,466 |
| Finland (DCP I Balance) | US$307,111 |
| Rental (GoM) | US$65,881 |

Source: DCP Financial Report 2010 (Lilongwe; DCP, 2010)

The absorption rates for the project were reasonably high.. For examples, for 2010, one of the two years in which DCP III was implemented for twelve months, the total actual expenditure to total available resources was 92% while the total actual expenditure to funds allocation was 96%.

There are several explanations for DCP III’s respected efficiency. The first was the project’s open competition based on capacity efficiently and effectively to implement a project of DCP III’s nature. For example, the selection of partners was open and highly competitive. In March, 2009, the need to expand the project to 7 more districts yielded 83 project proposals, from which only 7 were selected.

The second reason is DCP III’s modality, very lean on structures that it has to maintain. In contrast to NICE, DCP III did not own infrastructure at community level which it had to maintain. Instead, it worked through RLCs, VRCs, and CRCs, which used existing community structures or venues for their meetings, often using their resources for travel to make demands from duty bearers or animate other communities. In addition, the PMO is lean, semi autonomous office, with above average, professionalism, efficiency and effectiveness.

The third reason for DCP III’s respected efficiency was that its stringent reporting requirements increased the efficiency of the project. Under DCP III, there was need to report every quarter and in some cases, every month. On its part, DCP had to report to UNDP every quarter, which had to file its own bi-annual reports to the RNE. In addition, the PSC met every quarter to review progress, exercise oversight and provide guidance. At the end of the year, all key stakeholders would convene to report to each other and share lessons learnt. Although it can be argued that the reporting burdens under DCP III were heavy, the requirements facilitated diligence for all key actors to achieve results.

Community level facilitators train/sensitise community level animators

Community level animators animate other communities and community members

District level trainers train community level facilitators

**Figure 5.1:The Stepwise Approach for Training Under DCP III**

PMO trains trainers

Trainers train district level facilitators

The fourth reason for DCP III’s respected efficiency was in the way the project used training. In many projects, training is often an inefficient method, if viewed in from the perspective of an intended outcome. In contrast, training under DCP III was used catalytically, to increase a critical mass to implement the project. At the national level, the PMO would train trainers of trainers. These trainers of trainers would then transfer their skills to trainers at the district level. The district level trainers would then train facilitators, who in turn would train community level animators, who are the project’s most efficient assets, since they are volunteers.

In 2008, 29 trainers of trainers were trained. DCT trainers went on and established 12 more RLCs to add to the 30 established under DCP II. YONECO trained 96 CBEs who went on to train 240 VRCs. WORLEC identified 20 CBEs for its Mwanza-based activities. CARER trained 36 CBEs who went on to train 59 CRCs. During the district-level FGDs under this evaluation, some CBEs indicated that they had trained up to 9 VRC, although the DCP-recommended number of VRCs per CBE is 5.

The following table shows the increasing number of people trained as the training cascaded for 2009, when most of the training on the right to development was done, and 2010, when people were trained on fair trade, fair labour practices, and consumer protection.

**Table 5.3: Numbers CBEs/CBFs/Umunthu Ambassadors, Community Level Structures and Animators Trained Per Implementing Agency, 2009 to 2010**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Implementation Partner | CBEs/CBFs/Umunthu Ambassadors Trained | VRC/CRCs/CBRCs or RLCs Trained | Committee/Club Members Trained Members Trained |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2009** | **2010** | **2009** | **2010** |
| DCT | 0 |  | 57 | 39 | 684 | 468 |
| YONECO | 36 | 137 | 355 | 425 | 4,260 | 5,100 |
| Nkhotakota Youth Organisation | 0 | 28 | 93 | 82 | 930 | 820 |
| CARER | 0 (having trained 76 in 2008) | 79 | 147 | 236 | 1,470 | 2,360 |
| WORLEC | 16 | 40 | 116 | 100 | 1,160 | 1,000 |
| CSLS | 0 | 42 | 133 | 133 | 1,330 | 1,330 |
| NOYD  | 28 | 28 | 98 | 64 | 980 | 640 |
| IPI | 24 | 23 | 90 | 0 | 900 |  |
| CHHR | 40 | Repeated | 150 | No training undertaken | 1,500 |  |
| Mzuzu Diocese CCJP | 39 | 40 | 125 | 55 | 1,250 | 550 |
| Blantyre Synod Development Commission | 40 | 40 | 150 | 150 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Total | **223** | **457** | **1364** | **1284** | **15964** | **13768** |

*Source: DCP Annual Reports and Data bank*

The fifth explanation for the project’s efficiency was the catalytic use of media-related activities. Like training, media-based activities tend to be costly in project implementation. However, such methods were used to promote and cement synergy between the project’s, partners, activities, and results. *Boma Lathu*, CDC, and Capital FM, as implementation partners acted as vehicles of the lessons, messages, and experiences under DCP III. In 2008, DCT produced 12 episodes of *Kanthu N’khama* under DCP III and *one Tiunike Kanthu N’Khama* programme, a review of *Kanthu N’khama*. CDC produced 20 *Mbali Yanga* drama episodes, which were broadcast on the national radio station, MBC. On its part, Capital Radio produced 16 *Mau a Kumudzi* programme. Boma Lathu produced 30,000 copies of *Mfulu Supplement.*

The number of instrumental media-related results increased for 2009 and 2010 compared to the 2008 figures. DCT produced and aimed for at least one *Khama Lathu* dialogue programme aired each week on Zodiak Broadcasting Station (ZBS), with a counterpart review programme *Tilondoloze Khama Lathu* A similar set of programmes were arranged with Capital Radio. CDC produced 46 and 51 episodes in 2009 and 2010 respectively. Capital Radio produced 37 and 44 episodes of Mau a Kumudzi respectively in 2009 and 2010. Boma Lathu produced 110,000 and 89,000 copies of the *Mfulu Supplement* in 2009 and 2010 respectively.

The media projects were also used to publicise achievements attained by various communities through the implementation of DCP III. This served to inspire other communities to learn lessons for the improvement of their own living conditions. It also encouraged a competitive spirit between communities that energised them and contributes to the widening of the impact of the Project.

## The Efficiency Challenges of DCP III

Timeliness was a challenge in view of the demand the project had generated. The project’s need for a phased approach due to insufficient funding resulted in scaling down of activities during annual work-planning. Implementation for Years 1 and 2 started late and was adversely affected by a carry over of activities from DCP II, preparatory work for DCP III, and late preparation of key implementation manuals. Probably the most significant cause of delays in implementing the activities of DCP III was delayed disbursements from UNDP. The implementation of the project was characterised by interruptions in the flow of funding from UNDP to DCP. In turn, this would delay transfers to implementation partners. In some cases, such as during the last quarter of 2010, the PMO requested some of its partners to slow down on implementation due to poor cash flow. From UNDP’s side, the delays were partly a result of the transfers from RNE to UNDP having to go through UNDP Headquarters. Another contributing factor to the delays was some of DCP’s partners would delay their reports to DCP. As per the cost sharing agreement, RNE funds would be paid out once the half year report was submitted to RNE in January/February and the second in July. As the reporting chain and was long, it caused delays.

DCP III was further characterised by dilemmas regarding the efficiency of the varied methods of its partners, within the project’s broad strategy. The project had at least three implementation methods. The first were media activities that primarily involved three partners: *Boma Lathu*, CDC, and Capital Radio FM. *Boma Lathu* used print media for its circulation of the *Mfulu* supplement. This method’s advantage was in the circulation of the Government newspaper in rural areas. By including *Mfulu* as a Supplement, the paper partly became a mouth piece for the project and helped transfer information regarding the experiences of various communities across the country. The method however was limited by *Boma Lathu’s* small circulation and enveloping the *Mfulu* in the main *Boma Lathu* paper.

Another challenge for DCP was the varied skills of the people to whom it was to transfer skills for the implementation of the project. There were clear variations of skills among the implementing partners, especially with regard to the human rights-based approach to development programming and results-based management. There were also differences in competencies on effective teaching methods, including preparation and knowing appropriate levels to pitch lessons. Such variations would sometimes produce less than desirable results, which would not recognised as such by implementation partners and CBEs and CBFs. For example, in Salima, the PMO had to require a repeat of the first year training activities facilitated by CHHR before moving on to activities scheduled for the second year. Interestingly, the CBFs trained by CHHR in Salima did not understand the reason for the repeat of Year 1 activities , as they were more than satisfied with their work and its results.

## 5.10 The efficiency of the Project’s Outputs

In general, the cost of activities, decreased with increased number of people or social units involved. This was largely because of the reliance on the notions of animation and transfer of skills, which were central to the implementation of the Project. An examination of the budget and expenditure on Output 2 illustrates the point. With the key exception of the manual on fair trade, labour practices, and consumer protection, the inputs and activities under Output 2 built on the foundation established by Output 1 in the previous year and continued to rely on similar Output 1-related activities. By the second year, there were more clubs and committees established at the community level and more members joining these new structures. As can be observed from Figure 5.2,[[23]](#footnote-24) the budget for the output for 2010 comprised only 1.75% and its proportion of the total expenditure was only 1.72%.

In contrast, Output 3, which relied more on the collaboration with the MoLG&RD required an amount that constituted 22.5% of the total budget and 22.7% of the total expenditure. Of the outputs, activities under this output were third in total cost, after Outputs 1 and 4. However, this output was the most inefficient, considering the flurry of activities and results under Outputs 1 and 4, which were mainly district assembly orientations,.

With regard to the operation budget and costs, Output 4 took less than one third of both the budget and the costs. Its share of the total budget for 2010, for example, was at 29.2% while its share of the total expenditure was 30%.

## Activities Implemented as Planned

Most of the activities specified under Output 1 of the Programme were implemented as planned. These were radio listening clubs and Village/Community Rights Committees; training of programmers, trainers, facilitators and animators on right to development; community-led education, dialogue, and action-taking regarding the right to development and government’s policies, processes, and programmes; community-led whistle blowing for public accountability; reflective learning through sharing of best practices and other experiences (exchange visits and review meetings); production/acquisition of manual on fair trade, labour and consumer protection for stakeholders; baseline surveys on fair trade, labour and consumer protection; civic education for small scale and subsistence farmers; cooperatives and other enterprise blocks; whistle-blowing for fair trade, labour rights and consumer protection; joint MoLGRD and DCP orientation; dialoguing with local government structures and technical staff and action points through citizens’ forums and other activities; whistle-blowing against non-compliance with agreed rules, regulations, other norms, and failure to enforce rules, regulations, and other norms.

The same degree of implementation was true of all activities under Outputs 2 and 4, except for the development of a database on governance and the publication of a related state of governance report.

## Activities Planned but not Done

Some activities under Outputs 1 and 3 of the Programme were either significantly modified in their implementation or were not implemented at all. Under Output 1, most assessments, analyses, and action plans by communities were not conducted iteratively; reflective learning through sharing of best practices and other experiences was limited by the restriction of the number of exchange visits and review meetings and the orientation of policy makers on human rights based approaches and rights based management was limited.

Under Output 3, training of local government rights holders and duty bearers to demand rights at all local government levels did not sufficiently cover traditional leaders, VDCs and ADCs; demand-driven reforms on rules, regulations, and other norms as well as referral of proposals for rules and regulations to District Assemblies did not take place, neither did bi annual review meetings with District Assemblies. The absence of elected councillors, who would have the legal mandate to make or reform local level rules and regulations would have made the activity impossible to implement even if there had been no other constraints.

## Activities Done but not Planned

The Project did not implement any activities that were not planned.

## Degree to which Activities Led to Intended Results

Activities implemented under Output 1 of the Project produced most of their intended key results. There was evidence that the results made a significant contribution to the creation of a growing critical mass to animate and facilitate the demanding of the right to development and justice in the districts sampled for this evaluation. The demands produced demonstrable improvements in the lives of the concerned communities, especially with respect to successful demands for the construction and rehabilitation of bridges, provision of water boreholes and improvement in the treatment of patients by public health workers, as evidenced by DCP documentation of success stories and accounts of community members themselves. The provision of paralegal services significantly underpinned results produced under Output 1 by facilitating awareness and action necessary for enforcing the right to development and other human rights.

The production of key results under Output 1 was also limited in that the critical mass that grew did not make demands relating to a number of problems that the communities identified as being critical to the improvement of their lives as access to employment; access, availability and affordability of energy; as provided for in section 30(1) and (2) of the Constitution..

In addition, although the project was to pay special attention to the situation of women, children, people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, most activities by VRCs/CRCs and RLCs did not aim to deliver benefits specific to such groups . The focus group discussions among members of CRCs VRCs, and RLCs also demonstrated low levels of knowledge about the rights of children, women, people with disabilities, people living with HIV and Aids, the elderly, the ultra poor, and *akamwini* and *atengwas*. This suggested that the civic education for any other vulnerable groups had not achieved its intended results in this area.

Activities under Output 2 were largely successful in producing their intended key results. Interactive education on fair trade, labour and consumer protection in all districts and community and movement championed dialogue and implementation of action points and plans generated a significant amount of demands for consumer rights and fair market systems and processes, with some of the most successful initiatives including the following:

* Demands facilitated by the VRC in T.A. Mposa in Machinga and, among many areas in Nkhotakota, Mpamantha, which effectively eliminated exploitative pricing practices by buyers of local produce;
* Demands facilitated by Malawi CARER in Nsanje; and
* Demands facilitated by DCT in Mangochi which led to minimisation of fraudulent practices by local traders.

Despite these successes, key results under Output 2, like those under Output 1 were limited in effectiveness because none of the activities implemented under these outputs reflected the special problems of the urban poor. By their nature, such areas were the location of a significant number of challenges related to trade, labour and consumer protection. However, by the time the projected ended, the work of CRCs in such areas was yet to compare with that of CRCs in rural areas. There was a CRC in the peri-urban village of Chikanda in Zomba, which represented the few exceptions of urban-based CRCs.

Although the project implemented activities around certain district trading centres, such as in Rumphi, the activities were significantly similar to those implemented in typically urban areas. For example, CCJP’s-facilitated Mulongoti CRC is most proud about its collective irrigation-fed communal garden and cattle milk production. This may underline that although the definition of an urban area includes one at or near a district headquarters, these areas are not urban after all, by the means and standards of living.

*“The relationship between VRCs and CRCs, on the one hand, and ADCs and VDCs, on the other, varies from place to place, depending on the capacity of the VDC.”*

Northern Region FGD,

5 September 2011

Activities under Output 3 were the least successful in achieving their intended key results. There was no evidence to indicate that community driven and owned village, area, and district development plans, rules, regulations and other norms were developed or implemented as a result of activities under the Project. There was little evidence of systematic engagement between Village/Community Rights Committees, on the one hand, and VDCs and ADCs, on the other. Some VRCs and CRCs reported interacting with VDCs and ADCs but the modalities of such interface were largely *ad hoc* and varied considerably across the districts where programme activities were implemented. Bi-annual joint reviews between the Programme and District Assemblies which could have addressed the gap did not take place mainly because, in the absence of elected councillors, District Assemblies were non-existent.

**Table 5.4: Engagement of DCP III Structures with Local Government Community Structures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Community* | *Engagement of VRC with VDC/ADC* |
| Mulongoti VRC, Rumphi | * VRC and VDC work collectively as partners
 |
| Chindekani VRC, Rumphi | * VRC approaches ADC as a duty bearer
 |
| Chididi VRC, Nsanje | * Varies from case to case
 |
| Chimwavi VRC, Salima | * VRC makes input into VDC plans
 |
| Tithokoze RLC, Salima | * VRC and VDC work collectively as partners
 |
| Benga VRC, Salima | * VRC and VDC input into each others priority-setting
 |
| Chigoma RLC, Mzimba | * VRC “by-passes” VDC
 |

Activities under Output 4 were largely successful in producing most of their key results, namely, effective and efficient management of the Programme. PSC meetings, progress reports, reports of tripartite meetings and the MIM review indicated positive assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the PMO.[[24]](#footnote-25) On the other hand, some results were attained only partially or not at all. For example, although a website was created, it is yet to be a Web-based database for existing data on governance in Malawi.

## Key Factors Affecting Effectiveness

Three key aspects of DCP III positively determined its effectiveness during implementation. The first was the project’s focus on results, rather than completed activities. This allowed implementers to resort to methods and ways that would help them achieve intended results. For example, although, in theory, rights holders are supposed to make demands on immediate formal duty bearers who would, in turn, exert demands on their duty bearers, community members made demands on any duty bearer whose response would result in an intended result. In this regard, community members did not restrict their demands to formal or public duty bearers, but also worked with civil society survive providers, such as Total Land Care. The second aspect for the effectiveness of the project was its interactive methods, particularly in civic education, where principles of adult learning were used to good effect. Even media sub-projects such as those employed by CDC, Capital Radio, and DCT underlined interactivity to promote learning. The third positive cause of DCP III’s effectiveness was the use of group, participatory, and solidarity-based activities among communities. Community members attributed the effectiveness of their activities were rooted in their collective or group approach.

The effective of DCP III’s activities, particularly training was negatively affected by two factors. The first was that community members, CBFs, and CBEs complained that the policy of the project not to give cash allowances to training participants reduced motivation, compared to other comparator projects. The seriousness of this complaint was however outweighed by the results often achieved as a result of the training received. The second aspect that negatively affected the effectiveness of the project was the generally acknowledged short duration of trainings at the community level. Many CBEs and CBFs complained that the three days allocated for training was too short, .This view was not unanimous among trainers some of whom suggested that such difficulties arose mainly due to lack skills in effective teaching among some trainers, CBEs, and CBFs. Such skills included ability to pitch and orient form content and methods according to the capacity of learners.

## DCP III’s Outcome-Related Positive Impact

DCP III has cumulatively had both direct and indirect impact, positively and negatively, in its quest to contribute to the UNDP Country Programme of having an “informed public actively claiming good governance and human rights by 2011.” These results could be traced into the UNDAF outcome of “good governance, gender equality, and a rights based approach to development enhanced by 2011.”

The notion of the service provider and public functionary as the “bwana” is slowly being challenged by the concept of “a servant for the public.” A Mulongoti VRC member at Rumphi Central, put it in this way: “They are not bwanas; they are duty bearers.” In almost all community interactions during this evaluation, members insisted that they were no longer afraid of the public functionary, who they have come to understand as a duty bearer for their benefit.

DCP III’s progress on its outcome, “increased and more effective participation of communities in decision-making and in advocating changes to policies, laws, practices which affect their livelihoods and rights and holding public bodies accountable**”,** can be demonstrated by the project’s impact on both people and the direct and indirect contribution towards sector objectives. In relation to this outcome, the clubs and the committees are claiming the enjoyment of the right to development and are beginning to assert their rights with regard to labour, fair trade, and consumer protection rights.

In some cases, the community members could demonstrate a remarkably holistic approach in their work and protection of their rights and those of their children, as they curb household poverty.

**Holism on Convention Results and Novel Activism for Fair Trade and against Use of Children as Bilaboys in T.A. Mposa, Machinga.**

The YONECO-facilitated CRC at TA Mpaso in Machinga is a telling example of the holistic approach some VRCs, CRCs, CBRCs, and RLCs have adopted under DCP III. The CRC started its work in 2009 and “using the YONECO name”, the CRC had achieved the following conventional results:

* Moulding 300,000 bricks to construct a Police office with EU help;
* Having bridges constructed and roads maintained;
* Getting a water pump installed for the community; and
* Having chlorine distributed and used to counter cholera outbreaks.

In addition, the CRC undertook novel initiatives because of DCP III:

1. Facilitating the rice-producing community to form a trading cooperative to bargain on selling practices for rice from K70 to K150 per Kilogramme, with Tambala Food Products Limited purchasing 200,000 Kilogram’s. Under the project, such proceeds have been banked, as investments and savings, allowing some households to improve their house structures and meet other needs.
2. Curbing abuse of police powers (e.g.; demanding taxes for motor cycles and bicycles and generally harassing people). When the CRC questioned these practices, the Police responded by arresting 4 women and 8 men from the group. YONECO intervened through paralegal and legal assistance, resulting in the release of those that were arrested and a promise by the Inspector General to visit the area to apologise.
3. Intervening to protect the economic abuse and exploitation of children being brought from Phalombe, Mulanje, Zomba, and Mangochi to work as “bilaboys” to catch fish in the muddy waters of the lake. Through a related village-formed group, the Lake Chilwa Child Foundation, members of the CRC started monitoring the exploitative use of children as “bilaboys”, erecting a road block, rescuing and re-uniting some of the children with their families, and spending an excess of K230,000 to place some children back into school. In this work, the CRC collaborated with IPI-facilitated communities in Phalombe. Such activism to protect those that may be exploited was extended to the protection of women engaged in prostitution by Lake Chilwa.

There were people who were ‘dead’ here; but now, they are arising.” Group Village Headman, Benga VRC, Salima

## DCP III as a Cause of Social Transformation

Indirectly, the project has caused some social transformation especially in gender relations, roles, images, and stereotypes. For many of the community members that participated in this evaluation, especially those belonging to RLCs, there was no need to separate women from men during FGDs. Members of Madalitso RLCs in Machinga and Chigoma RLC in Embangweni in Mzimba, women and men recounted on how they carry each other on bicycles, irrespective of whether they are married to each others, on long journeys to animate other communities. It was observed during the evaluation that women sat next to men, without manifestations of conventional cultural sensitivities. In such communities, the women were very articulate and often assumed leadership roles within the groups. This was also the case with female CBEs or CBFs, as observed in Chididi in Nsanje and Chindikani CRC in Bowe in Rumphi. Such transformation of gender attitudes, images, and roles are indicative of overall transformation of cultural attitudes, which have included the abandonment of negative cultural practices especially those against children. At Benga in Salima, for example, community members insisted that gule wamkulu should help “chase” the child to school rather than terrorise people. In the Northern Region, implementers and CBEs reported that there were marked changes to the traditional customs of “kuphimbira”, “indura”, and “iphiro”, to make them more conducive to development.

DCP III further appeared to have re-ignited capacities of communities for team-working and social cohesion. Development as a notion for progressive dignified life or living as “mfulu”, has become a common vision. With such a vision, community members through RLCs, VRCs, CBRC, and CRCs put together their energies and talents to attain results that could improve the quality of their collective or individual life. As such transformation was occurring and community members were gaining higher aspirations. One such aspiration was the demand for appropriate adult literacy so that they could speak English fluently and understand new forms of knowledge.

## DCP III’s Inputs into Sector Objectives

There were benefits related to sector objectives within the context of the MGDS. At lower levels, the project’s impact on good governance was unmistakable, unlike its lack of impact on governance at the national level. For example, traditional leaders were increasingly becoming convinced to abandon bad governance practices following the work of RLCs and CRCs, CBRCs, VRCs, and CBEs. Similarly, the work of paralegals enabled communities to overcome one of the significant challenges in the governance sector, namely low awareness of rights and the mechanisms for their enforcement. As community members in the DCP III-created structures were determined to get results, they so much demanded good governance at the national level, where they considered they may not succeed as easily as at the lower levels. In demanding good governance, community groups under DCP III appeared able to go as far as the district assemblies, largely because of the knowledge provided by DCP III under Outputs 3 and 1.

There is nobody who is above the law and we go by the law; hence we have no fear and we cannot fail. *FGD discussant, Rumphi CBF FGD*

**An RLCs in Solidarity with a Neglected Community in Mzimba**

The members of the DCT-facilitated Chigoma RLC in Embangweni in Mzimba District became respected by traditional and other leaders and community members. This was because of their work as “light” to facilitate development and change in attitudes and practices of service providers. For example, some unhelpful or negligent teachers, health workers, court staff, and other service providers had been transferred or disciplined and the area had “started to change.” Through their development monitoring work, they learnt of a village that had promises of boreholes not honoured. Chigoma LRC worked with the deprived village to have a tape recorded for dialoguing with the District Assembly.

At the District Assembly, the response was that people from Chigoma RLC had not right to speak for people of another village. The RLCs members sought the logistical support of their Mlangizi (advisor) from DCT to have people from the two communities visit the district assembly offices in solidarity and show of determination. The officials quickly installed boreholes in the community that had long not had access to safe drinking water.

The unintended negative impact of DCP III, however, has been the gradual incorporation of the VDC and other local government structures into the agenda and work of CRCs, VRCs, and RLCs. In some areas, the VDC was becoming irrelevant, as people get results due to the work of DCP III-created structures. There was also a tendency on part of some RLCs, VRCs and CRCs to ignore or by-pass unresponsive duty bearers. This may ironically be condoning the dereliction of duties by those who must be accountable for the performance or non-performance of duties.

## The Output-Specific Energy for Change

It is possible to demonstrate the impact of the project per output. Under Output 1, RLCs, CBRCs, and VRCs, CRCs and paralegals are perceived as useful to communities, often describing themselves or being referred to as “lights.” This is because these groups and CBEs and CBFs have demonstrable skills as well-meaning animators.

The intended transfer of skills has had profound impact on key implementers, those trained to train others, facilitators, animators, and community members. For members of the DCP III-created structures and CBEs and CBFs, the training they have received from the project has resulted in general awareness and assertiveness. Training has also been appreciated by partners, including those that did not necessarily implement DCP III activities. This is because DCP has taken a lead in advancing the human rights-based approach to development programming. However, there is yet to be a transfer of skills to lower level duty bearers as rights holders against upper level duty bearers.

However, as the capacities for community level rights bearers have speedily been developed, key service providers and public functionaries have continued to have low capacities to respond. Although they appear to respond to demands of communities, many do so to avoid “trouble” from the village groups that demand their rights. Such trends represent shifting power balances between rights holders and duty public decision makers and duty bearers.

**Skills Chigoma LRCs Claimed to Have**:

* “We go direct”
* “We use different methods, but together”
* “We work in a group, like bees”
* “We work to be nyali (lanterns) for chiefs, other authorities and everybody”
* “We make sure the chiefs love us”
* “We travel to animate others in other areas”

Building on the availability of the growing critical mass developed under Output 1, Output 2 created much excitement and energy for change among communities. Through the membership and the work of VRCs, CRCs, CBRCs, RLCs and paralegals, community members gained knowledge on the need to check expiry dates on industrial commodities and demand that expired goods be removed from shop shelves. The groups were also gaining organisational skills to forms and work as cooperatives or trading blocks. Many of the CRCs, CBRC, and VRCs and RLCs were able to demonstrate the ability to assert fair trade rights, consumer rights and fight against child labour. This was supported by paralegals whose advisory and referral services provided communities with legal knowledge of consumer rights and their enforcement. Communities agreed that there had been economic benefits in their lives, were able to save money, and plan household improvements. Growing knowledge on fair market systems had helped community members as consumers and producers to reduce long-suffered power inequalities against buyers of their agricultural produce. Although there had been no specific programming on the reduction of inequalities (a requirement under section 30 of the Constitution), community members and CBEs agreed that there was some reduction of economic inequalities. In addition, Output 2 was contributing towards the alleviation of household economic poverty. The transaction and “middle man” costs were being reduced, as community members could directly deal with large scale buyers, such as Tambala Food Product Ltd.

**Fair Trade and the People versus the Tycoon and the Police**

At the Regional FGD in Mzuzu, a participant, verified by others, reported about a case in which a nationally known tycoon wanted to buy maize cheaply from villagers, as he had done in the past.

The people through had organised themselves into a trading block and they refused to accept the offered low price. The tycoon enlisted the Police to force the villagers to sell to him. The community told the Police that their role was to ensure law and order and not to interfere with trade contracts. When the Police learnt that they were dealing with a CRC, they retracted. The tycoon offered a higher price, in keeping with the community’s asking price.

Indirectly though, Output 2 had unintended limitation against the logic of free trade, which is championed by the MGDS. The increasing demand for fair trade sometimes resulted in elements of surprise for powerful businessmen and the even the Police. Another unintended negative effect of Output 2 was that the phased nature of the project contributed towards the creation of inequalities between communities that had RLCs, CRCs, CBRCs, and VRCs, on the one hand, and those that did not have these DCP-created structures.

With regard to Output 3, despite initial fears that people in VRCs, CRCs, CBRCs, and RLCs might have been parallel to local government and traditional structures, there appears to be positive collaboration between the two sets of structures. Local government structures and DCP-created structures pooled skills and resources to gain benefits for communities. Indirectly, the articulation of needs, in some cases, input into village and area plans. Although there was no direct input into the development of rules and regulations, the results, patterns of behaviour, and expression of expectations were, informally, producing unwritten norms which were beginning to guide community members and the relationships with their duty bearers. However this must be immediately qualified: the lack of sync in the development of local government plans and the project activities was minimising the effect of such inputs.

**Example of a New Norm at Benga, Nkhotakota**

If a village has children that are not going to school, the village head is liable to a fine of a goat.

However, despite the flexibility in approach on part of VRCs, CRCs, CBRCs, and RLCs, there were unintended negative impacts on local government sector objectives. The creation of the RLCs, VRCs and CRCs was an introduction of informal structures that could undermine the structures in the official system. The apparent satisfaction of community members with the RLCs, VRCs, CRCs, and CBRCs without the demand for laws and regulations had reduced the sustainability of any impact their work with VDCs and other local Government structures might have been achieving. This was not helped by some of the DCP III-created structures being called “village” rights committees, when the local government counterparts are called “village” development committees.

DCP III has made further impact through Output 4. The status of the project, especially its link to the OPC and the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Human Rights has indirectly increased the effectiveness and responsiveness of public service providers and other public functionaries. The holistic nature of the project has underlined the need for interdependence between government ministries and civil society. The impact on sector objectives, however, would have been enhanced if DCP III had taken a lead in the development and use of indicators on governance, as planned at the design stage.

Further, the work of the PMO in managing the project had unwittingly introduced negative effects on the achievement of sector coordination ideals. DCP’s focus on human rights made it to be perceived by the MHRC as a rival.

## Sustainability of the Project’s Outcome

Community members, CBFs, and CBEs were quick to indicate that they would sustain the activities and results achieved through DCP III, although they still needed more training and technical and logistical support. There was strong and unqualified ownership of the general outcome of the project. As a result, there was effective participation to have service providers deliver services and goods. In some cases, community members were able to demand decisions with regard to the allocation of public resources, and holding service providers accountable for unperformed duties. There was also evidence that community members demanded and achieved changes in bad practices by service providers, especially teachers and health workers. In some cases, such service providers been transferred or otherwise disciplined.

We are now able to see problems we could not see and we have the skills to solve them. *VRC Member, FGD at Nkhotakota Boma*

We have learnt and we have educated others what we did not know especially on how to get development. *Female CBE, Nkhotakota*

The project fostered a sense of pride, which has in turn increased the degree of empowerment experienced by community members. The VRCs, CRCs, and RLCs appeared highly motivated due to being perceived as “lights.” The motivation was so high that communities are contributing to the implementation of tasks under the project through their own money and other material resources and labour. Community members expressed pride in the capacities developed under the project, acknowledging increased knowledge levels on human rights, human rights principles including gender equality, and official procedures and structures.

“Let this continue so that people can continue to be strong.” *Traditional leader participating in Chigoma LRC, Embangweni, Mzimba*

The strongest sustainability factors pertained to changing gender roles and images. Some communities took up gender issues on their own and increasingly appeared to accept the principle of gender equality. In their work, increasingly, but not yet with uniformity, the roles under the project were assigned and performed irrespective of gender. Many of the CBEs and CBFs met during the evaluation were females who asserted leadership roles in meetings that involved traditional, religious, and local government leaders. In the RLCs, many of the key positions of Chair, Monitor, and Secretary appeared to be allocated irrespective of gender. The women in these groups are above average in their expressiveness, Malawi-wise. Gender stereotyping in the work of these groups is increasingly becoming insignificant. Such changing gender roles and images, however, were not uniform across the districts and communities where DCP III was implemented.

However, although community members expressed the desire to sustain the activities and results catalysed by the project, such sustainability was heavily and strongly qualified. They express the need for more knowledge, training, and skills. To this end, they advanced two main arguments. The first was that they considered that their baseline levels of knowledge were so low that they still need further education and skills. The second argument was that, through the knowledge acquired, they had come to realise that there was no end to knowledge. They knew that knowledge evolves, including with regard to Government laws and systems change. Much as they expressed a strong sense of autonomy, initiative, and drive, they also had strong dependence on those they called “our teachers”, DCT’s programme officers, CBFs, and CBEs.

This suggests that the anchor of their hope to sustain the activities is continued training and technical support. This is necessary partly because there was yet to emerge evidence that community members had started advocating for changes to policies and laws “which affect their livelihoods, ” as partly envisaged by DCP III’s outcome. This was largely due to the absence of a complete local government structure and system as intended under the Local Government Act.

Other conditions for the sustainability of the activities and results of the project were similarly qualified. The activities and positive results of the project could be sustained, partly because the technology and material resources provided under DCP II were largely appropriate. Bicycles were generally accepted as appropriate for the work of RLCs, VRCs, CRCs, CBRCs, and CBEs. However, there was weak provision for the maintenance of the few bicycles provided, which were very vulnerable to breaking down because of heavy use. Megaphones used by CBEs, and VRCs tended to be initially effective, but quickly lost this ability because batteries were often too expensive for the communities. This was unlike the radios used by RLCs, which were appropriately powered by solar energy. Cloths and T-shirts were well accepted and very much in demand. The literary materials provided under the project, though limited in number of copies, were highly appreciated as useful, but community members cited such usefulness as the need for continued technical and other support.

There was evidence that the project had addressed issues of HIV/AIDS, but there was no uniformity across communities and districts on such work. Although HIV/AIDS concerns were addressed by some RLCs and CRCs, there was evidence in some communities that the dominance of infrastructural needs might result in failure to mainstream HIV/AIDS issues.

The greatest threat to sustainability, however, was lack of a supportive policy and regulatory framework for the work carried out under DCP II. So far, the project had very much depended on people’s flexibility to work with policies and structures made known to them. In this regard, DCP-created structures accepted the legitimacy and roles of local government structures.

## 5.19. The sustainability of the DCP III’s Outputs’ Compared

In general, the sustainability of the project’s activities and results per output reflected that of the DCP III’s outcome. Community members indicated that the results and activities associated with the project’s Outputs 1 to 3 would continue even if the project ended, but that progress would slow down and communities would lack technical and logistical support.

Sometimes we are called *anthu amwano* (rude people) when we light the way for duty bearers, but they soon acknowledge that we are saying and doing is beneficial for all of us here. *CBE, Nkhotakota FGD*

As expected by Output 1, the RLCs, CRCs, and VRC indicated that they would continue to demand the realisation of the right to development. Though highly appreciative of the implementing agencies, the clubs and committees that were demanding public services were perceived by community members as owned by the communities and not the implementing partners. The skills to demand, especially the use of group work, appeared to be ingrained in these clubs and committees. Although these committees were initially resisted by traditional and other authorities in some areas, as was the case in Ntchisi, such opposition would quickly vanish. The resistances died quickly because the knowledge and skills or the animators were demonstrated by results and an acceptance of their truthfulness by the wider community. It however must be stressed that the demand of the enjoyment the right to development as a human right had so far been haphazard, according to needs, and not focused on the elements of the components of that right.

However, examined separately, the results and activities per output had varying levels of sustainability. Of the results and activities, the demanding of community-level public facilities associated with the right to development appeared to be more likely to be sustained. This was largely because of the phased nature of the project, which allowed activities under Output 1 to be implemented for longer periods than those under Outputs 2 and 3.

With regard to results and activities associated with fair trading, consumer protection, and fair prices, the results were exciting for the communities but very nascent. Not much experiential knowledge had been generated within the communities, following the initial training on these matters. Even for communities that might be in the same year of implementation, it appeared that sustainability varied with the occupation or means of living of the community involved, with largely trading communities ingraining the concepts and practices more than subsistence farming-based and heavily leadership dependent communities. For example, in Machinga and Mangochi, where the communities significantly depend on trade, the communities appeared confident further to develop their knowledge and skills on fair trade, consumer protection and the fight against child labour. In contrast, in Salima, which was largely subsistence farming-based, fair trade issues were not as invigorating for the community as farming projects and community-based health, educational, and infrastructural amenities.

The results and activities under Output 3 appeared the most fragile to sustain. Like with regard to Outputs 1 and 2, key training was done for VRCs, CRC, CBRCs, and RLCs in the districts where the project had been initiated. Unlike under Outputs 1 and 2, however, Output 3 envisaged orientations for district level local government functionaries. These orientations, by nature, would not develop the capacities that a properly designed training could deliver. As the interests of communities were not necessarily to make the local government system work but have their needs meet, the demands made under Output 3 have not been as keenly asserted as those associated with fair trading, consumer protection, protection of children from worst forms of labour, and the community need-associated aspects of the right to development. More significant than any reason, however, is that DCP III and its counterpart LOGSIP project were unable to develop capacities to respond at sustainable levels. The results were that RLCs, VRCs, CBRCs, and CRCs skip such unresponsive duty bearers in search of those that could respond. In this quest, the community members did not make a distinction between government, civil society, or private service providers.

The activities and results under Output 4 were the most dependent. Although the PMO was reputed as very professional and competent, its sustenance remained dependent on the financial contributions from UNDP, RNE, and other donors. The Government had so far been concerned with the payment of rent. The GoM though was yet to develop a policy framework that could facilitate the continuation of DCP.

The sustainability of activities and results under Output 4 could become heavily strained if DCP III’s staff base is not increased. The members of staff at DCP were among the project’s greatest assets because of their programmatic talents, hearts for the project, self-initiative, hard work, team-working, and humility. For much of DCP II, the PMO had 4 professional staff. By the time of DCP III, the officer responsible for civic education took up new roles and was not replaced. Hence, although DCP III was more innovative and more demanding compared to DCP II, it was implemented with one programme staff fewer. The phased nature of the project entailed, relatively, more work for the PMO as the project went to scale. If the staff starts to become stretched, the performance of the sustainability of the project may be in further jeopardy.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

On each of the evaluation criteria, DCP III’s results were, in general, very much above average. The project was widely appreciated as highly efficient. Efficiency was ensured largely due to pooling of financial and other resources and talents at all levels, competiveness in the selection of partners, strict and frequent reporting requirement, focus on animation and transfer of knowledge and skills, catalytic use of media activities, and volunteerism at the community level. Against these were the project’s initial lack of timeliness due to overlap with DCP II and delayed disbursements and late procurements on part of DCP, the project’s low budgets in relation to the demand it generated, and the varied skills amongst its partners especially in training and teaching.

The project’s results-based approach ensured a high degree of effectiveness, as implementing partners and community members focused on results rather than particular ways and activities. This aspect was buttressed by team/group working especially at community level, and the project’s use of interactive methods even in media sub-projects. In its management, most activities were implemented as planned, with no unplanned activity over the project implementation period. Taken together, the results under the planned outputs significantly contributed to the creation of a growing critical mass per community, but not across the districts. Greater focus on the situation of women, children and people with disabilities would have enhanced the project’s contribution to the realisation of the tight to development as enshrined in Malawi’s Constitution. Compared, the activities under Output 3 were the least effective largely because of the problems faced by DCP III’s counterpart project, the LOGSIP.

Although implemented for a short time, DCP III had demonstrable impact, especially at the community level. There were infrastructure and other results of demands on the right to development, as there was excitement about justice in trade, consumer protection rights, and fair labour. The evaluation found strong but not even evidence of social transformation in gender relations and stereotypes, cultural attitudes, team work, traditional leaders' styles and reduction of corrupt practices. There was nascent evidence of reduction of household level poverty. There was certainly strong increased participation of communities in decision making with regard to the allocation of public goods and services. Although community members acknowledged increased and more effective participation in advocating changes to practices that affected their lives, this was predominantly with regard to service providers and district assembly bodies. The holding of public bodies was also heavily qualified, as community members focused on service providers and not policy makers and political leaders above the community level. Advocacy for changes in laws were restricted to informal norms, partly because of the absence of councillors. Although there was much focus on availability and acceptability of services and goods, the results were yet to pertain to accessibility, which, in terms of public services and goods, was additionally adversely affected by the rainy season. The DCP-created structures focus on quick results may ironically however, ironically, be making already weak local government structures even weaker and irrelevant.

The results pertaining to outcome were, overall, indicated as sustainable by community members. However, this was acknowledged to be dependent on continued logistical and technical support. The major challenge to sustainability was lack of a supportive policy related to most of the results achieved under the project. For example, although there were clear patterns in the demands made by community members, there were no policy responses to such demands. The PSC could play such an additional role in future, considering its multi-sectoral composition at the policy level. Compared by output, the results under Output 1 were more likely to be sustained because of the phased nature of the project while activities and results under Output 2 are generally nascent. Activities under Output 3 were the most fragile due to weak synergy with MoLGRD and low capacities of duty bearers. Activities under Output 4 are the most dependent

* + 1. In view of these observations, this evaluation makes the following recommendations:
* A successor project should consider continuing the provision of technical and logistical support and information to DCP III-created structures.
* A successor project should extend the geographic coverage of its components on the right to development and fair trade, labour and consumer rights to more areas in the districts in which they were implemented under DCP III and aim at covering the rest of the districts.
* The Programme’s activities should be linked directly and formally to activities of other community-level human rights education and access to justice programmes implemented by the government and constitutional bodies, including the Malawi Human Rights within the framework of developing or developed Governance Sector Policy.
* The programme should focus on enhancing the quality of the training provided to facilitators and animators, and the civic education of community members in rights-based approaches to development, utilising refresher courses and continuing education where necessary.
* Deliberate focus on animation and solidarity-based group-working at the community and district level should be encouraged.
* Use of interactive methods and adult learning principles should constitute key features of the civic education component of a successor programme to DCP.
* Building on the best practices of DCP III, a successor programme should transcend availability of resources and amenities and address all aspects related to obligations for the realisation of human rights through such services: availability, accessibility, affordability, and acceptability.

# DCP III as Monitored and Evaluated

## Introduction

One notable weakness of DCP II was its monitoring and evaluation aspect. The design of DCP III responded by requiring an “effective and management monitoring and evaluation” of the project. To underline the importance of monitoring and evaluation as an aspect of programme management, the training on results-based monitoring and evaluation had to be implemented early. DCP III’s first workplan, for 2008, required that monitoring of progress track attainment of targets, as disaggregated in both the logical framework and that workplan.

This chapter examines the monitoring and evaluation aspect of DCP III.

## DCP III’s Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

At the outset, DCP III set forth to create a monitoring and evaluation framework. That monitoring and evaluation framework had the following agreed traditional elements:

* Key results
* Key indicators
* Key data requirements
* Means of verifying the progress
* Level of data collection
* Frequency of monitoring the progress
* Roles and responsibilities

The framework insisted on the appointment of a focal point responsible for coordination monitoring and evaluation activities within the MPO, partner organisations, ministry headquarters, and at district headquarters. DCT, for example designated its programme coordinator as in charge of monitoring and evaluation for its activities and results. For the VRC, CBRCs and CRC-based partners, such a national level person coordinated others, with similar functions at the district level. The CBE was the community based monitoring and evaluation person, reporting to the district level officer. For DCT activities, the community level-based monitoring was left to RLCs, working directly with the programme officer responsible for the particular RLCs.

The framework underlined reporting as central. At the beginning of each quarter, a monitoring work schedule would be agreed. This was synchronised with DCP’s reporting to UNDP and the PSC; and UNDP’s accountability to the RNE. At the PMO level, there was ample evidence that reports were filed by organisations, as evidenced in its reports to UNDP and the RNE.[[25]](#footnote-26) These reports underlined results that were achieved during a quarter. These reports, in addition to providing quantitative data, were also very much about documenting “success stories.”[[26]](#footnote-27) At the end of the year, the PMO would use its quarterly reports to compile the annual reports. The reports included data gathered and analyses and recommendations which would be considered and adopted at management and oversight levels.

The two main monitoring methods under DCP II, monitoring visits and review meetings were continued under DCP III, except that the monitoring and evaluation framework insisted that such activities should be jointly undertaken between the PMO, the partner, and the partner’s officer at the district level. Such visits would sometimes involve UNDP officers who would file a “back to office report” upon return. Community members appreciated such visits, regarding them as opportunities for further learning and obtaining needed technical and logistical support.

The review meetings were much in demand with CBEs, CBFs, and programme officers asking that they should be more frequent, as they improved programming through lessons learnt and sharing of experiential knowledge. The value of the annual stakeholder forum was well-appreciated by its participants. The monitoring and evaluation framework had underlined that this forum should help stakeholders share “programme experiences, lessons, achievements and challenges with partners and other stakeholders.”[[27]](#footnote-28) On their part, community members requested more visits to other areas to share experiences and learn.

The monitoring and evaluation framework further provided for the handling of data in DCP III’s monitoring and evaluation system. Those involved in monitoring and evaluation activities were to maintain both hard copies and electronic copies of the all data and reports. There was also to be technical backstopping to partner institution on data collection, analysis, reporting and management. According to implementing partners, these roles were well executed by the PMO, which was technically respected by its partners.

## DCP III’s Complementary Monitoring Tools

The complementary monitoring tools developed and used by the project were performance-related. They were about noting the results and returns about the project’s inputs and activities and keeping the records of such results. The reporting tools underlined duty bearer mapping and case management. The following were the aspects of the duty bearer mapping tool: the name of the institution, programme/project title/name, impact area, type of intervention, target beneficiaries, criteria for identifying beneficiaries, and community contribution.

The case management chart captured data on number of cases, type of cases, number of cases resolved, number of cases referred, and number of cases pending. That chart was used in conjunction with quarterly records of cases handled by an organisation and submitted to DCP. This record had to include numbers of cases as follows: those carried forward from the pervious quarter, registered during the quarter, handled during the quarter, referred, and cases pending or carried forward to the next quarter.

## Omissions of the Monitoring Framework

DCP III’s monitoring framework had several omissions, largely because of its generic nature. First, it did not regard the project’s audits as part of the monitoring and evaluation system. These audits were largely financial and concluded that the project was well managed.

Second, there was no evidence that the project undertook any review of the monitoring and evaluation framework, as required by the framework itself. It was possible that had the framework been reviewed, some of DCP III monitoring and evaluation weaknesses and lapses would have been revealed.

Third, a serious gap in DCP III’s monitoring and evaluation framework was its singular focus on the creation of a critical mass for the demanding of the right to development. In this way, the framework was insufficient for the monitoring of Outputs 2 to 4, let alone the synergy of results of the outputs as means towards the outcome.

## The Need for a Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

Despite marked improvements on monitoring and evaluation in DCP III compared to DCP II, there is a strong case for a dedicated staff member specialising in monitoring and evaluation at DCP. Currently, programme management, coordination, communication, and monitoring and evaluation roles are shared among the three professional staff. Although the staff had performed above average, this came at the cost of much hard work and sacrifice and because the staff had their hearts in what DCP seeks to achieve. It is questionable whether wholesale change in the staffing would not adversely affect the core attributes of the project.

Few examples demonstrated the need for at least a monitoring and evaluation specialist at DCP, who can transfer knowledge and skills to DCP’s implementation partners. Much as the project needs financial audits, an occasional programme audit, especially in the light of previous phases of the programme, would have added value. As no such audits were done and because the monitoring and evaluation framework was on current results and ongoing activities, DCP, as a whole, was very weak on post-implementation monitoring. Although results from previous phases had unwittingly been noticed, there was no systematic monitoring of the results under DCP I and DCP II. Such post-implementation monitoring was crucial for the consolidation of and the building upon new results.

The project’s passion for reporting current results and ongoing activities resulted in a second monitoring and evaluation-related lapse. There was little monitoring of activities of vendors not regarded as stakeholders but involved in the implementation of the project. For example, the evaluators noted that Zodiak Broadcasting Corporation (ZBS), which airs programmes recorded by RLCs was sometimes too trusted by DCT and the PMO In at least one instance during the evaluation, DCT’s 57 RLCS waited in vain to listen to their favourite programme at 14.00 on a Sunday. Without notice, ZBS carried another sponsored programme during the time slot. Although ZBS later indicated that they would make reparations in such cases, the station was not immediately questioned by DCT or the PMO – an indication that the omission was probably not noticed. One reason for such omissions was that both DCT and the PMO had few people that could effectively be involved in the monitoring of the activities of vendors. Much as the staff at the MPO and DCT was very professional and dedicated, monitoring may require dedicated attention by specialists and treating vendors such as ZBS as stakeholders.

DCP III would also have benefited from a mid term review. It is true that DCP was subjected to independent monitoring, but such assessments and evaluations were not adequate. The Malawi Institute of Management conducted a micro-assessment of DCP III, but the focus was merely on financial risks, “to identify capacity gaps in the programme’s financial management system to enable UNDP determine the appropriate cash transfer modality to the programme.”[[28]](#footnote-29) The conclusion was that the overall risk of DCP was low. In 2011, UNDP commissioned a more substantive and analytical evaluation or review to assess its development results and evaluate its overall contribution in Malawi. The evaluation team examined the work of DCP alongside other projects supported by UNDP.[[29]](#footnote-30) For DCP, the results were most favourable, with the team noting that “DCP ha[d]contributed tremendously to the promotion of a culture of active citizenship especially in 17 out of 28 districts across the country where its activities had been fully rolled out.” The project was given as an example of UNDP’s ability to address “questions of equity, justice, fairness and poverty reduction.” The evaluators noted that a “culture of active citizenship being propagated by the DCP ha[d] substantially improved the engagement between the public and the duty bearers.” However, the micro-assessment exercise merely examined financial risk, the assessment for development results was about UNDP’s overall work and not dedicated on DCP.

A review of the project’s monitoring and evaluation framework would also possibly have shown that community meetings were not really used as ways in which community members themselves could participate in monitoring. With the exception of trainings and visits and other activities to demand aspects of the right to development, the assessment meetings at the community level involved some assessments, analyses, and agreements on actions and methods to be taken. In the process, much information was generated by the communities. Although CBEs, CBFs, and DCT’s programme officers tried to capture such information, the bias was on achievements and not causes or processes. Although failing duty bearers were identified, the actions often focused on approaching duty bearers that could respond. In some areas, as for members of Chinong’o VRC in the area of GVH Paulosi in Nkhotakota, the CBE’s focus was on self help, with the concept of *“umwini”* or ownership being stressed as the need for community members to work for themselves.

As such, a community that may have obtained significant infrastructural and other amenities related to the well-being of the community, such as Makiyoni in Salima and Paulosi in Nkhotakota, appeared untransformed in gender relations, health habits, and household economic well-being. Such data was not captured, as long as the results obtained through the demanding could be demonstrated.

**Bicycle-Riding VRC Members Chase a Rubbish Dumping Vehicle at Wozi in Nkhotakota**

Nkhotakota Town Council decided site a rubbish near an inhabited area. The members of a nearby VRC expressed their fears that the dump would pollute water in a nearby rive and the air in the area. They told the Council not to cite the site the area as a rubbish dump, especially since no proper assessment regarding health and safety had been undertaken. The Council indicated that the dump would be constructed and used according to established safety standards.

In a show of power, the Council went ahead and started dumping rubbish at the site, without complying with the expected standards. One day, as the vehicle to dump further rubbish approached, the VRC members banded together and blocked the road. The vehicle had to turn back, with bicycle-riding VRC members chasing and escorting it all the way to the Council offices. The consequence was that a proper dumping site was constructed.

During the evaluation, however, it was evident that members of the DCP III-created structures had very effective skills in monitoring and evaluation. DCP-created structures appeared not only able to assess the quality of life in their local areas, but in the surrounding areas as well. Not only did they monitor the implementation of their agreed activities and results, but they also monitored the performance of duty bearers. In T.A Mpaso in Machinga, for example, the community members took on the Police to stop malpractices and demand accountability. In Nkhotakota, VRC members chased a vehicle sent to dump rubbish near their area all the way to the Town Council offices, eventually making the authorities to construct a proper dumping site.

The most significant weakness of DCP III’s monitoring and evaluation framework and the manner in which it was implemented was that it did not deal with monitoring of the results chain, as planned in the logical framework. In other words, the developed and implemented framework was not on results, from inputs to outcome, let alone the monitoring of the cogency of the result chain. Instead, the framework only required focus on one key result: the creation of a critical mass to demand the right to development.

Further, the framework involved itself with the capturing of results. It was not about having those results addressing synergy of causes in the situation analysis on which the logical framework was based or that undertaken by the community members themselves. In some cases, such as in Chinong’o VRC in GVH Paulosi’s area, this weakness of the monitoring system threatened or made the project to be need-based rather than human rights-based.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

DCP III responded early to the recommendation made by the evaluation of DCP II, that the monitoring and evaluation framework needed to be strengthened. One of DCP III early instrumental results was a monitoring and evaluation framework. That framework alongside other complementary tools under it regarding the work of paralegals was used in DCP III’s monitoring and evaluation.

The framework however was too generic for a result-based and human rights-based project. In particular, the framework did not provide guidance on the monitoring of the results chain, especially with regard to the synergy of causes identified in the situation analysis. Instead, implementers under DCP III concentrated on reporting current or recent activities and results and not on how the targets in the logical framework and the DCP III’s results chain would be monitored. The focus on current or recent activities further overshadowed the need for post-implementation monitoring, a programme audit, or mid term review. In addition, community members implementing the project were not regarded as actors in the monitoring and evaluation of DCP III, except during this evaluation.

In view of these observations, this evaluation makes the following recommendations:

* Having selected indicators based on the updated baseline-related data DCP commissioned in 2011, any successor project should explicitly refer to vulnerable groups.
* Any successor programme to DCP III should have a monitoring and evaluation framework that guides the monitoring and evaluation of results chains in relation to the synergy of identified causes in a situation analysis.
* A successor programme to DCP III should consider including post-implementation monitoring of previous DCP phases.
* DCP should consider hiring a monitoring and evaluation specialist.

# 7. Lessons and Consolidated Recommendations

## Introduction

This chapter consolidates the lessons learnt in this evaluation. These lessons are based on the inputs by those who participated in this evaluation at various stages.

The lessons and recommendations are arranged according to the key stages of a development project or programme. In addition the chapter proposes possible features of a successor project/programme.

## Lessons on Project Design

DCP III, under DCP, had a clear structure, with clear and distinct roles that enhanced the project’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact, and chances of sustainability. DCP III itself had a well-aligned outcome and set of outputs that were a logical response to the situational analysis conducted at its design stage. However, the implementation of the project has underlined both positive and negative lessons.

Table 7.1 contains the key lessons of programme design learnt under DCP III.

**Table 7.1: Key Lessons on Design**

|  |
| --- |
| Key Lessons on Design  |
| * Making a lower level result already aligned to the MGDS through the UNDAF into a higher level result in a project is a useful way to ensure that a project’s outcome and other results are aligned to priorities.
* Clear and distinct roles of key stakeholders in a project adopting a human rights-based approach to development programming and results-based management increases the likelihood of focus and quality of programmatic results.
* Clarification of distinct roles for a lean professional PMO supported by a politically non-interfering oversight-exercising PSC, a reflective stakeholder forum, and interested but non interfering donors enhances chances of programmatic excellence.
* A focus on fair trade, labour practices, and consumer protection is a sound strategy for the implementation of the MGDS to reduce poverty.
* A general focus on the right to development or the definition of development still requires specific focus on that right’s component as provided for in Malawi’s Constitution.
* The critical importance of enforcement in human rights requires enhancement of community awareness of the mechanisms and processes for enforcement of rights through consolidation of the paralegal component of the Programme.
* A logical framework-based partnership with a project merely because it has similar programmatic focus or areas of congruence does not guarantee efficient and effective joint implementation.
 |

## Lessons on Implementation

A distinctive reason for the appreciable results under DCP III was its use of the notions of transfer or skills and animation, within a human rights-based approach, on matters that were appreciated to improve the quality of life of people. These attributes were buttressed by the project’s competent and professional management. However, this strength was constrained by less than desirable timeliness in disbursements from UNDP and a small pool of resources, relative to the demand for the project’s activities and results within communities and across districts. Table 7.2 contains the key lessons related to implementation..

**Table 7.2: Key Lessons and Recommendations on Implementation**

|  |
| --- |
| Key Lessons |
| * Developing a common understanding and a minimum level of programme implementation increases chances of success even if partners already have knowledge and experience in human rights-based approach to development programming
* Deliberate use of animation at the community level to empower community members is both efficient and effective if results of a project are about the collective and individual quality of life.
* Group-working by community members increases effectiveness and motivation, especially if belonging to a group endows community members with empowerment and ability to demonstrate contribution to the improvement of community and individual quality of life.
* Although a created critical mass for the demanding of human rights and good governance in Malawi may be sustainable if there are demonstrable benefits to community members, provision of technical and logistical support is still necessary for optimum implementation and achievement of results.
* Knowledge about the basis for common ownership in public resources increases the ownership and determination of communities to demand accountability from service providers and other public functionaries.
* Although not all structures may be in place for a local government system, community members show flexibility to adapt systems and make what is available work and deliver services.
* While availability of public goods and services improves the quality of life, accelerated development can be achieved if availability and acceptability are also addressed.
 |

## Lesson on Monitoring and Evaluation

There were marked improvements on monitoring and evaluation in the light of the programmatic experiences and achievements of DCP II. However, monitoring and evaluation was the weakest aspect of DCP III as a results-based and human rights-based project. Table 7.3 contains the key lessons on monitoring and evaluation.

**Table 7.3: Key Lessons and Recommendations on Monitoring and Evaluation**

|  |
| --- |
| Key Lessons |
| * Reporting on results needs to refer to targets and the totality of the results chain to ensure clear progress towards an outcome.
* Focusing on current activities and results may conflate the importance of post-implementation monitoring, which is essential for the consolidation of achieved results.
* Using a standard monitoring and evaluation framework may not be sufficient to ensure a monitoring and evaluation that is human rights-based or results-based management or at least the involvement of community members in the meaningful monitoring.
* It is more useful and less difficult to evaluate a project whose targets were based on baseline if such baseline has been updated or the sub-projects of the project kept and tracked their own respective baseline indicators.
 |

## The Case for the Continuation of DCP III’s Thrusts

From this evaluation, there are three sets of reasons for the continuation, in one form or another and with necessary modifications, with the gist for DCP III. - The first set relates to the nature and the results of the project so far. The second set of reasons is about the country’s goals and development priorities. The third is with regard to the programmatic gap that may still need to be addressed after DCP III.

**MGDS II Expected Outcomes on Democratic Governance:**

* Enhanced awareness and practice of human rights and responsibilities
* Improved respect for human dignity and choice
* Enhanced equitable access to opportunities

The nature and results of DCP logically strongly suggests a continuation with the project or some form of follow-up initiative. By 2011, DCP III is yet to reach all districts of the country, such as Likoma and Kasungu. The geographic phased nature of the project entailed that by the final year, some districts would be in their fourth year of implementation, while others would be in the first year. Results in the districts that joined the project later, such as Nkhata Bay, need further consolidation to ensure sustainability. By design, the project’s thematic approach meant that inputs and activities under Output 1 preceded those under Output 2 while Output 3 was initially to be tackled on a pilot basis. This entails that by the fourth year, the project’s outputs were yet fully to synergise in many districts. In addition, the project generally focused on the definition of development, without systematic programming on the components of the right to development as enshrined in Malawi’s Constitution. For example, there was yet to be uniform programming to place special attention on the reduction of disparities and contribution to the quality of life of women, children, and people with disabilities

Further, the results of and demand created by the project requires continuation. Although a very useful critical mass had been created across the country, the RLCS, CRCs, CBRCs, and VRCs are still in isolated places. Although these are expected and do animate other communities, their work is yet to cover the whole country. The project has created so much demand from community members that it would be frustrating for many communities who still expect further technical and logistical support if it was to cease.

With regard to the country’s national goals and policies, section 30 of the Constitution and related country policies and priorities are still to be adequately realised. The country was ranked 153 out 169 countries in 2010, with an HDI of 0.38, well below the Sub-Saharan regional average of 0.389.[[30]](#footnote-31) Vision 2020’s goal of a medium income country is yet to be attained. Although MGDS I ended in 2011, MGDS II had just been developed at the time of the review. The review of MGDS I underlined “the weak poverty reduction focus and the absence of clear focus on employment generation” [[31]](#footnote-32)as challenges MGDS I did not address effectively enough. DCP III has been contributing to the overall goal of poverty reduction and through its Output 2, started to address issues pertaining to labour and fair markets. This work is still nascent and requires continuation.

MGDS II itself has “improved governance as one of its thematic areas, with democratic governance as a sub-theme. MGDS II’s goal on human rights under improved governance is to “promote and protect rights and freedoms as enshrined in the constitution of Malawi.”[[32]](#footnote-33) The right to development and the other rights that DCP III focused on are all in Malawi’s Constitution, with the project use of the right to development as a fulcrum to realise other rights. This work, as is the nature of the right to development itself, is necessarily progressive. The expected outcomes under DCP III are also all congruent with DCP III’s results. MGDS II expects enhanced awareness and practice of human rights and responsibilities, improved respect for human dignity and choice, and enhanced equitable access to opportunities.[[33]](#footnote-34) In addition, two of the strategies for improved democratic governance envisaged by MGDS II have already been used under DCP III. These are enhancing human rights awareness and promoting equitable access.[[34]](#footnote-35) It should therefore be easy to align a successor project to DCP III with the MGDS as it would continue to be well-aligned with the Constitution and Vision 2020.

Programmatically, there is a gap that can be addressed by a project of DCP III’s thrust and style. DCP III continued the strength established by DCP II on civic education, an area where DCP III had no monopoly. For example, there were the Malawi Human Rights Commission (MHRC), the National Initiative for Civic Education (NICE) and many civil society organisations that worked on civic education. NICE’s independence and viability as a new trust became questioned in 2011 and there were serious doubts about its continued independence and effectiveness.

The MHRC human rights education programmes, which aim to cover the whole country, have, according to its enabling Act, two specific functions that are congruent with the civic education roles to which DCP III contributed. The first is assisting “in educating the public on, and promoting awareness and respect for, human rights.” The second is promoting “more particularly the human rights of vulnerable groups, such as children, illiterate persons, persons with disabilities and the elderly.”[[35]](#footnote-36) Nevertheless, DCP III transcended mere knowledge or understanding of human rights. DCP III’s value added was on the development and transfer of skills regarding the demanding of human rights, on which the work of the MHRC is not as strong.

The most distinguishing aspect of DCP III in civic education was in use of interactive and adult-learning methods, compared to methods used by other civic education projects or organisations such as NICE, MHRC, and many civic education projects. The use of LRCs, VRCs CRCs, and CBRCs as learning structures was underpinned by the principles of adult-learning that were highly participatory and interactive. This maximised the effectiveness of the learning under the project. In view of the declining role of NICE in delivering voter education, it is not presumptuous to envisage a civic education role that involves CBEs, CBFs, and the DCP III-created structures in a successor programme. Similarly, various government departments and other development agents can in a future programme use the DCP-created structures to deliver development and other well-being related education to community members,

By 2011, there were more projects that a successor initiative to DCP III could partner or merge with. Merging similar projects would be ideal, in view of the emerging Democratic Governance Strategy.[[36]](#footnote-37) Probably the most significant of potential projects that would merge or partner with a successor to DCP III was the Malawi Public Service Charter Programme (MPSCP). This initiative is similarly connected to the OPC. This programme commenced well after DCP III, in June 2010 and it will end in July, 2015, a year before MGDS II comes to an end. The overall objective of the MPSCP is as to:

“improve public service delivery and ensure that basic public services are provided equally to all people in Malawi in accordance with well-known, transparent, accountable and realistic minimum standards.”[[37]](#footnote-38)

Under the Public Service Charter Programme, users are meant to have mechanisms for feedback to service provider institutions. The charters, in purport, set standards for service delivery, thereby providing a ground for expectations for use. The system then sets out a complaints-making mechanism.

A review of the implementation arrangements of the programme was done in 2011. It noted so far, most of the work under the programme had been about district level charter formulation processes, mainly training of district level officials. This work though, the review noted, had “been undertaken without adequate stakeholder reflection on the pilot lessons to inform the design and planning of the district roll out process.”[[38]](#footnote-39) The Ministry of Local Government was yet to develop a roll out plan, resulting in poor coordination. One recommendation was that the programme should create links with other programmes that are building community capacities to demand accountability such as the Democracy Consolidation Programme (DCP) currently being funded by UNDP.”[[39]](#footnote-40)

It is important to stress the similarities of the MPSCP and DCP III. Both DCP III and the MPSCP have been about the delivery of public services. Both are linked to the Office of the President and Cabinet – the MPSCP coming under the Public Sector Reforms Management Unit, and DCP being managed by the Democracy Consolidation. The VRCs, CRCs, RLCs, and CBRC could use the service charters as implementation tools. Alternatively, or in addition, the DCP III-created structures could be linked to the service user committees.

There are however some differences between the two initiatives, which explain the development of the MPSCP as separate from DCP III, two years after DCP III was already in implementation. Administratively, the PMO for DCP III was established outside the administrative control of the OPC. The Chief Secretary to the President and Cabinet’ oversight role of chairing the project’s inter-ministerial PSC and the leadership of the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Human Rights as the main links between the project and the OPC. More significantly, DCP III was designed and has been implemented as an initiative on the demand side of human rights enjoyment, with the right to development as the thematic fulcrum. The outcome focus of DCP III has been increased participation of rights holders to demand accountability and improved governance. In contrast, the MPSCP is not so much rooted in the linkage between human rights enjoyment and good governance. Its fulcrum has been public service reform, with service delivery as its focus. The newer initiative is not necessarily rights-based and it has so far not adopted a human rights-based approach.

Although the MPSCP user committees may appear similar to the RLCS, CRCs, CBCRs, and VRCs, their focus is on agreements with service providers on delivery standards and not necessarily on skills to demand the performance of duty bearers. The two initiatives, despite these differences, are very complementary, with the MPSCP potentially complementing or replacing the role of the LOGSIP: improving the capacities of service providers to provide optimum responses to the needs and demands of rights holders.

Even if the similarities were to be underlined, it is important to stress one key lesson from the linkage of DCP III and the LOGSIP: that similarity of goals or forms of projects may not necessarily be effective and efficient if the linked partners are not human rights-based in their approach and skills. The effectiveness and efficiency of DCP III improved remarkably compared to results under DCP II mainly because the implementation partners were chosen on the basis of their proven effectiveness, efficiency, and experience in the human rights-based approach to programming.

## Overall Conclusion: Possible Design Features for a Successor Programme/Project

The design of a successor programme/project has to build on the results and experience of DCP III and the context within which any such programme/project. Based on the findings and experience, the following tenets could be considered as features for a successor programme/project.

*Linkage of the right to development and good governance as a fulcrum for the realisation of other human rights*. One finding in this evaluation is that DCP III’s fulcrum for human rights realisation and improvement of the quality of life was its linkage of the right to development and good governance. DCP III enjoyed a clear comparative advantage on this linkage and delivered appreciatively well. Using this linkage, DCP III was able very efficiently and effectively to ignite excitement and start contributing to poverty reduction at the household level through a further focus on fair trade, consumer protection, and fair labour practices. Such a linkage could be maintained in a successor programme/project. Extension to a focus on other human rights contained in the Constitution would depend on a proper situation analysis on the state of well-being in relation to the right to development and good governance and consolidation of the role of paralegals whose advisory and referral services enhance the capacity of communities to enforce their demands if they are not met by duty bearers.

*Alignment, through UNDAF, to national priorities as expressed in the Constitution, Vision 2020, and MGDS II*. One success feature of DCP III was is its perfect alignment to a UNDAF that was itself well aligned to national development priorities and the MDGs. In particular, DCP III’s contribution to the realisation of specific Constitutional rights and towards the reduction of poverty made the project very relevant at both the national and local levels.

*Non-conflation with work on the supply side of human rights enjoyment.* One criticism of DCP III was that it created demand which would, sometimes not be responded to by duty bearers due to lack of capacity. To cope with this problem, DCP-created structures just by-passed unresponsive duty bearers to demand from upper level duty bearers. A further criticism, which was not accepted by community members, was that DCP III was guilty of creating parallel structures, even though its Output 3 required it to work with local government structures. Ironically, the failure of duty bearers to cope with the demands from rights holders should be taken as a mark of the project’s success, according to its intended outcome. The ability of rights holders to keep demanding from upper level duty bearers even when lower level duty bearers were unresponsive should be credited to the project as excellence in the development of skills to demand. The solution of the problem is, logically and ideologically, not to make DCP start working on the supply side, except with regard to developing the capacities of lower level duty bearers as upper level rights holders. Such focus on lower level duty bearers as rights holders would firmly keep the successor project on the demand side of human rights enjoyment, where it belongs.

*A clearer focus on the specific aspects or components of the right to development.* One key negative finding of this evaluation is that the DCP III could have focused more on the components of the right to development, which would have resulted in clearer results for vulnerable groups. A successor programme, from the situation analysis stage, will need to focus on the components of the right to development as enshrined in the Constitution. Poignant work in this regard could be done by designating roles pertaining to such aspects to different members of the DCP-created structures and consolidating the training and deployment of paralegals who contribute their own specialised knowledge of the Constitution to enable community members to gain a more analytical appreciation of the nature and scope of human rights.

*A possible change of the name without unnecessary loss of good will and image*. It is true that DCP III was not just, directly, about the consolidation of democracy. It achieved more on advancing the right to development, fairness, and the human rights-based approach to service delivery and performance of public duties. A departure in name from democracy consolidation may however could result in an unnecessary loss of goodwill that the project may have been using. A compromise name could be that which recognises DCP as a programme, with projects of various names that do not refer to phases.

*Taking DCP results, animation, and transfer of skills to scale, district-wise*. DCP III has been unable to reach all the 28 districts in Malawi. As planned, the project envisaged that it would continue after 2011. As the nature of the results and the demand for the project’s activities is very positive, it is sound and fair to take the project to those districts not yet covered under DCP III.

*Consolidation through the increase of involved communities within districts*. Although DCP has reached nearly 20 districts, coverage of communities in these districts is very uneven. It is true that other partners are working in some areas where DCP is not operating, but it would be fair for communities to choose the initiatives in which they would like to be involved. In addition members of some DCP-created structures travel far to animate other communities. These structures could be increased or allowed more time and opportunity to animate other communities.

*Deepening experiences and results in geographic areas under DCP III through a focus on accessibility*. It is clear that the communities involved in the implementation of DCP are at different levels with regard to the results of their work and not many have transcended availability and acceptability to address accessibility issues. Focusing on accessibility could help consolidate the results obtained by the various communities.

*Enhancement of the human rights-based approach to development programming and results-based management.* A distinguishing feature of DCP III was its approach in that it underlined the human rights-based approach to programming and service delivery and results-based management. Skills on these aspects however were uneven among the implementing partners and the DCP-created structures. A successor project/programme will need to continue sharpening such skills. This may involve a review of the tools used under DCP III before deploying them again under a successor project/programme.

*Choice of implementing partners based on efficiency, effectiveness, and skills in the human rights-based approach to programming and results-based management*. DCP III excelled in general because it chose implementing partners based on these attributes. Output 3 was the least effective, efficient, and sustainable because its logframe linking with the LOGSIP was not based on these factors. A successor programme/project will need to avoid any such linkages and proceed to form partners as part of implementation.

*Use of lesson gleaned from patterns of demands by communities for input into national policy and programme reviews and development programmes*. There was a disconnect between policy thrusts in instruments such as the MGDS and the pattern of demands made by community members. Any negative impact of the project, indeed, related to policy objectives. This could be minimised during a successor project/programme if the lessons on the patterns of the demands by community members could input into national policy and programme reviews and developments.

*Use of a specialist guided human rights-based and results-based monitoring and evaluation system*. The monitoring and evaluation aspect of DCP was its weakest, programmatically. This was because the monitoring and evaluation framework was too conventional for a such a human rights-based project. In addition, the monitoring and evaluation capacity in the project was stretched and in demand of a monitoring and evaluation specialist at the PMO level. With such capacity, the successor project should monitor the results framework in relation to the synergy of the situation analysis and not only on completed activities and attained results.

*Possible use of DCP-created structures to advance interactive civic and voter education for the democratic choice and development.* The effectiveness of DCP III’s methods was largely because of the project’s interactive approach and use of adult learning principles in civic education. Such approaches are in short supply in rural areas. With the declining sustainability and effectiveness of NICE, a successor programme to DCP III could build on such interactive methods to contribute to the consolidation of democracy and the realisation of development.

# 8. Annexes

## *8.1 Annex 1: Terms of Reference*

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF DEMOCRACY CONSOLIDATION PROGRAMME PHASE III**

1. BACKGROUND

In 2008 the Malawi Government developed the third phase of the Democracy Consolidation Programme (DCP III) on the basis of the recommendations of the 2003 road-map for civic education and results of the 2006 baseline survey on civic education. The phase was designed to address poor enjoyment of the right to development in the country which disadvantaged women, the young and rural people. DCP III’s intended outcome is “Increased and more effective participation of communities in decision-making and in advocating changes to policies, laws, practices which affect their livelihoods and rights and holding public bodies accountable.” The programme phase was designed to run from 1st January, 2008 to 31st December, 2011. It was aimed at creating a critical mass, at all levels of society, that vigilantly and consistently demand good governance and fulfilment of human rights, with a special focus on the right to development, from appropriate duty bearers. Consequently, the Programme empowers the citizenry with knowledge and skills to be able to take a lead in promoting good governance and human rights, especially the right to development, in their localities. The communities are mobilised into Village Rights Committees (VRCs) and Radio Listening Clubs (RLCs) in order to facilitate consensus building on community priorities and fulfilment of right holder responsibilities. The committees also provide community leadership in right holder/duty bearer dialogues aimed at identifying solutions to challenges prioritised by the community.

DCP III was designed as one of the implementation tools of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (2006-2011) and UNDP’s 2006 – 2008 Country Programme Action Plan. It uses the rights based approach to programming. The Programme is implemented through Civil Society Organisations and Public Bodies selected through competitive bidding.

2. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The inter-ministerial steering committee on Human Rights and Democracy Consolidation would like the programme to be evaluated with the aim of assessing the extent to which its objectives have been achieved and documenting its successes, challenges as well as lessons learnt. The evaluation is also expected to provide lessons and guidance on the designing of the next phase of support which will assume a re-designed programme approach.

**2.** **OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

1. Overall Objective

The overall objective of the evaluation is to carry out an assessment of the DCPIII implementation, management, achievements and challenges.

1. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the evaluation include:

1. Examine the relevance of the design to priorities set.
2. Assess the degree of efficiency and effectiveness of the programme in meeting the objectives for which it was designed.
3. Identify challenges to programme implementation and make recommendations on possible way forward.
4. Identify unintended results achieved by the programme and determine whether or not they positively or negatively impacted on programme implementation.

**3.** **SCOPE OF THE EVALUTION**

The evaluation will cover all activities carried out by the programme in all districts in the country and will include, but not be limited to, the following tasks:

1. Analysis of performance of the Outcome and outputs according to the following criteria:
	1. Relevance;
	2. Effectiveness;
	3. efficiency and
	4. Sustainability.
2. Assess the roles and responsibilities of various programme stakeholders: Programme Office, Programme Steering Committee, UNDP, Stakeholder Consultative Forum, Implementing partners, etc.
3. Assess the results of the activities implemented compared to the key programme outputs in the programme work plans.
4. Assess the programme implementation strategy and design including the adequacy of results framework.
5. Assess factors outside the scope of the programme, which impacted on its performance.
6. Assess impact of the programme on the institutions, groups, individuals that benefited from its support.
7. Assess the management (approach, objectives and implementation) modality of the programme (NEX).
8. Assess the efficacy of the Programme’s monitoring and evaluation system.
9. Assess the cumulative impact of the programme through an in-depth analysis.
10. In view of the assessment findings, make general recommendations as well as recommendations for a possible future programme and provide guidance on its major design features
11. draw lessons that will improve the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and impact of the programme; and
12. assess if the programme design and implementation sufficiently addressed the cross cutting themes of gender, human rights and HIV/Aids.
13. Evaluate DCP III monitoring and evaluation system and assess whether the programme can demonstrate the impact of its interventions.

**4.** **METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation team will be required to undertake the following activities:

* *Desk/literature review:* Review programme documentation including progress reports (both Financial and Technical); Audit Reports; Quarterly, Annual and Bi-annual work plans; Minutes of Tripartite and PSC Meetings, correspondence between the DCP and UNDP, contract between UNDP and Norway, etc.
* *Stakeholder consultations:* Interview relevant stakeholders e.g. members of staff at DCP, UNDP, the Royal Norwegian Embassy (Donors), Government Officials, Civil Society Organizations as well as grassroots beneficiaries.
* *Analysis and presentation of reports:* Evaluation team should prepare their findings and conclusions and present them through the following steps:
1. Debriefing of relevant stakeholders on the evaluators’ preliminary findings.
2. Presentation of evaluators’ findings and recommendations to PSC, UNDP, and the Royal Norwegian Embassy.
3. Circulation of draft evaluation report.
4. Elaboration of the final report

**5.** **COMPETENCIES**

The evaluation will be undertaken by independent local consultants/company. The consultants should have higher education, preferably in the areas of political science, law, public administration or sociology. The consultants should be familiar with monitoring and evaluation techniques, and should have extensive knowledge of political, social, cultural and economic situation of Malawi.

The evaluation team should have a minimum of the following qualifications and experience:

Team leader:

* Minimum educational qualifications of a Masters’ degree in the area of governance with a minimum of 10 years working experience with:
* civil society organisations and civic education programs
* democracy consolidation programs
* Practical project management and/or implementation experience.
* Proven experience in participatory research using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies.
* Demonstrated knowledge of current evaluation theory, methods and practice and several years of experience in evaluating development projects, preferably those that are related to civic education, human rights awareness and community empowerment preferably funded by multilateral and bilateral partners in developing countries.
* Computer literacy.
* Professional fluency in the English Language.

Team member

* An advanced degree in development, economics, management, social or political sciences or related field.
* At least 5 years of relevant experience
* Excellent drafting skills in the national working language
* Sufficient competence in spoken and written English
* Superior ability to produce high quality evaluation reports

6. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

1. Management arrangements – The DCP Programme Manager will be responsible for liaising with the evaluation team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits and co-ordinate with the Government. Travel and per diem costs will be included in the consultancy administration fees and will be the responsibility of the evaluation team. These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by UNDP Country Office, the Government and the Evaluation team. The two parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion. The Programme Analyst at UNDP will be assisted by UNDP Evaluation Focal Point to ensure compliance with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Evaluation Policy, Standards and Norms.
2. The Evaluators will be expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of office equipment and supplies, communication, accommodation and transport.
3. The Evaluators will provide the UNDP Programme Analyst and the Evaluation Focal Point with regular feedback on the progress of the evaluation process.
4. The Evaluators will ensure strict adherence to timely delivery of the report.

**7. OUTPUTS AND SCHEDULE**

* **Inception report**: The consultants will be expected to produce an inception report demonstrating a full understanding of the assignment 5 work-days after signing the evaluation contract. The report will outline the evaluation approach, methodology and details of field visits, among other elements.
* **Draft evaluation report**: The Consultant will present a draft report not later than 20 work-days after presentation of the inception report. The draft evaluation report detailing key findings and recommendations will be presented to a stakeholder forum
* **End of project evaluation Report**: The final project evaluation report will be submitted 5 days after receiving written feedback from the implementing agency and stakeholders. The Final end of programme phase evaluation report will contain both narrative and qualitative data.

The assignment is for 30 full-time working days. The assignment should be completed within 60 days from the date of signing the evaluation contract.

**8.** **TIME TABLE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Month 1**  | **Month 2** |
| Wk 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Contract and Entry meeting | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inception report, draft revised | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection and analysis |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drafting and submission of Evaluation Report |  |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |
| Review of draft report and submission of comments by stakeholders  |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |  |
| Revision and submission of Final Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |

**9.**  **PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE**

1. Executive summary
2. Introduction
3. Background
4. Evaluation purpose and objectives
5. Evaluation Methodology
6. Major findings
7. Lessons learnt (from both positive and negative experiences)
8. Constraints that impacted country programme delivery
9. Recommendations and conclusions

**10. REFERENCE GROUP FOR EVALUATIONS**

1. **Introduction**

This reference group has been instituted to provide overall guidance during the evaluation process of the Democracy Consolidation Program (PSCDP). The group consists of key stakeholders in the Program and is largely drawn from the Technical Working Committee/Project Steering Committee of the Program.

**B. Composition of the Reference Group**

The composition of Reference Group was as follows:

* DCP Implementation Unit
* YONECO - representing grass root based institutions, with experience in community mobilization.
* Development Communication Trust (representing Electronic media based institutions)
* Ministry of Information and Civic Education (representing print media)
* Ministry of Local Governments and Rural Development (MoLGRD)
* Royal Norwegian Embassy
* UNDP
1. **Terms of Reference of the Reference Group**

**Responsibilities of the Reference Group**

The reference group will provide overall advise on the evaluation to enhance its quality and its use. It will meet at key points during the evaluation process as outlined below:

1. review ToRs for the assignment and suggest improvements where necessary;
2. review the overall methodology of the assignment to ensure quality of process and output
3. support data collection process and ensure access to data required for the evaluation.
4. review intermediate and final output of the assignments;
5. provide written comments on reports and briefs from the assignment;
6. provide guidance to the consultant during the course of undertaking the assignment; and
7. advise UNDP and OPC on whether output from the assignment is of acceptable quality.
8. **Organizational Arrangements**

The Reference Group will be convened by DCP Program implementation unit and UNDP as and when needed. The role of the Reference Group will cease after the submission of the Final Evaluation Report.

## *8.2 Annex 2: Consolidated Tools*

Tool 1: Generic Checklist

1. Bear in mind the aspects of the right to development for service delivery:
* Education
* Health services
* Food
* Shelter
* Employment
* Infrastructure
* Basic resources: energy, water, land
1. Which aspects of the right to development are you most proud of and why?
2. Which aspects of the right to development face the greatest challenges and why?
3. How do the people demand the enjoyment of these aspects and with what results and why?
4. To what extent has the life of the following groups changed since 2008 as a result of the project:
* Children
* Women
* People with disabilities
1. How has the project helped with regard to the following:
* Removing problems that result in unfair differences in people’s well-being?
* Showing that government decisions and actions respect the right to development?
* Addressing issues related to gender?
* Addressing issues related to HIV/AIDS?
1. What types of vulnerable people have the project empowered and which ones have are still left behind?
2. Has there been an increase in the effectiveness of participation of communities in decision-making and in advocating changes to policies, laws, practices which affect the livelihoods of marginalised people and ordinary people in general? Why?
3. What changes have you noticed in the responsiveness of government and other public bodies or officials since the beginning of the project?
4. To what extent have there been changes since (2008, 2009, 2010) in the extent to which people hold public bodies accountable?
5. To what extent have people been demanding fair trade, labour and consumer protection?
6. To what extent and why do people demand public services and good governance from district assemblies and other public functionaries?
7. Which results of the project have remained and which ones are likely to remain and why?
8. What are the aspects of the implementation of this project that your admire and why?
9. What aspects of the implementation of this project need to change and how?
10. To what extent do you think the project has contributed to good governance with regard to you area?
11. To what extent has the project contributed to consolidation of democracy in this area?
12. What needs to be kept in this programme if a new phase was to be developed?
13. What needs to be changed in this programme if a new phase was to be developed?
14. Do you have any questions for us?

Tool 2: Scorecard on the Aspects of the Right to Development

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Aspect** | **Core out of 10** |
| Education |  |
| Health |  |
| Food |  |
| Employment |  |
| Shelter |  |
| Infrastructure |  |
| Other Basic Social Services | Water |  |
| Energy |  |
| Justice |  |
| Non-discrimination |  |
| Fair Trade |  |
| Reduction of Disparities |  |

Tool 3: Design Process

Tool 3(a): Logical Framework Development

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stage | Observations Related to Human Rights Principles |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Tool 3(b): Logic between Goal, Purpose and Strategy

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Logic Between Goal and Purpose** | **Relevance of Strategy and Activities** | **Observations** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |

Tool 3(c) : Organizational Analysis, Findings and Observations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organs** | **Roles**  | **Reasons Given** | **Observation and Findings** |
| Full Structure |  |  |  |
| PSC |  |  |  |
| Programme Office |  |  |  |
| Stakeholder Consultative Forum |  |  |  |
| UNDP |  |  |  |
| Norwegian Embassy |  |  |  |

Tool 3(d): Adequacy of Results Framework and Findings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Impact** | **Outcome** | **Output** | **Inputs** | **Observations and Findings** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Tool 2 (d): Partnership Formation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria for Partnership Formation** | **Partnership Principles** | **Partnership Analysis Results** | **Observations** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Tool 3

**Relevance: The Programme’s design and the extent to which stated objectives correctly addressed identified problems, real needs, or aspirations**

**Relevance of the Project to Manifestations, Causes and Aspirations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Manifestation/Aspect of the Right to Development* | *Stated Outcomes/Objectives* | *Cogency of Results Chain In Relation to Synergy of Causes* |
|  | *Right/Manifestation* | *Duties/Key Causes* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Tool 4

Efficiency: how well the various activities transformed the available resources into intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Output Intended | Budget | Notes on Quantity of Activities and Results | Notes on Quality of Activities | Timeliness |
| Planned by Year | Actual by Year |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Tool 5

**Effectiveness: The extent to which the results of the programme achieved the actual programme purpose and how assumptions affected project achievements**

**Programme Purpose: People have been empowered to promote, protect, and defend human rights.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year and Output | Key Results | Assumptions Mitigating Impact | Notes on Progress Towards Purpose |
| Anticipated | Unforeseen/Observations |  |
|  | 1st Output |  |  |  |  |
| 2nd Output |  |  |  |  |
| 3rd Output |  |  |  |  |
| 4th Output |  |  |  |  |

Tool 6

**Impact:** The relationship between the purpose and overall objectives of the programme and the extent to which the benefits had a wider overall effect on larger numbers of people in the region and the wider policy or sector objectives**.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Goal | Project Output | Benefits With Positive Effects on People | Benefits Related to Sector Objectives | Negative Effects |
|  |
| Direct | Indirect | Direct | Indirect |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |

Tool 7

**Sustainability: Whether the positive outcomes of the programme are likely to continue after external funding ends.**

|  |
| --- |
| Component |
| Ownership | Policy Support | Economic Factors | Gender | Appropriate Technology | Environmental  | HIV/AIDS |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Tool 8

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **M and E Methods and Activities** | **Evidence of Technical Capacity** | **Evidence of Existence and Usefulness of Baselines** | **Contribution to National M and E Monitoring** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Notes:

Tool 9

**Key Challenges and Lessons**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Context-Related | Programme-Related | Operation-Related |
| Lessons | Challenges | Lessons | Challenges | Lessons | Challenges |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Policy Analysis for Future Project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Long-term goal** | **Medium-term Outcomes** |  **Strategies** | **Implications for DCP III design** |
|  |  |  |  |

## *8.3 Annex 3: Participation in the Evaluation*

* + 1. **Reference Group Members**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **Interest Represented** | **Reference Group Member** |
| DCP Implementation Unit | Programme management Office | * Amani Mussa
* Grace Valera
* Martin Kaluluma Phiri
* Joseph Taju
 |
| YONECO -  | Representing grass root based institutions, with experience in community mobilization. | * McBain Mkandawire
 |
| Development Communication Trust  | Representing electronic media based institutions | * Lusungu Dzinkambani
 |
| Ministry of Information and Civic Education  | Representing print media stakeholders  | * Victor Chikwawe
 |
| Ministry of Local Governments and Rural Development (MoLGRD) | Representation Government key implementation partners | * Hastings Botha
 |
| Royal Norwegian Embassy | Representing basket fund contributing development partner | * Michael Nyirenda
 |
| UNDP | Representing UN and project fund contributing and managing development partner | * Marius Walter
* Peter Kulemeka
 |

* + 1. **Community and Other Interactions**
* **Chigoma Radio Listening Club, Mzimba**
* Robert Banda, Phinious Jere, Christopher Nkhoma, Violet Shaba, Grace Ng’oma, Wongani Ng’oma, Bertha Chipeta, Gift Phiri, Molesi Makwakwa, Madalitso Mbewe, Kastima Jere, Ridia Phiri, Grace Gondwe, Anna Mwale
* **Nkata Village Rights Committee, Mangochi**
* Senior Group Village Headwoman Nkata; Chief Matungwi, Chief Mdima, Chief Nsafali, Chief Ng’ombo, Chief Kwilemba, Chief Mbuzi, Hajira Chilombo, Marten Mustapha, C. Nyasulu, Usseni Jawadi, Mogoya Mulangizi, Beston Matola, Mbwana Jemala, Laston Makawula, Kapalamula Lemani, John Luka, Tembula Mana, Umali Ali, Tchatcha Issa, Beston Mbwana, Alice Safiyani, Maria Alija, Mariam Dinesi, Manesi Ali, Enifa Ibraimo, Msumana Samundiya
* **Chindikani Community Rights Committee**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant | Position |
| **Milliam Chavula** | Member (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Mathias Jere** | V. Sec. (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Wedson Nyirongo** | Member (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Tyfore Zyambo** | Member (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Benson Lwanja** | Member (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Vinjeru Jimmy** | Nkhonjera MC-CRC |
| **Harry Nkhonjera** | Member (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Steven Nkandawire** | Chair- Tikolelane Goat Club |
| **Harry Chikanga** | Tree Growers Club |
| **Enala Makwa** | Chair- Goat Club |
| **Iress Msuku** | Chikaya Poutry |
| **Ester Nyirongo** | Treasurer (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Martha Glory Nyilongo** | Secretary (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Pastor Ronex Mzande** | Member (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Malict Mlotha** | V. Chairlady (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Henry Munthali** | Chair- African Curch |
| **Hensley Kumwenda** | VDC Chairman |
| **Brian Luhanga** | School Chairperson |
| **Medson M’nthali** | Member VDC |
| **Golden Mkanda** | V.H Katikika |
| **Lucia Mzumala** | Chairlady (Chindikani CRC) |
| **Charles Zyambo** | GV Majiathika |
| **Benard Nkhonjera** | SGVH |
| **Watson Nkandawire** | PSGV. Nkononga |
| **Mathias Lwanja** | SPGGVH Chilambo |
| **Judith Mkandawire** | CBF |

* **Mulongoti Community Rights Committee, Rumphi**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant | Position |
| PSGV Mlongoti | Principal Sub-Group Village Headman |
| Osman Chiwowa | VDC |
| Ken Ngoma | CBF |
| Lolyn Mhango | CRC Chair |
| Oliver Kumwenda | CRC Secretary |
| Dicken Gondwe | CRC V. Chair |
| Maggie Mnyenyembe | CRC Member |
| Leonard Mhango | CRC Treasurer |
| Ester Lungu | CRC Member |
| Files Kalua | CRC V. Secretary |
| Savimbi Mhango | Co-operative Member |
| Denis Thera | CRC Member |
| Wadson Zimbiri | Co-operative Member |
| Maggret Betera | Co-operative Member |
| Tiwonge Ngwira | Co-operative Member |
| Tiwonge Mwandira | Co-operative Member |
| Dorah Mhango | Co-operative Member |
| Linda Zgambo | Co-operative Member |
| Eunice Zgambo | Dairy  |
| Tamala Chavula | Dairy |
| Molly Zgambo | Dairy |
| Lina Nyirenda | Dairy |
| Stelia Madise | Dairy |
| Millika Zgambo | Co-operative Member |

* **Chididi Village Rights Committee, Nsanje**
* Mary Bello, Patrick Msiyaphanje, Paul Paul, Odala Fraghton, Theniford Ngwanji, Fredson Kandelo, Nyakamera Nyakamera, Luciano Mpangira, C. Masiono, Suwali Suwali, Samalani Rose, Christina Shawa, Mingilesi Bertford, Chricy Khambadza, Enia John
* **Takondwa Radio Listening Club, Nsanje**
	+ Gladess Thawani, Benford Kaitano, Aubrey Foley, Stela Chakholoma, Aleya Waiton, Nyalani Mpakula, Ridia Mkweza, Ridia Mtemuwa, Kalikokha Ephraim, Cosmas Petro, Gloria Thole, Falesi Nkhodolo, Felia Lupiya, Rozi Nasho, Chricy Leonard, Christerner Chivunde, Kelita Kelita Tchuzi
* **Benga Village Rights Committee, Nkhotakota**
	+ Mathews Nkhoma, Allen Majani, Masautso chiwilira, Affaxad Kambalani, Chricy Chaziya, Endson Kamdzakwe, Loveness M. Kabungwe, James Aloni, Paul Gunde, Getrude Shadreck, Malliot Yohane, Benard Kaso, Satapika Mazoni
* **Chinamwabvi Village Rights Committee, Salima**
	+ Emily Kaunda, onald Likitucha, Elizabeth Yohane, Ida Sandalamu, Flocy kafanaye, Esnart Mndala, Mwenyekala Izaka, James Kalisoni, Zakaria Morris, Anne Malingamoyo, Evereti Kaunda
* **Tithokoze RLC GVH Sitima T/A Mwanza, Salima**
* Katelera Chipingasa (Chairman), Alefa Tito (Vice Chairman) Afawelo Kasitomu (Monitor) Lyness Banisani (Vice Monitor), Lyton Kalimbakatha (Secretary), Dorothy Mateyu (Vice Secretary) Lucia Chabinya (Treasurer): Members: Chimpesha Kotala, Taipa Dyson, Elizabeth Kachipanda, Jelina Kabanga, Maria Chipezayani, Zenasi Bernado, Eliyana Chipingasa, Alice Misoya, Agness Makisawo, Malita Jayilosi, Alufi Samisoni, Neliya Undani, Tasiyana Falawo, Chifunilo Kalimba, Chrissy Afawelo, Nelia Lyton, Likisina Pemba
* **Lisanjala Radio Listening Club, Machinga**
	+ Fatima Elard, Gidiel Ngwira, Jean Anafi, Rodrick Saulosi, Friday Yandu Chiwisa, Alice Daiton, Steven Biswick, Gladys Asma, Phelisa Madengu,
* **Lungwena RLC GVH Chapola, STA, Namavi, Mangochi**
	+ Msusa Kawanga (Chair) Esmie Karimu (Monitor) Fatima Daudi (Vice Monitor), Daye Juma (Secretary) Enelesi Ali (Vice Secretary); Shaibu Abudu (Treasurer); Members: Daye Juma Teleza Mwamadi; Fanesi Saineti; Zambiya Msusa, Regina Asani Hawa, Alisa, Akusiwona Uladi, Marriam Paudala, Ethel Namakhwa, Liz Kanjoti Patuma Kenesi
* **Mposa Community Rights Committee, Machinga**
	+ Richard Nkhonjera, Christopher Waile, Kaduya Sabiti, Isaac Chiwandasi, Richard Jamali, Watson Dozola, Evelesi Kafati, Enies Gondwe, Paulo Sitivini, Edina Sitande, Joni Inusa, Naomi Jilambo, Chyness Mkakata
		1. **District Level Focused Group Discussions**
* **Rumphi CBFs and CBEs**
* Michael K. Nundwe, Henry Nyimbiri, Flora Chavula, Thomas Mhango, Andrew Zyambo, Alberto Gondwe, Alex Mhango, Mary Nkhangaimo, Kosindi Chilongo, Mathews Mzembe, Catherine Gondwe, Regina Chilima, Layton Tembo, Arnord Msimuku
* **Salima CBFs, CBEs and Paralegal**
* Davie Makhamadzi, Jacob Banda Chima, Maxwel Chikweza, Pius Bester, John Mwantisi, K. Banda, Cecilia Nyirongo, McPeterson Aurkrand, Zione Kachepa, Memory Chisale, Lictor Chisapo, Silino Kamphanje, Leonard Ntaba Mwale
* **Nkhotakota CBEs, CBFs, Project Staff, and Paralegals**
* Rose Zuze, Jonous E Chiwaya, Mofolo Zakaliya, Ethel Difati, Ackidu Chawinga, Chimpezi Staford, Melinas Chisati, Benson Pepa, Glad Nhoma, Bolden Phiri, Dorothy Chiphwanya, Stambuli Balaka, Funachina Umali, Ramadhan Saidi, Omega Jalafi
* **Mancgochi CBEs, CBFs, Project Staff, and Paralegals**
* Jafali Foster, avie Chilombo, Andrea Mphaya, Rabson Sumani, Misozi Jana, John Francis, Elias Andiwoch, Edimy Chilenga, Hawa Lusha, Sabiti Saizi, Ajida Mwenyezunda, Isaac Gama, Jaussa Siliva, Patrick Ndovie, Elizabeth Mwenyeheri
* **Nsanje CBEs, CBFs, Project Staff, and Paralegals**
* Chrissy Sailos, William jailos, Mhathayo Mhathayo, Elicy Lota, Butao Mtendesi, Mary Tsandoka, Sailesi Chibuli, Charles Charlie, Mary Ndafakale, Nowa Kamasho, Rhonex Nyantondola, Elita Kampala, Chakudza Zondani, Annie Sandram , Grace Ntakwesi
	+ 1. **Regional Level Focused Group Discussions**
* **Southern Region**

*Southern Region Stakeholder FGD*

*26 August 2011*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participant | Implementing Partner |
| Chance Kalolokesya  | YONECO |
| Chikondi Kuwani  | CARD |
| David Mussa  | IPI |
| Dorothy Dafter  | WOLREC |
| Edison Chikoko  | YONECO |
| Edna Bvalani  | DCT |
| Frazer Chinkhande  | Blantyre Synod  |
| Fred Yiwombe  | CDC |
| Hassan Nkata  | DCT |
| Henry Nandolo  | IPI |
| Lusungu Dzinkambani  | DCT |
| Maggie Kathewera Banda  | WOLREC |
| Martin Mazinga  | WOLREC |
| Pachalo Namatumbo | CARER |
| Paul Kachusa  | CARER |
| Prince Mtelera  | DCT |
| Rachel Nkhonjera  | YONECO |
| Sam Msuku  | YONECO |
| Timothy Kateta  | Capital FM Radio |
| Weston Seyama  | CARD |
| Zione Mayaya  | DCT |

* **Northern Region**
* Madalo Jumbe, Diaz Chisinga, Werdson Richman Njewa, Rev. Dean Mzozonda, Marius Kamanga , Grace Nguluwe, Paul Mvula
* **Central Region**
* Evans Phiri, Victor Chikwawe, Jasten Chitsulo, Chisomo Mwasinga, Steven Ndhlovu, Michael Kayatsa, Betty Liwimbi, Mathews Mawinga, Christopher Kolla, Richard Kaleo, Clement Zindondo, Felix Katemula
	+ 1. **Government and other Public Key Informants**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Institution | Designation |
| Hastings Botha | MoLG&RD | Director for Local Government |
| Emmanuel Konzakapansi | Malawi Human Rights Commission | Deputy Executive Director |
| Mr Mike Chipalasa | Malawi Human Rights Commission |  Chief Human Resources Officer |
| Ms Lusako Munyenyembe | Malawi Human Rights Commission | Principal Investigation Officer |
| Mr Luscious Pendame | Malawi Human Rights Commission | Investigation Officer |

* + 1. **Royal Norwegian Embassy**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Designation |
| Mr Solrun Maria Olafsdottir | Programme Officer |
| Michael Nyirenda | Programme Officer |

* + 1. **The UNDP**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Programme**  | **Designation** |
| Richard Dictus | UN Resident Coordinator |
| Fred Mwathengere | Assistant Resident Representative – Governance  |
| Marius Walter | Programme Analyst |
| Participants in programme meeting | Various designations |

* + 1. **Other Development Partners**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Organisation | Designation |
| Julia Ojanen | European Union | Governance Advisor |
| Alex Stevens | DfID | Governance Team Leader |
| Thokozile Chisala | DfID | Prpgramme Manager |
| Winston Khamula | GTZ | Deputy Team Leader, Chief Advisor Devolution |
| Viweni Chavula | GIZ | GIZ Chief Advisor, Local Governance |
| Adrian Fitzgerald  | IrsihAid | Head of Development |
| Janet Liabunya | IrishAid | Governance Advsior |

* + 1. **DCP**

|  |
| --- |
| **Programme Steering Committee** |
| Kamanga, Anthony | PSC Deputy Chairperson |
| **Programme Office** |
| Mussa, Amani | Programme Manager |
| Valera, Grace | Deputy Programme Manager |
| Phiri, Martin | Programme Planner and Administrator |
| Taju, Joseph | Programme Accountant |
| Salonga, Alena | Deputy Programme Accountant |
| **Stakeholder Forum**  |
| Name | Institution |
|  |  |
| Paul Mvula | Church and Society, Livingstonia Synod |
| Weston Seyama | Churches Action in Relief and Development |
| Gerard Chigona | Norwegian Church Aid |
| Robert Mbaya | Nkhotakota Youth Organisation |
| Timothy Kateta | Capital Radio  |
| Maggie Kathewera Banda | Women’s Legal Resources Centre |
| Lusako M. Chikoko | MALGA |
| Winston K. Khamula | GIZ MGPDD |
| Charles Kasambara | Centre for Legal Assistance |
| Emmanuel Konzakapansi | Malawi Human Rights Commission |
| Lucius Pendame | Malawi Human Rights Commission |
| Francis Ngopola | Evangelical Lutheran Development Services |
| Prince Mtelera | Development Communications Trust |
| Paul Kachusa | Malawi CARER |
| Fred Yiwombe | Centre for Development Communications |
| Alnord Msimuko | CCJP – Mzuzu Diocese |
| Fraser P. Chinkhande | CCAP Blantyre Synod Development Commission |
| Mathews Malunga | Youth Net and Counselling |
| Clemence Alfazema | UNDP |
| Rafiq Hajat | Institute for Policy Interaction |
| Mary Makhiringa | Boma Lathu (MICE) |
| Richard Kalea | Ntchisi Organisation for Youth and Development |
| Mary Phombeya | Anti Corruption Bureau |
| Betty Liwimbi | Centre for Human Rights and Rehabilitation |
| Janet Liabunya | Irish AID |
| P. Ndasauka | Ministry of Information and Civic Education |
| Julius Munthali | EU Delegation |
| Michael Nyirenda | Norwegian Embassy |
| Fannie Nthakomwa | NDI |
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