 

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK (UNDAF) FOR MALAWI**

**2012-2016**

**EVALUATION REPORT**

**May 30, 2015**

C:\Users\Cathal.elder\Documents\Logos\UN Agencies\UNAIDS.jpg





**RICHARD OLVER: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES & EVALUATION**

[richard.olver@verizon.net](mailto:richard.olver@verizon.net)

+1 (917) 346-5587

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2

Acknowledgements 4

List of United Nations Organizations in Malawi 5

List of Abbreviations 6

Part 1: Executive Summary 9

The UNDAF evaluation 9

National Development Issues and Priorities 9

The UNDAF 10

Achievement of Outcomes and Indicators 13

Recommendations 16

Part 2: The Evaluation of the Malawi UNDAF 2012-2016 18

2.1 The UNDAF Evaluation 18

2.2 Scope of the Evaluation 19

2.3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology 21

Part 3. National Development Issues and Priorities 24

3.1 The Malawi Context 24

3.2 MDGS II and National Development Priorities 26

Part 4: UNDAF Contribution to National Development Priorities and Results 27

4.1: UN Coherence and Programming Principles 27

4.2 Relevance of the UNDAF 36

4.3 UNDAF Design and Management efficiency 37

4.4 Effectiveness of the UNDAF 44

4.5 Achievement of Outcomes and Indicators 50

4.5.1. Cluster 1: National policies, local and national institutions effectively support equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security by 2016. 50

4.5.1.1. UNDAF Outcome 1.1: Targeted vulnerable households are resilient (capable of meeting their basic needs and withstanding shocks) by 2016. 51

4.5.1.2. UNDAF Outcome 1.2: Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016. 54

4.5.1.3. UNDAF Outcome 1.3: Productive poor benefit from decent work, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016 55

4.5.1.4. Cluster 1 Funding and Financial Performance 57

4.5.2. Cluster 2: Basic Social and Protection Services: National institutions effectively deliver equitable and quality basic social and protection services by 2016. 59

4.5.2.1. UNDAF Outcome 2.1: The population in selected districts has increased access to equitable and quality essential health services by 2016 59

4.5.2.2. UNDAF Outcome 2.2: Children under five years of age, pregnant women and lactating mothers in selected districts have access to and use quality nutrition services by 2016. 62

4.5.2.3. UNDAF Outcome 2.3: Rural and peri-urban underserved areas in selected districts have access to integrated safe water supply, sanitation, hygiene and environmental health services by 2016. 64

4.5.2.4. UNDAF Outcome 2.4: Boys and Girls of school-going age in selected low performing districts enroll, are retained, learn, and complete basic education by 2016. 66

4.5.2.5. UNDAF Outcome 2.5: Children, young people and women are better protected from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect and have access to an expanded range of protection services by 2016. 67

4.5.2.6. Cluster 2 Funding and Financial Performance 69

4.5.3. Cluster 3: HIV and AIDS: National response to HIV and AIDS scaled up to achieve Universal Access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support by 2016. 70

4.5.3.1. UNDAF Outcome 3.1: Key and vulnerable populations have equitable access to and uptake of quality gender sensitive HIV prevention and treatment services 71

4.5.3.2. UNDAF Outcome 3.2: Critical enablers for the implementation of the national response enhanced and utilized by 2016 73

4.2.3.3 Cluster 3 Funding and Financial Performance 74

4.5.4. Cluster 4: Governance and Human Rights - National institutions effectively support transparency, accountability, participatory democracy and human rights by 2016. 75

4.5.4.1. UNDAF Outcome 4.1: National institutions foster democratic governance for all, especially children, women, persons with disabilities and the youths by 2016 76

4.5.4.2. UNDAF Outcome 4.2: Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016 78

4.5.4.3. UNDAF Outcome 4.3: National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016 80

4.5.4.4. UNDAF Outcome 4.4: National policies and public behaviour responsive to population dynamics for sustainable development by 2016 83

4.5.4.5. Cluster 4 Funding and Financial Performance 84

4.6. Effect on the UN’s contribution of Funding flows and gaps 86

4.7. Partnerships 89

Part 5: Recommendations for Improving the UN’s Contribution 92

Annex A: Terms of Reference 110

Annex B: Evaluation Objectives Matrix 120

Annex C: List of Persons Interviewed 128

National Partners 128

United Nations System 131

External Development Partners 136

Consultants 136

Annex D: Joint Programmes 138

Annex E: Bibliography 142

Annex F: Feedback on the UNDAF from Civil Society Groups 164

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere thanks for the frank, constructive and helpful insights shared with me by everyone I spoke with in the Government the UNCT, and among a wide range of other partners.

Everywhere, UN people and their partners showed the passion and insight that makes the UN’s work special. I have reflected many commonly held views in my report: most of my findings and recommendations derive from the deep thought and practical understanding shared with me by UN staff and others at all levels. In the end however, the views and recommendations expressed in this report are my own.

I would also like to give special acknowledgement and thanks to the Heads of Agencies of the UNCT, PMT members and the Outcome Group Leads who met with me repeatedly and at length: their vision, energy and commitment are a credit to the UN idea.

Finally, I am extremely grateful for the constant, unstinting support and guidance of the Resident Coordinator and the staff of her Office, as well as the many UN people who found ways to facilitate my work. Without your daily diversion of energies from other pressing tasks to address the needs of this evaluation, it could not have been accomplished.

## List of United Nations Organizations in Malawi

**Resident Agencies:**

**FAO** - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

**UNAIDS -**Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS

**UNDP** - United Nations Development Programme

**UNICEF**- United Nations Children's Fund

**UNHCR** - **United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees**

**UNFPA** - United Nations Population Fund

**UN WOMEN** - United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

**WHO** - World Health Organization

**WFP** - World Food Programme

**Non-Resident Agencies:**

**IAEA** - International Atomic Energy Agency

**IOM** - International Organization for Migration

**IFAD** - International Fund for Agricultural Development

**ILO** - International Labor Organization

**OHCHR**- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

**UNCDF**-United Nations Capital Development Fund

**UNEP** - United Nations Environment Programme

**UN-HABITAT** - United Nations Human Settlements Programme

**UNESCO** - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

**UNIDO** - United Nations Industrial Development Organization

**UNODC** - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

**UNOCHA** - United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

## List of Abbreviations

**ACB** Anti-Corruption Bureau

**AD** Actively Disbursing

**AG** Attorney General

**AIDS** Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

**AMP** Aid Management Platform

**ART** Antiretroviral Therapy

**ARV** Antiretroviral

**ASWAP** Agriculture Sector Wide Approach

**CABS** Common Approach to Budget Support

**CBCC** Community Based Childcare Centre

**CBDA** Community-based Distribution Agents

**CC** Climate Change

**CD** Country Director

**CHD** Community Health Day

**CMAM** Community Management of Acute Malnutrition

**CMD** Centre for Multiparty Democracy

**CSO** Civil Society Organisation

**CVSU** Community Victim Support Unit

**DaO** Delivering as One

**DCP** Democracy Consolidation Programme

**DGSS** Democratic Governance Sector Strategy

**DHIS 2** District Health Information System 2

**DIPs** District Implementing Partners

**DNHA** Department of Nutrition and AIDS

**DPs** Development Partners

**DRM** Disaster Risk Management

**ECAM** Employers Consultative Association of Malawi 

**ECD** Early Childhood Development

**ED** Executive Director

**ENR** Environment and Natural Resources

**EP&D** Economic Planning and Development

**FAO** Food and Agricultural Organisation of the UN

**FPAM** Family Planning Association of Malawi

**FY** Fiscal Year

**GBV** Gender Based Violence

**GEWE** Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

**GIZ** German International Cooperation

**GoM** Government of Malawi 

**GPI** Gender Parity Index

**HACT** Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers

**HABITAT** United Nations Human Settlements Programme

**HF** Health Facility

**HIV** Human Immunodeficiency Virus

**HR** Human Resources

**HTC** HIV Testing and Counseling

**HTSS** Health Technical Support Services

**IAEA** International Atomic Energy Agency

**ICT** Information Communication and Technology

**IFAD** International Fund for Agricultural Development

**ILO** International Labour Organisation

**IM** Instant Messaging

**IMCI** Integrated Management of Childhood Illness

**IRD** Integrated Rural Development

**IT** Information Technology

**JMP** Joint Monitoring Project

**JSSP** Joint Sector Strategic Plan

**KMC** Kangaroo Mother Care

**MASEDA** Malawi Socio-Economic Database

**MDG** Millennium Development Goal

**MDHS** Malawi Demographic and Health Survey

**MGDS** Malawi Growth and Development Strategy

**MoFEPD** Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development

**MoGCDSW** Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare

**MOH** Ministry of Health

**MTCT** Mother To Child Transmission

**NAC** National AIDS Commission

**NAO** National Audit Office

**NER** Net Enrolment Rate

**NES** National Export Strategy

**NGO** Non-Governmental Organisation

**NNPSP** National Nutrition Policy and Strategic Plan

**NO** National Officer

**NPP** National Population Policy

**NSO** National Statistical Office

**NSSP** National Social Support Programme

**OMT** Operations Management Team

**OPC** Office of the President and Cabinet

**OPC, DHRM** Office ofthe President and Cabinet, Department of Human Resource Management

**OSC** One Stop Centre

**PA SWG** Public Administration Sector Working Group

**PLHIV** People Living with HIV

**PMT** Programme Management Team

**PMTCT** Prevention of Mother To Child Transmission

**PVSU** Police Victim Support Unit

**RBM** Results-Based Management

**RDT** Regional Directors Team

**RR** Resident Representative

**SIP** Sector Investment Plan

**SRH** Sexual Reproductive Health

**SOP** Standard Operating Procedures

**TB** Tuberculosis

**TIPSWAP** Trade, Industry and Private Sector Development Sector Wide Approach

**UN** United Nations

**UNAIDS** Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS

**UNCDF** United Nations Capital Development Fund

**UNCT** United Nations Country Team

**UNDAF** United Nations Development Assistance Framework

**UNDG** United Nations Development Group

**UNDP** United Nations Development Programme

**UNDSS** United Nations Department of Safety and Security

**UNGA** United Nations General Assembly

**UNESCO** United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organisation

**UNFPA** United Nations Population Fund

**UNHCR** United Nations High Commission for Refugees

**UNICEF** United Nations Children’s Fund

**UNIDO** United Nations Industrial Development Organisation

**UN Women** United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

**UNV** United Nations Volunteers

**VMMC** Voluntary Male Medical Circumcision

**WMS**  Welfare Monitoring Survey

**WASH** Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

**WFP** World Food Programme

**WHO** World Health Organisation

# Part 1: Executive Summary

## The UNDAF evaluation

This UNDAF evaluation is jointly commissioned and led by the UNCT and the Government of Malawi.

The UN Development Group (UNDG) requires all UNCTs to undertake an evaluation of their UNDAF to support greater accountability of the UN to stakeholders and to support learning, so that lessons learned may be applied to the design of the next UNDAF. This evaluation took place in March-May 2015.

The evaluation has four key objectives: to assess the contribution made by the UN; to identify the factors that have affected the UN’s contribution; to reach conclusions concerning the UN’s contribution; and to provide actionable recommendations for improving the UN’s contribution, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF.

The Evaluation examined the broader national and development context, performance against planned Outcomes, mainstreaming of the five UN programming principles, especially the crosscutting themes of Gender and Human Rights, key overarching issues such as a focus on adolescent girls and building resilience among communities and institutions, realization of Delivery as One (DaO) goals and joint programming. It also explored implementation and partnership issues and results.

The primary focus of the evaluation is at the Outcome level. It examined Outcome work plans and future estimates of target achievement and resources, and other objective sources. It also conducted interviews with key stakeholders on issues and likely results by end-2016. It assessed the UNDAF against standard evaluation criteria. The overall approach was participatory. One hundred and thirty -one (131) people were consulted from Government, the UN, CSOs and development partners.

The evaluation took place along with an evaluation on gender, and its findings are incorporated here.

## National Development Issues and Priorities

The national context: Malawi has had a fairly steady development trajectory since independence in 1964. During this time it has received considerable external support for development, including from the UN.

Nevertheless, it continues to suffer from poverty and weak governance. Chronic vulnerability and food insecurity is also a persistent feature in Malawi, and in recent years floods and droughts have further increased vulnerability. From a UN perspective, fundamental problems include: a largely poor, rural population with poor nutrition; traditional gender roles and norms, inequalities and population growth of 2.8% per year; shrinking size of small-holdings, and a lack of non-agricultural livelihoods; and an absence of non-wood energy sources, resulting in a 2.5% annual loss of forest cover.

National systems (notably for health, education, agriculture) are stronger and more universal than in other countries at similar levels of development, but domestic financing alone is unable to sustain these services. The status quo is not sustainable.

#### The Millennium Development Goals: Of the eight MDGs, national targets are likely to be met in four: Reducing Child Mortality; Combating HIV and AIDS, Malaria and other diseases; Ensuring Environmental Sustainability and Developing Global Partnership for Development.

The four remaining goals to be attained are: Eradicating Extreme Poverty and Hunger; Achieve Universal Primary Education; Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women; and Improve Maternal Health. Though it seems unlikely that targets for these will be met, there has been significant progress in all four areas. All are gender-related or have a strong gender component.

MDGS II, DCS and challenges to development coherence: The national Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (MGDS II) aims to accelerate the pace of economic growth and reduce poverty. It addresses the full range of national priorities, but it does not concentrate efforts through an articulated strategic focus.

Malawi’s Development Cooperation Strategy (DCS) is a country-owned strategic document that champions the principles of ownership, focus on results, inclusive development partnerships, and transparency and accountability. It provides a solid country-level framework to guide development cooperation. Great improvements have been achieved in the coherence of development in Malawi in recent years, reflected in the DCS and some Sector Working Groups (SWGs).

After significant progress in pooled funding and coordination through SWAps, accountability concerns led development partners to suspend pooled funding through the national budget. Since then, disbursement has increased through NGOs, UN agencies, and to local governments. The net effect of these arrangements is a multiplication of implementing agents and a loss of funding to support government capacity. A strategic response to these issues is a highest priority for the UN.

## **The UNDAF**

The UN in Malawi supports the Government in four priority areas. These issues correspond well to the areas of greatest national importance the UN could have addressed:

* Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security
* Basic Social and Protection Services
* HIV and AIDS
* Governance and Human Rights

The UNCT framed its interventions fairly realistically, and achieved significant changes in each subject matter area. Overall results have been good to excellent. The choices of focus of the UNCT have been highly appropriate.

The UNDAF is a very good compilation of agency mandates and capacities, organized and deployed around national and international priorities. The UNCT is only now learning to plan together from the key national issue to a collective UN response (i.e., the Joint Programme on Resilience), rather than from the agency priority to the collaborative programme.

The UNDAF is coherent within almost all Outcomes, and is usually coherent at the level of the four Clusters, but there is limited linkage among the Clusters, and UNDAF Outcomes and Outputs generally operate in silos. In a very impressive mid-term rationalization of the UNDAF in 2013, a general streamlining of structures and indicators took place that better matched agency commitments and capacities, and greatly improved efficiency and effectiveness. The new Real Time Monitoring system will help the UNCT to become more results focused.

Agency identities are often subsumed within the Clusters and Outcome Groups. However, efforts within them are sometimes quite unbalanced, due largely to the major differences in resources among agencies, and the fact that some areas are essentially single-agency efforts. Several positive steps have been taken to redress the imbalances among agencies (i.e., through the One UN Fund and Joint Programmes) but these are only partial solutions to systemic issues.

In four years the UN has moved from linking separate programmes in a common matrix to thinking together, planning together and monitoring and reporting together. And steps are being taken toward implementing together. The UNDAF is a very positive framework, but one that requires undue effort to implement. There is an urgent need for simplified processes for implementation. A major effort is needed to enable the UNCT to move to the next level: joint programming that allows a partner to deal with a single UN interface for funding or implementation.

#### Key Overarching Issues

**Advancing Human Rights and Gender Equality:** These two principles have been central to the logic of the UNDAF, and have been both mainstreamed and targeted in a number of areas. The original design of the UNDAF programmed each as if the UN and national partners had full capacity and a fully receptive national context. In practice, national circumstances proved complex, and capacities limited. The UN capacities have increased and now it needs to prioritize better to match still-limited national capacities. Comprehensive strategies are needed for both in the next UNDAF.

In future, the UN should not support any policy or implementation response without being vetted for gender and human rights as part of doing no harm.

**Adolescent girls:** The situation of the adolescent girl has been very rightly selected as a central focus for the UNDAF, as the betterment of her condition would dramatically improve the national situation in several key respects. The first UN joint programme (other than HIV/AIDS) was on adolescent girls**.** The current joint programme on education for girls aims to improve access, quality and relevance of education for girls, through a holistic and human rights-based approach in three districts. If successful, it should be scaled up.

**Environmental Sustainability:** The UNDAF sought to improve management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risks.  Policy and legislative initiatives have not been fully effective. A major programme was planned to promote affordable alternative energy sources for the poor, but lacked donor support.  Significant good work was done in forest protection, but with limited results. The UN needs to rethink its energy and forest conservation strategy.

#### The Sustainable Land Management (SLM) approach has demonstrated much potential. Coordination for the climate change sector has been strengthened and climate change continues to be mainstreamed into a number of policies. The DRM Policy and Implementation Plan has been approved, and average response time to a disaster has decreased. The connections between climate change, Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and resilience need to be strengthened.

#### A renewed emphasis on forestry and environment is likely to be successful, if the UN pursues a more modest, focused strategy around Climate Change, DRM and community based environmental regeneration linked to its resilience efforts.

**Resilience of communities and institutions:**Work toward resilience is at the heart of the current UNDAF. Building resilience effectively links and sequences interventions so the vulnerable can be lifted out of poverty and avoid falling back when shocks hit. The UN looks to help government create integrated social support systems with effectively targeted social protection schemes, coherence and synergies within existing investments and institutional arrangements to make them work.

A multi-agency Joint Programme is underway in Phalombe District. Separately, WFP is undertaking resilience work in several additional districts. The roll out of two separate approaches reflects differing perspectives and technical and operational strengths. Steps should be taken to integrate and harmonize work in this area, to improve UN coherence.

**Capacity Development:**UN capacity building support for economic governance, and for service provision institutions such as in health, education and agriculture, have had number of positive results. A central UN strategy has been to support the development of national level policies, strategies and legislation, and develop capacities in government for their implementation. A significant programme of capacity development measures support decentralization at the District level.

The absorptive capacity of the public sector has been a major constraint. Also a number of the UN’s areas of focus promote culture change in areas like gender, human rights and population where there are not yet strong institutions within government structures. The UN should provide operational support to government entities in such areas, while promoting institutional strengthening.

Heavy over-reliance on one-off “workshop” methodologies also greatly reduces the effectiveness of much capacity development work. Instead, the UN should invest on a sustained basis in institutional strengthening, using methods aimed at changing behaviours of entire teams.

#### One UN[[1]](#footnote-2) and the UNDAF

In four years the UN has moved from linking separate programmes in a common matrix to thinking, planning and monitoring and reporting together. And steps are being taken toward implementing together, though lack of progress globally on creating common implementation systems makes this very difficult. Extended discussions have been required to achieve a more coherent UNDAF and joint plans and programmes. The harmonization and simplification of business practices has had a secondary priority, and has moved very slowly.

The UNCT is now implementing the Standard Operating Procedures for One UN countries, concentrating on Joint Work Plans, Joint Programmes, and Real Time Monitoring. The UN in Malawi has been working towards developing fully joint annual work plans, replacing agency-specific plans.

Thus far the quality of the design, planning and indicators for joint programmes is good, but implementation still takes place in agency silos.

The stated aim for the longer term is joint programming for each UNDAF outcome, with the UN speaking and implementing with one voice. Should all proposals obtain funding there will be joint programmes in around half of the UNDAF Outcomes. To support this, dedicated windows in the One Fund have been proposed for key areas. However, it will not be easy to get agencies to mobilise funds together, or DPs to resource them.

A Real-Time Monitoring Framework is now operational. It is part of a broader effort to make essential management information available in real-time. Agencies are already becoming more result focussed and staff are now thinking about results in their day-to-day work.

The One UN Fund has is a highly useful tool through which the UNCT has been able to channel funds and address imbalances in funding among agencies. The UNCT should continue to promote this invaluable facility.

During 2014 accountability concerns led agencies participating in the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) to reexamine their assessments. Unfortunately, this led to differing conclusions and the harmonization achieved was lost. Urgent action is required to reestablish a common pattern.

#### Effectiveness of the UNDAF

The collective leadership of the UNDAF has been very active and all agencies contribute. While there are capacity issues, resource constraints, and control risk issues, overall, the One UN Team in Malawi is performing at a very high level of coherence and result orientation, and the UNDAF is consequently achieving considerable impact.

Four significant factors have constrained the performance of the UN: the failure of the global reform processes to produce promised, standardized operational methods, rules, processes and procedures; the tendency of DPs to continue funding specific agencies and activities, rather than the UNDAF; limited support to the UNCT from the UNDG Regional Directors Team (RDT); and the shift in the foundations of the development paradigm in Malawi since 2012.

The UNDAF invested heavily in supporting and promoting policies and legislation. Though progress has generally been slower than anticipated, the UN has largely met policy formulation goals. UN implementation support, especially in Food Security and Resilience, and Basic Social Services, has buttressed development of Government implementation capacities, especially at District level. And UN advocacy has promoted key campaigns.

Government was meant to implement the policies and legislation developed with UN support. However, budget constraints have slowed implementation. And UN efforts to build Government capacity have not been fully successful. The UN needs to reexamine and prioritize its policy efforts, and its approach to capacity building.

## Achievement of Outcomes and Indicators

#### Cluster 1: National policies, local and national institutions effectively support equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security by 2016.

The substantive areas of work of the Cluster are very broad, varied and diverse, and some of its subjects only loosely linked. It brings together issues of resilience and food security, and the related areas of disaster risk management, along with harnessing the private sector for rural employment. It also includes management of natural resources, the environment and climate change.

There has been excellent work in each area, but the span of these subjects made Cluster coherence difficult. The 2013 merger of Food Security and Resilience in one Outcome has been beneficial. There needs to be greater integration of cross cutting issues. In addition, the differing approaches taken by agencies on food issues further reduce coherence.

An overall strategy for the Cluster is needed. The Joint Programme on Resilience provides a strategy intended to become the core of a Cluster in the next UNDAF. The Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund has had an outstanding response from the private sector, and should be scaled up as a highest priority, in tandem with the identification of a suitable financing institution to continue investment.

The UNDAF was designed at the end of a series of good harvest years. Since then there have been poor harvests and humanitarian crises (floods and droughts). UN work has rightly shifted to a more humanitarian role, from building long-term resilience. The UN should integrate the humanitarian and development agendas, and the UNDAF should better link relief, recovery and resilience work, linking food security with early recovery and resilience building as well as social protection.

For the next UNDAF, a Cluster should provide for both humanitarian relief work now in Cluster 1 and direct support elements now in Cluster 2, while also building longer-term resilience, within a single framework. Climate change should also be in the new cluster, with environment separate.

#### Cluster 2: Basic Social and Protection Services: National institutions effectively deliver equitable and quality basic social and protection services by 2016.

The Cluster is based on a positive concept of grouping together nearly the entire range of social services and support systems (HIV/AIDS excepted). Very good synergies have been achieved in health. However, the other Outcomes reflect the service lines and approaches of the largest agency active in these areas. This is a great strength as it provides a highly capable foundation for implementation and strong results. Conversely, it has made for difficulty integrating other partners.

The scope of the Cluster is quite wide (Health, Education, WASH, Nutrition, Protection), and there is a need for a more compelling narrative, and one more specifically supportive of efforts to build resilience, food security and employment. There needs to be a greater link between nutrition and the humanitarian response. It is also a natural vehicle for promotion of population issues.

In health, the UN has supported a major increase in access to health care, and is now addressing the quality of care. Strong nutrition efforts have had very good results, but there remains a major national challenge. The UN will meet or exceed the majority of its WASH targets for the Districts in which it works. It has clearly had a strategy that has produced consistent results.

Net enrollment in primary school is on track for a significant increase by 2016, though it will fall short of the target. The Girls Education Joint Programme was developed for three districts in response to cultural factors discourage the participation of girls in school. This is a good practice that should be a model for other initiatives. Results were defined jointly first, and only then was agency programming done.

Very good progress was made on creating resources for prevention and referral, and structures for protection of women and children but it is now clear that by the end of 2016 these will not have reduced violence, abuse and neglect significantly. Earlier estimates of Gender Based Violence (GBV) greatly underestimated the problem. A new approach focusing on the architecture of response is now being piloted.

Crosscutting issues such as Gender Based Violence have been included across the Clusterbut there is still more work to be done. There should be an even greater focus than at present on the girl child with respect to education, and there should be more of a focus on youth.

#### Cluster 3: HIV and AIDS: National response to HIV and AIDS scaled up to achieve Universal Access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support by 2016

The work of the Cluster has been impressive, especially in innovations such as the B+ model of providing immediate anti-retroviral treatment to HIV positive pregnant women, and successes in treatment. More remains to be done in prevention and the enabling environment. And sustainability of financing of the national response remains a critical concern.

Having a separate Cluster for HIV/AIDs gives visibility and focus to work in the area, but has not helped in leveraging partners and resources. The approach should be reexamined.

The original design of Cluster 3 proved too complex, and in 2013 the overall structure of the Cluster was revised, greatly simplified programme management and encouraged joint programming. Prevention and treatment were merged into a single Outcome. The rationale is that globally, the latest evidence shows that treatment is prevention. Discrimination/Protection and Legal and Policy Environment were merged into a single Enabling Environment Outcome.

There has also been a focus on greater synergies across the Cluster, and on joint work. Lead agencies have been assigned to Annualised Key Results and there has been a prioritisation of activities. A Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS has been established.

Funding remains a serious issue, for both UN and government, especially for the Enabling Environment Outcome.

#### Cluster 4: Governance and Human Rights - National institutions effectively support transparency, accountability, participatory democracy and human rights by 2016

The Cluster focuses on institutional capacity development to advance transparency, accountability and democracy. Themes include Democratic Governance, Integrated Rural Development with a focus on people centred decentralisation, Development Effectiveness, Population Management and Family Planning.

The UN supports the Democratic Governance SWAP and coordination of democratic governance interventions in Malawi through the Sector Working Group (SWG). The UN supports national capacity and ownership of development assistance to ensure government capacity to negotiate, manage, monitor, report and account for aid.

Focussing specifically on adolescent girls, particularly in rural areas, the UN advocates for legislative change around gender equality, early marriage and gender based violence. The UN provides policy expertise and supports the Government to integrate population dynamics in development policies and programmes.

Governance, public sector capacity development, human rights, gender equality and population and development are all critical issues in Malawi, and are areas of strong comparative advantage for the UN, but some of the most important Outcome targets related to these crosscutting issues are not going to be met. For instance, progress toward gender goals has been greatly slowed by the tenacity of traditional cultural norms and limited national capacity.

Resource mobilization and delivery have been very disappointing: by end-2016 an overall average of only 45% of plan will have been spent in the Cluster. And the situation has been particularly acute for Gender (36% funded) and Population (25% funded).

Further, the withdrawal of budget support further limited counterpart support essential to the implementation of laws and policies developed with support of the Cluster.

The Cluster needs to be re-focused. Governance is an issue that affects all sectors and the UN needs to be clearer on how its work supports them. Should thoroughgoing public sector reform take place, the UN must use its comparative advantages in development strategy and public sector accountability to influence the process.

There should also now be less focus on developing and reviewing policies and strategies and a greater focus on their implementation. There should also be more of a focus on using data to guide national decision-making. The next UNDAF should do more to address the policies needed to support livelihoods for youth.

The next UNDAF should emphasize UNDAF-wide gender and human rights strategies, a new approach to capacity development, and an enhanced commitment to population issues.

#### Funding flows and gaps

The UNDAF was planned with most Clusters looking to spend between $100 million and $150 million. Cluster 2 – Social and Protection Services planned to spend above $250 million, as it includes a range of high cost direct implementation support activities. The pattern of actual funding was fundamentally different from the plan.

As humanitarian needs increased, and (coincidentally) DPs diverted funds from the government budget, funding ballooned for two agencies providing direct service support, while those working closely with government around capacity building and technical advisory services at national level saw funding and spending constrained. The different experiences of these two groups have put a strain on what is otherwise a highly functioning team. The first group needs to “get on with the job” urgently. The second, larger group needs to make elaborate plans with limited funds. A two-track approach is needed.

New approaches are also needed for the areas of work contained in the half of the Outcomes that did not succeed in securing increased funding, or did not spend the funding available.

#### UN Coherence, Development Partners and CSOs

In the view of DPs, the UN is doing very well given the current constraints within which it operates but it is not yet doing what it should to create lasting improvements in people’s lives. Issues of focus, implementation and alignment need to be addressed. The division of labour is still unclear, as is the balance between agency service lines and substantive Outcomes. The UN must demonstrate that agencies are serious about the UNDAF priorities, rather than agency resource mobilization.

The UN is playing the desired role on the humanitarian side, but not yet on resilience (though it is doing good work). A coordination role is seen for the UN in resilience and productive capacities, moving away from short-term responses. There is a need to shift from “handouts” to a national resilience strategy.

A more strategic approach to UN capacity building is also desired, around public sector reform and decentralization. The UN should also promote inclusive growth through the private sector. There is need to support government to elaborate a green vision for Malawi. On gender, DPs look to the UN to deal with issues of resettlement and land, and of traditional authorities and customary practices

CSOs broadly support the work of the UN, but desire greater consultation, across a wider range of agencies. A deeper partnership with INGOs and CSOs is critical. Their role in the UNDAF should not be limited to implementation for the UN. And even when acting as implementing agents, CSOs should be given capacity building support.

## Recommendations

The report contains many recommendations. The following are key to promoting greater coherence, efficiency, effectiveness and impact in the next UNDAF:

**National Planning**

The UN should advocate actively for a more focused national plan. It should not advocate for inclusion of all international goals and agency mandates.

**UN Planning**

Currently, much of the work of the UN addresses symptoms rather than the underlying causes of major issues. As a result, the UNCT largely acts as “a provider of last resort” for basic services. A deeper root cause analysis should yield a clear set of insights on what is needed to affect lasting change for the better in key areas. This should allow the UNCT to rebalance its interventions toward making a more lasting impact.

**UNDAF Planning**

There are many policies, plans, strategies and laws developed with UN help that have either not been approved or implemented. A review should lead to a holistic strategy and timeline for achieving approval, and additional commitment of resources for building capacity for implementation, and (where necessary) direct implementation support.

**UNDAF Structure**

UNDAF Outcomes should correspond to the working groups in the national coordination architecture whenever possible.

The UNCT should explore how the Clusters can build linkages and integrate efforts across groups, adding greater value without further time-consuming “coordination”. There are already too many UNDAF groups, and Clusters seem to be the least essential layer. It may be that a set of PMT task-teams around specific linkages would be more effective.

Within the UNDAF, humanitarian response and the direct implementation of services has become a huge undertaking. To avoid overshadowing the remainder of the UNDAF, this work should be managed within a new Cluster.

All UNDAF Outcomes (except humanitarian response and direct services) should be conceived as joint programmes, and agency Outputs developed to contribute to those joint programmes.

**UNDAF Funding**

In preparation for the next UNDAF the UNCT might create an informal tripartite group among UN, Government and DPs to jointly examine the issue of balance between funding root causes and service delivery. Such a group would seek to promote more balanced funding.

Funds should be mobilized jointly for each joint programme, and contributions should be pooled to allow more flexible allocation within the programme to essential but underfunded activities.

**Programming Principles**

Capacity Development

The preferred method of capacity building for functions or units has often been through short-term workshops for individuals (rather than intact teams). This is not a very effective method for adult learning. A new approach is needed, and requires careful thinking at the level of the UNCT, with external professional support.

The UN should create an internal Capacity Development Team that provides professional guidance and design support to capacity development initiatives of all agencies. The team should be headed by an experienced learning professional, and deploy expertise in mainstreaming capacity building, human rights and gender.

The current UNDAF is designed to match agency service lines with national problems. The new UNDAF should be designed around select root causes of key national problems, and UNDAF Clusters should be designed to address those root causes.

Gender

The next UNDAF should include a UNCT gender equality strategy. The UNCT should continue to take a multi-track approach to gender, through both mainstreaming and targeted approaches in the UNDAF.The next UNDAF should pursue a coherent and limited set of achievable gender goals both in a stand-alone Outcome and integrated in all other Outcomes.

Human Rights

The next UNDAF should be based on a thorough human rights and gender analysis, identifying root causes of challenges, barriers for rights holders to exercise rights, and patterns of discrimination and exclusion. There should be a thorough capacity gap analysis, drawing on the analysis and recommendations of the UN human rights mechanisms.

Human rights must be mainstreamed throughout the UNDAF. Recommendations of the UN Human rights mechanisms, where possible, should be systematically integrated, with suitably defined human rights indicators.

RBM - Data & Real-Time Monitoring

Over the next UNDAF period, donors are likely to reengage with government around development funding. The UN may have a role to play as a trusted “scorekeeper” of results. It should position itself to support national statistical series, and to conduct a comprehensive programme of surveys around key national targets.

The UN’s new Real Time Monitoring system will be an important element in this. The UN should look to build data series around the goals of the new national plan.

**Programme Management**

The Programme Management Team and the Operations Management Team should be jointly charged with creating a “toolkit” of operational solutions that have been developed locally or in other countries to enable multiple agencies to implement together.

Urgent action needs to be taken to re-establish HACT as a common platform.

**Partners**

Currently CSOs are often treated as contractors. They should be treated as development partners, and a stronger relationship built with them around themes. When implementing for the UN, they should be afforded capacity development support.

# Part 2: The Evaluation of the Malawi UNDAF 2012-2016

The Malawi UNFAF for 2012 to 2016 is a complex framework strategy covering the sectoral and multi-sectorial work of the UN in operational activities for development over a five-year period. It is the UN System’s response to the national development plan (the MDGS II).

The purpose of the UNDAF is to focus the work of the UN strategically to best support national efforts to achieve MDGs and other global goals, especially in regard to lagging national efforts related to poverty and gender; to enhance impact of UN results in addressing key national problems identified in the MDGS II; and to make optimal use of UN comparative advantage (local and global).

The UN’s strategy seeks to produce impact in four Priority Areas. Each one of these has been addressed through several Outcome Areas, each of which has been actively managed to achieve the Outcome result statement. All UN agency activities contribute directly to one or more Outcomes.

## 2.1 The UNDAF Evaluation

The UN Development Group (UNDG) requires all UNCTs to undertake an evaluation of their UNDAF once during the programming cycle, so that lessons learned may be applied to the design of the next UNDAF. UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidance sets out the required Terms of Reference, which have been adapted for the Malawi Evaluation, to ensure quality standards are maintained[[2]](#footnote-3). See Annex A, below.

The UNDAF evaluation ensured an inclusive approach, with stakeholder representatives in key decision-making processes. This is critical to ensure the Evaluation is nationally owned, encompasses topics of national interest and has wider national application.

This evaluation took place in March-May 2015,18 months before the end of the UNDAF in December 2016, so that lessons learned may be applied to the design of the next UNDAF for 2017-2021. As set out detail in the Terms of Reference, the purpose of this Evaluation is twofold:

***To support greater accountability of the UN to stakeholders*** *– by objectively verifying results achieved within the framework of the UNDAF and assessing the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions used, the evaluation will enable the various stakeholders in the UNDAF process, including national counterparts and donors, to hold the UNCT and other parties accountable for fulfilling their roles and commitments.*

***To support learning –*** *the evaluation must provide clear recommendations for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF programme cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the country level. The UN, the Government of Malawi and UNDAF stakeholders should be able to learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned which can then be shared with UNDOCO and used for the benefit of other countries.*

The evaluation has four key objectives:

*To* ***assess the contribution made by the UN*** *through the UNDAF to national development priorities and results, including international and regional commitments on human rights and gender equality, through making judgments using evaluation criteria based on evidence.*

*To* ***identify the factors that have affected the UN’s contribution****, identifying, understanding and explaining the enabling factors and bottlenecks that influenced the this contribution (learning).*

*To* ***reach conclusions concerning the UN’s contribution*** *across the scope being examined.*

*To* ***provide actionable recommendations for improving the UN’s contribution****, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation, including a review of the UNDAF management structure and processes to identify good practice going forward.*

## 2.2 Scope of the Evaluation

This Evaluation provides a comprehensive review of UNDAF design and implementation since 2012, changes that have been made to the UNDAF in response to factors affecting achievement of planned results, and likely performance against plan at end-2016

Fundamentally, the Evaluation examines whether the planned Outcomes were appropriate for the UN’s capacities; important nationally and globally; realistically framed and targeted and addressed with appropriate plans and resources; and whether the likely level of achievement in 2016 is commensurate.

It examines how and to what effect the UNDAF mainstreamed the five UN programming principles, especially the crosscutting themes of Gender and Human.

The evaluation also examines how and to what degree the UNCT has pursued and realized Delivery as One (DaO) goals, and identify good practices and areas where further improvements can be made; in joint programming, operations systems and communications.

The context in which the UNCT operates is often difficult and complex, and externalities often greatly impede (or sometimes enhance) its work. The evaluation looks at those that have had most impact on the UNDAF, among them: changing circumstances (political, climatic, etc.), funding flows, continued absence of harmonized global UN operations systems, and others.

RBM remains very much a work in progress in the UN System. The evaluation reviews the manner in which the UNCT has pursued its UNDAF Outcomes using RBM systems, and the performance of its M&E.

It draws conclusions and makes recommendations that will assist the UNCT in influencing the new national plan, and guide it the development of a new UNDAF for 2017-2021.

#### An Outcome Level Evaluation

The Evaluation is centered on the four UNDAF Priority Areas and their 14 Outcomes. The primary focus of the Evaluation is on the achievement of results across all 14 Outcomes, contributed to by 21 UN Agencies, following the Evaluation Criteria and Performance Factors set out in the TOR.

The evaluation takes key issues pertaining to specific Outputs into account in making broader judgments, but focuses on the targets of Outcomes, their achievement, and the many factors affecting their realization.

In addition, these priority areas are bound together by key overarching issues, which the UNCT describes as including a focus on adolescent girls as a means to accelerate development; building resilience among communities and institutions; advancing human rights and gender equality and advocating for changing attitudes and behaviours.

Five UN programming principles and a number of international treaties guide the work of the UN. The evaluation includes analysis of the mainstreaming of the five UN programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development). These are examined in the context of the Outcomes, and as cross-cutting issues and standards.

A focus on results backed by solid monitoring and programme oversight are key principles of UN programme implementation, and the UNCT has implemented its’ collective work within an RBM framework, with extensive monitoring, reporting and evaluation. The Evaluation examines the utility and effectiveness of these systems.

The Evaluation examines Delivering as One (DaO) as an overall strategy. As a DaO country, the UNCT in Malawi has undertaken to create greater impact, effectiveness and efficiency in its work through increased synergies in joint programme planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting, and in operations systems and communications. The evaluation examines the impact on the UNDAF of progress in each of these areas and draw conclusions and makes recommendations.

By design, an UNDAF is a partnership document, responsive to changing national circumstances. To the extent feasible, this evaluation examined the broader national and development context, implementation partnerships and results.

The UNDAF evaluation has taken place in tandem with an evaluation of gender across the UNDAF 2012-2016. This gender evaluation and its outputs form the basis of the conclusions and recommendations on gender in this evaluation.

## 2.3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

#### Overall Approach

The evaluation is a programmatic evaluation, assessing performance against the UNDAF 2012-2016 programme framework. The UN contributes to national development outcomes contained in the results framework. As such, the evaluation is country-led, with UN and national partners jointly assessing the quality and achievements of the UNDAF.

The evaluation assessed delivery of the UNDAF Outcomes and broader contributions to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II as well as advancement of gender and human rights. Given that the issues addressed by the UNDAF Outcomes involve a number of partners, establishing a causal linkage (attribution) between Outputs and impacts is difficult. It is especially difficult to draw conclusions regarding the role (if any) played by the UN in the achievement or non-achievement of the changes in national conditions selected as targets for Indicators of the Outcomes. The evaluation therefore considered the contribution of the UN to the UNDAF Outcomes in light of national strategies and circumstances, and draws conclusions to the extent possible.

The primary focus of the evaluation is at the Outcome level. As the assessment was undertaken more than eighteen (18) months before the end of the UNDAF, it required estimation (albeit highly informed) by OGs of the likelihood and degree of Outcome achievement. The evaluation addressed this challenge through examination of work plans and future resource estimates, and other objective sources, as well as interviews with key stakeholders on likely results by end-2016.

The overall approach was participatory and consultative, oriented towards learning how to jointly enhance development results at the national level. The Evaluation was gender and human rights responsive and conformed to UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, as well as ethical guidelines.

The Evaluation was undertaken in concert with all major stakeholders: member agencies of the United Nations System, the Government of Malawi, national and international civil society partners and development partners. Partners were consulted regarding the evaluation of each UNDAF Outcome in which they are involved, to the extent feasible. In this manner, broad ownership of the resulting findings and recommendations has been assured.

#### UNDAF Evaluation Criteria and Enabling Factors

As required in the Terms of Reference, the Evaluation has been carried out to assess the UNDAF against standard evaluation criteria for UNDAFs, namely:

* Relevance
* Effectiveness
* Efficiency
* Sustainability
* Impact

During assessment, using the above criteria, the following factors were examined to explain performance, among others:

* UN Coordination and Value Addition of Delivering as One (DaO)
* UN Programming Principles
* Partnerships
* Risk analysis
* Responsiveness
* Governance and Management Structures

These criteria and Enabling Factors are described in detail in the Terms of Reference.

#### Evaluation steps

The following steps took place from March through June 2015:

1. A Preparatory Phase for review of existing documentation; scoping and scheduling of tasks; planning and scheduling of in-country consultations with UN, national and other partners; and preparation and agreement on evaluation plans, instruments and methods.
2. An Evaluation Phase in Malawi in April 2015, for finalization of the evaluation plan and Inception Report, iterative consultations with all key stakeholders around the UNDAF Outcomes and other issues relevant to UNDAF performance, data gathering, cleaning and analysis, assessment of the contribution of the UNDAF to national results, and presentation of initial conclusions regarding the UN contribution to the PMT and UNCT.
3. A Drafting Phase in May 2015 for collection of final inputs and clarifications; drafting of the Evaluation Document; circulation of the draft to stakeholders, and incorporation of their comments (to the extent compatible with the independent nature of the Evaluation), and final revision of text.

#### Review of Documentation

The Evaluation was provided some eight hundred (800) documents, including the assessments, plans, studies and reports covering all of the substantive and contextual areas of relevance to the UNDAF, and extending from the period covered by the previous UNDAF through to the present. Sources include the Government of Malawi, its Ministries and Departments; the UN, the UNCT, UNDAF OGs and individual Agencies; Development Partners and International NGOs and academic institutions.

Some four hundred (400) of the documents are directly related to the UNDAF; its design and overall management, each of its Clusters; and each Outcome and sub-Outcome. These documents have been reviewed for background orientation, and as a basis for validation of interviews and analysis. A list of documents consulted is set out in Annex F.

#### Data gathering and analysis

Through interviews, data gathering and analysis a data set was developed for each Priority Area and Outcome for:

1. Estimated change by end-2016 in the relevant national reality over the UNDAF period
2. Achievement of the UN against planned Outcome goals by end-2016
3. Financial commitments at end-2016, and their breakdown by source, against projected needs
4. Narrative explanations of the process of implementation for each

Data and narrative explanations have also been developed on all of the cross-cutting issues, and other factors described in the TOR, including DaO issues.

Each Outcome and issue was analysed taking into account both the UN commitments and actualities, and the internal and external factors that may have inhibited (or accelerated) achievement.

The analysis of this data produced an assessment of overall UNDAF achievement. Individual Clusters and Outcomes and were assessed in relation to the overall levels of achievement, as well as based on factors specific to the individual component.

During the process of data gathering, review and analysis, key issues and opportunities were identified and discussed with the Evaluation Management Structure, and findings and recommendations included in the Evaluation Report. A number of periodic and ad hoc discussions with the principals took place throughout the process to validate findings.

Two tools were developed for the Evaluation, based on the guidance of the ToR and the availability of data on UNDAF performance:

1. An Evaluation Objectives Matrix. An expanded version of the questionnaire tool elaborated by the UNCT and PMT in the TOR was used to capture crosscutting issues. It was used to frame all interviews and consultations. See Annex C.
2. UNDAF Outcome and Output Performance Against Targets. The UNDAF Action Plan presents a detailed matrix of planned activities, anticipated financial flows and Outcome and Output baselines and targets. The tool sought data on the likely status of each as at end-2016, as a basis of comparison between plan and achievement.

In addition, the results from these tools were compared with the data available through other sources, including reviews and reports and feedback from external partners.

#### Persons consulted for the evaluation

The UNDAF evaluation has taken an inclusive approach, with stakeholder representatives in key decision-making processes, and consultations with a wide range of UN officials and partners from Government, Development Partners and Civil Society.

One hundred and thirty -one (131) people were consulted in the course of the evaluation, individually, in teams and in groups. A list of all those interviewed is set out in Annex D.

The leadership and staff of the UN have been primary informants. The evaluation interviewed eighty-three (83) UN staff, from fourteen (14) agencies, as individuals or in small groups. Those interviewed are primarily senior programme and operations managers, but discussions at meetings also included staff from NO-A to G-4 levels.

Thirteen (13) national partners were interviewed from ten (10) government Ministries and Departments.

Two workshops were conducted to gather views on the UNDAF from CSOs. Twenty-seven (27) people participated from twenty-one (21) CSOs.

Two meetings were held with development partners, to brief and consult them, and to present preliminary findings. Eight (8) officials participated, representing six (6) development partners

#### Performance criteria

Given the complexity and varying levels of difficulty of the UN’s interventions under the UNDAF, as well as the problems of attribution and changing national circumstances, it is not possible or appropriate to appraise the UNDF using any but the simplest criteria. In particular, it has not been possible to make an evidence-based assessment of the contribution of the UNDAF to the national MDGS II across most Outcomes. The evaluation therefore relies on the Outcome goals and indicators, supported by documentation and interviews.

The Evaluation describes performance in each area discussed in a balanced manner. It identifies good practices and challenges. It examines funding flows. Finally, it uses the likely levels of achievement against UNDAF indicator targets by end-2016 to appraise performance of each Outcome as falling in one of three categories:

1. Green: Full achievement of the Outcome goal (some areas fall in this category)
2. Yellow: Substantial achievement (most areas justify this rating)
3. Red: Limited achievement (some areas)

As many of the indicators reflect national conditions, the evaluation then makes a qualitative assessment of the UN’s contribution to the changes reflected by the indicators.

#### Evaluation Management Structure

This UNDAF evaluation is jointly commissioned and led by the UNCT and the Government within a dual-tiered evaluation management structure.

An UNDAF Technical Committee (an expanded UN Programme Management Team) including a representative from the Government provided direct supervision. This group was responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation. Mr. Yona Kamphale, Principal Secretary for Economic Planning and Development (Acting) represented the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development.

The decision-making organ for the evaluation was the UNDAF Steering Committee, comprising the UNCT and representatives of the Office of the President and Cabinet. The latter was represented by Mr. Randson Mwadiwa, Principal Secretary of the Performance Enforcement Department, and Mr. Wezi Kayira, Principal Secretary for Good Governance.

Mr. Sipho Billiat, Principal Economist, Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Developmentprovided liaison support to the evaluation mission on behalf of the government.

On behalf of the Expanded PMT and the RC, the RCO monitored and supported the process of the evaluation.

The evaluation reviewed each element of the UNDAF in close collaboration with the Chairs and members of the Clusters, Outcome Groups and other committees established by the UNCT.

At the end of the fieldwork in Malawi in April, 2015 an initial summary overview of findings and recommendations was prepared for the UNCT and partners. It presented provisional overview observations, many of which have been modified or refined in this full evaluation.

# Part 3. National Development Issues and Priorities

## 3.1 The Malawi Context

Malawi has had a fairly steady development trajectory since independence in 1964. During this time it has received considerable external support for development, including from the UN.

Nevertheless, it continues to suffer from persistent poverty and weak governance. Chronic vulnerability and food insecurity is also a persistent feature in Malawi, and in recent years floods and droughts have further increased vulnerability. These make it difficult to address a complex of chronic, fundamental problems. From a UN perspective, these include:

1. A largely rural population, the majority living in poverty as small-holders, with poor nutrition
2. Traditional gender roles and norms, inequalities and a population growth rate of 2.8% per year
3. Consequent shrinking size of small-holdings, and a lack of non-agricultural livelihoods
4. Absence of non-wood energy sources, resulting in a 2.5% annual loss of national forest cover, which is symptomatic of a broader environmental challenge

Consistent national efforts to address poverty and other key issues have received strong support from external Development Partners (DPs). However strong population growth puts increasing pressure on agricultural land and forest cover, and development efforts are not keeping pace.

The status quo is not sustainable. Development efforts are aimed at creating a path toward sustainable development and growth in the longer term, while improving national capacities and conditions of life for the Malawian people in the shorter term. National systems (notably for health, education, agriculture) are stronger and more universal than in other countries at similar levels of development, but domestic financing alone is unable to sustain these services.

#### The Millennium Development Goals

Of the eight MDGs, national targets are likely to be met in four.[[3]](#footnote-4) Progress has been good on Reducing Child Mortality; Combating HIV and AIDS, Malaria and other diseases; Ensuring Environmental Sustainability and Developing Global Partnership for Development.

The goal on Reducing Child Mortality will be achieved by 2015. Significant progress has been made in the provision of child health services. Under-five mortality has been declining steadily from 234 deaths per 1,000 live births in 1990 to 112 per 1,000 live births in 2010. If this trend continues, it is expected that by 2015, there will be 61 deaths of under-five children out of 1000 live births.

Combating HIV and AIDS, Malaria and other diseases is another set of targets the country is likely going to achieve. Estimates of HIV prevalence rate among pregnant women aged 15 to 24 years has declined to 8.2 percent in 2010 from 12 percent in 2006. There has also been a decline in deaths related to Malaria and TB.

Malawi is making efforts toward environmental sustainability. Out of the six indicators for this goal, the country is committed to meet half of them. The number of households with sustainable access to improved water sources has increased from 79 percent in 2011 to 83 percent in 2012. With poverty levels still high, the fight against deforestation remains difficult. The land area covered by forest is not improving and remains at 36.2 percent.

Malawi is likely to attain the goal of Developing Global Partnership for Development. There has been an increase in the subscribers of mobile phones from 22.5 percent in 2010 to about 41.2 percent in 2012.

The four remaining goals to be attained are: Eradicating Extreme Poverty and Hunger; Achieve Universal Primary Education; Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women; and Improve Maternal Health. Though it seems unlikely that targets for these will be met, there has been significant progress in all four areas.

The country’s poverty level is very high at 50.7 percent (HIS 3 2012). Income inequality as measured by the share of poorest quintile in national consumption worsened from 10.1 percent in 2005 to 5.5 percent in 2012. The ultra poor population has also worsened from about 22 percent in 2005 to about 25 percent in 2012.

The country is also unlikely to attain its target on Net Enrolment Rate (NER) in primary education. As of 2012 NER was estimated to be 85 percent. Though projections indicate that by 2015 it will be 90.7 percent, this is below the target of 100 percent. Similarly, there was a reversal with respect to the proportion of pupils who start grade 1 reaching grade 5 from about 86 percent in 2005 to 77 in 2012.

Gender inequality is a major challenge for Malawi. Girls’ education and early marriage, and gender based violence (GBV) are particular issues. The ratio of girls to boys in primary school increased from 0.91 in 2000 to 1.01 in 2013 indicating that gender disparities in primary school enrolment has been eliminated. However, the ratio of girls to boys in secondary school is estimated at 0.84 (2011).

Malawi has one of the highest maternal mortality rates in the world, in spite of a general reduction in maternal deaths over the past few years. Maternal mortality, according to MDHS 2010 was 675 deaths per 100,000 live births. It is projected that by 2015 Maternal Mortality will be reduced to 551 deaths against an MDG target of 155. The rate of skilled birth attendance (SBA) has increased to 87%.

## 3.2 MDGS II and National Development Priorities

#### The National Strategy

The national strategy, the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (MGDS II) aims to accelerate the pace of economic growth and reduce poverty. MDGS II addresses the full range of national priorities. This is also its great weakness: it does not concentrate efforts through an articulated strategic focus (defined here as achievable goals in a very few areas, that if achieved would change society sustainably for the better).

Malawi’s Development Cooperation Strategy (DCS) is the main instrument to move forward on the implementation of the Busan agenda[[4]](#footnote-5) at country level. As a country-led and country-owned strategic document it champions the principles of ownership, focus on results, inclusive development partnerships, and transparency and accountability. It provides a solid country-level framework to guide development cooperation in line with country’s development goals and internationally agreed principles. The strategy proposes establishing a dialogue structure with a Development Cooperation Group and a High Level Forum at the center of the development effectiveness and policy discussions.

The new strategy has been more inclusive and engages CSOs and the private sector. It has been country-led, focuses on results and promotes both domestic and mutual accountability.

#### Challenges to Development Coherence

In late 2013 a major fraud against the government was uncovered, nicknamed “cashgate.” In November 2013 donors participating in the Common Approach to Budget Support[[5]](#footnote-6) suspended pooled funding through the national budget. They and the Government agreed to strengthen the public financial management system with clear targets. So far, only the African Development Bank has resumed budget support.

The most common modalities, which have been adopted by the DPs since 2013 are disbursement through NGOs and UN agencies, and disbursement to local governments. Norway made a commitment to support the education sector through the One UN Fund, and drug procurement through UNICEF. For both, the budget was from their funding previously earmarked for direct budget support. Similarly, Germany is financing the health sector, particularly EPI, through UNICEF.

Another modality is the direct funding to local councils without channeling through the central ministries, which is adopted by the Flemish and Norwegian governments.

The net effect of these arrangements is a multiplication of implementing agents and a loss of funding to support government capacity.

#### The UN and the Collective Development Effort

Great improvements have been achieved in the coherence of development in Malawi in recent years, reflected in the DCS and some of the Sector Working Groups (SWGs). However, three issues weaken the collective development effort:

1. Limited national strategic focus, without which effective, data based national decisions cannot be taken, and true development partner (DP) and UN coherence cannot be built and maintained. The current national strategy, the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (MDGS II), is comprehensive but does not focus on a strategic and limited set of priorities. As a result, development assistance is characterized by a good deal of bilateralism, focusing on activities rather than impacts.
2. Issues of accountability, leading to the withdrawal of bilateral donor funds from SWAPs in late 2013. This withdrawal has seriously weakened government capacities, and destabilized DP and UN efforts toward coherence.
3. A shift of donor and UN funding for implementation to NGOs. The shift of donor resources to the UN and NGOs has limited financing available to government for implementation of development measures. In order to implement its own programmes timely, the UN is hard pressed to use government capacities, and is itself increasingly using NGOs. This exacerbates capacity weaknesses in government, fragments development efforts and builds fragility.

A strategic response to these issues is at the top of the agenda for the UN: for a tactical response to current funding realities; as a strategic issue of the role of external partners in building capacity; and as a central problem for the next UNDAF.

UN is working at policy level, and at implementation level in specific areas. Donors were providing resources (through SWAPs) to Government for the translation of policies into institutional actions and structures, but their withdrawal of funds has destabilized this model. Policies are not being implemented timely, and Government is not able to act as planned in support of common goals.

The experience of the current UNDAF makes clear that the next UNDAF must be more narrowly focused in fewer areas of critical relevance. This requires a strong government lead on choice of priorities. Consequently, it is essential that the UN work with its partners in an organized manner to advocate for and promote a more focused successor national strategy.

# Part 4: UNDAF Contribution to National Development Priorities and Results

## 4.1: UN Coherence and Programming Principles

In response to national priorities, and the national gaps in achievement of the MDGs (especially lagging indicators) the UN in Malawi supports the Government in four inter-linked and mutually reinforcing priority areas, focusing UN capacities around aspects of a number of highest priority issues. These issues correspond well to the areas of greatest national importance the UN could have addressed:

* Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security
* Basic Social and Protection Services
* HIV and AIDS
* Governance and Human Rights

The UN and its agencies have differing capacities and possibilities to affect national conditions in these areas, and the UNCT has attempted to frame its interventions realistically to achieve a significant set of changes in each subject matter area, whether nationally or in a discreet set of Districts. The overall results of these efforts have been good to excellent. This review of the UNDAF has confirmed that the choices of focus of the UNCT have been highly appropriate.

#### UN Coherence

The UNDAF is a very good compilation of agency mandates and capacities, organized and deployed around national and international priorities. In the area of HIV/AIDs, where UNAIDS has long promoted a coherent approach, it a UN Joint Programme of Support on AIDS was created as one of the oldest mechanisms for the UN agencies Delivering as One (DaO), with planning guided by a mutually agreed division of labor. But more broadly the UNCT is only now learning to plan together from key issue to a collective UN response (i.e., the Joint Programme on Resilience), rather than from the agency priority to the collaborative programme. Most planning is still done as an amalgam of preexisting agency perspectives, often driven by agency mandates and structures.

The UNDAF is coherent within most Outcomes, and is usually coherent at the level of the four Clusters, but there is limited linkage among the Clusters, and the Outcomes and Outputs generally operate in silos. In the rationalization of the UNDAF in 2013, a general streamlining of structures and indicators took place that better matched agency commitments and capacities, and greatly improved efficiency and effectiveness.

The 2013 Review also resulted in recognition that as a practical matter the UNCT did not have the capacity to address all issues with the same level of focus. Group-specific issues (gender, youth, refugees) were subsumed within the broader “vulnerable groups.” This shift was necessary but has left unmet capacity development needs for future attention, several of which are recommended for future consideration in this report.

In the 2013 rationalization many agencies also dropped participation in Outcomes outside their primary areas of work. This has improved overall effectiveness but unfortunately also reinforced agency silos. Explicit linkages must be created in a number of cross cutting areas of work.

Coherence depends on active leadership. In the 2013 revision of the UNDAF criteria were developed for good Cluster and Outcome leads. Most have been very active and effective. Now that these roles have become established they should be rotated, to expand the pool of managers with experience in “thinking as one”.

Monitoring and reporting issues have been identified and are being addressed. Most agencies are still “double reporting” to agency and UNDAF, which is very burdensome. The new Real Time Monitoring system will help the UNCT to become more results focused, which may in time provide a push toward single reports, though the requirements of agency headquarters continue to undermine efforts toward this.

Cluster and Outcome leads report that the UNDAF is a very positive framework, but one that requires undue effort to implement. There is an urgent need for simplified processes for implementation. It now takes many months of discussion to agree on how to manage a joint programme. A joint PMT/OMT programme and operations task force could agree on “pre-approved” implementation models that could be used in future joint programmes. A promising case is the HIV and AIDS Joint Programme that has a dedicated secretariat (UNAIDS) and clear division of labor with clear roles for each participating UN organization.

There exists strong commitment and understanding of the concept and goals of the UNDAF down to the level of support staff. To help them align their efforts, agency performance appraisals should state annual results defined in terms of UNDAF deliverables.

In terms of coordinating within the national Development Cooperation Strategy, the challenge will be to leverage agencies to link with the overall clusters. This needs to be a truly joined effort, cutting across the UN system. From there, monitoring TWGs will be possible, with lessons learned on key cross cutting issues.

#### Key Overarching Issues

“Within its priority areas the UNCT has identified key overarching priority issues to accelerate development in Malawi: focus on the girl child - in terms of education, health and protection - and advocating for changing attitudes and behaviours against harmful traditional practices; building resilience among communities and institutions. A strong results based approach is a key strategy for programme implementation, backed by solid monitoring and programme oversight.” *UNCT Annual Review and Planning Meeting, 15 March 2015*

The priority areas of the UNDAF are bound together by key cross cutting issues, including the five UN programming principles: advancing human rights and gender equality, as well as environmental sustainability and capacity development, within a results-based framework. Each of these principles is a major factor within the UNDAF design and its implementation has been strongly guided by them.

#### Advancing Human Rights and Gender Equality

These two principles have been central to the logic of the UNDAF, and have been both mainstreamed and targeted in a number of areas. The original design of the UNDAF programmed each as if the UN and national partners had full capacity to undertake what were designed as technical initiatives within a receptive national context. In practice, national circumstances proved far more complex than expected, and national capacities limited and overstretched.

At the beginning of the UNDAF, the UN also lacked its current capacity for rights based programming, though significant capacity had been developed. A Human Rights Working Group (UNHRWG) and a Gender Working Group had conducted training and led UN thinking in the drafting of the UNDAF, and periodic reporting. The UNHRWG was instrumental creating the human rights advisor position stationed in RCO.

In practice, both the national Human Rights Commission and the Ministry of Gender proved to have limited absorptive capacities, and under the UNDAF six to nine agencies have conducted numerous activities with each. This unsustainable level of complexity and demands from the UN side has recently been ameliorated through more coherent programming, but the UN needs to prioritize better to match national capacities.

Especially in its gender work, the international principles and standards promoted by the UN have not always been readily accepted in the traditional national culture. The strategy and capacities of the UN proved inadequate to achieve its stated goals in several areas, notably gender based violence and electoral parity. And unfortunately, the 2014 elections saw a significant reduction in the numbers of women elected. These issues significantly affect the UN’s ability to achieve its planned results in both human rights and gender.

The opening of an office of the newly created UN Women in 2012 has given a major positive boost to UN capacity and coordination, and ongoing work on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, as well as gender mainstreaming. The more recent posting to the RCO of an OHCHR human rights advisor has had a similar positive effect. But the UNCT needs to be clear that UN Women and OHCHR have a dual programmatic and advisory role, and cannot take the lead on all relevant issues.

Originally, the UNDAF provided for both crosscutting Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and individual Outcome Groups (OGs) for issues of Human Rights, Capacity Development and Gender. This had proven cumbersome and the TWGs were merged with the corresponding UNDAF Outcome Groups to ensure greater coordination at the programme level (externally), rather than just focussing on internal coordination.

The merger streamlined coordination and increased the focus on these issues in programmes. Mainstreaming of crosscutting issues remains a key focus of these individual Outcome groups. However, progress in advancing these groups has been slow.

The UNDAF 2014 Annual Review meeting concluded that all of the Outcomes have now better integrated human rights and gender issues into their activities. However the UN can do still more to integrate a human rights-based approach into its approach.

In future, the UN should not support any policy or implementation response without being vetted for gender and human rights as part of doing no harm. For example, some viewed the Disaster Risk Management Policy as being gender and human rights blind. Further, the UN should not look at civil society merely as implementing partners in its approach, but as duty bearers and rights holders. Capacity development should be aimed at the rights holder, rather than just focusing on the duty bearer. It should focus on ensuring civil society space, including through a legal and policy environment that complies with international human rights standards.

#### Human Rights

Malawi’s national Constitution and Bill of Rights, which are broadly based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, provide a strong basis for the promotion and protection of Human Rights in the country. However despite progress, Malawi is characterized by weak capacity of Human Rights institutions and actors, a failure to implement existing legislation, delays in reviewing and bringing legislation in line with international standards and a lack of compliance with UN Human Rights reporting obligations.

The 2012-2013 UN Transformation Plan charged the Human Rights Thematic Working Group with responsibility for four key areas of intervention: (i) Strengthening National Capacities in Human Rights; (ii) Advocacy and Partnership; (iii) Reporting; and (iv) Internal UN Capacity. The HR TWG was to develop a Joint Programme on the Human Rights Based Approach to programming in order to build the capacities of government and civil society. Recognizing the importance of Partnership in promoting and protecting human rights, it was envisaged that a forum comprising government, donors and civil society would be established.

However, concluding that the UNCT was overstretched, the 2013 review of the UNDAF merged the TWGs with the substantive Outcomes. Human Rights interventions were dispersed among a number of these. Nevertheless, the UN Human Rights Working Group has continued to meet, led by OHCHR since August 2014.

A visit in 2013 of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food coordinated by the UN HRWG served as a catalyst for a Joint Programme on the Right to Food, which is now being implemented. This Joint Programme supports two projects to enable Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to: advance a right to food legal framework in Malawi, carry out related policy research, monitoring, and advocacy on the right to food; and to increase awareness around related access to land issues, in particular women’s access to land.

The right to food offers human rights based entry points for the UN into the highly complex and delicate but critically important land rights and security of tenure issues, including the need to adopt proposed Land Bills. The UN has mobilized additional funds to work on these issues.

In December 2014 the UN strengthened its engagement and substantive human rights support to the Malawi Human Rights Commission through a Joint Annual Work Plan between six UN entities and the MHRC.

The presence of the Human Rights Advisor broadens the ongoing work of the UN in human rights in Malawi. The first Universal Periodic review (UPR) report on human rights was submitted in 2010, the first time Malawi was reviewed. The UN worked with government to follow up on the recommendations although not all were accepted. The Malawi Government had been reporting consistently on the CEDAW and CRC with the support of the UN. Now, there is also now follow up with government on the timely submission of state party reports to the Treaty Bodies as well as on implementation of the recommendations of the UN Human Rights Mechanisms (UPR, Treaty Bodies and Special Procedures) on more treaties.

Technical assistance has been provided to the Ministry of Justice and Malawi Human Rights Commission to ensure that Malawi’s future National Human Rights Action Plan integrates the recommendations of these Mechanisms. The UNCT has also strengthened its engagement and advocacy with the UN Human Rights Machinery, by making submissions to the UN Human Rights Committee, CEDAW[[6]](#footnote-7) Committee, and UPR 2014-15.

In 2014 the UN Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) together with the Gender Technical Working Group conducted a joint review of the integration of cross cutting issues in all Mid-Year Review reports, identifying areas of the UNDAF needing further work.Main findings included anoverall lack of disaggregation of data, the need for strategies to be put in place to address rights and needs of excluded and marginalised groups and redress patterns of discrimination. The review found that there is a need for greater linkages to Malawi’s human rights obligations, contributing to accountability and the rule of law (holding duty bearers accountable to meet their specific human rights obligations, with rights holders able claim their rights). It recommended that the UN should focus more on strategies to empower excluded groups and towards a stronger focus on advocacy, than on service provision.

In 2014, checklists were also reviewed and shared to all Outcome leads to enable them to integrate human rights into their respective work areas, and HRBA[[7]](#footnote-8) training was earlier provided to UN staff in 2012 and 2013. The HRWG has struggled to ensure mainstreaming across all 14 outcome groups given the limited UN human rights expertise available in country. Human rights mainstreaming requires a strategy within the UNDAF, with consistent leadership and commitment from all members of the UNCT.

#### Gender Equality

The decision by the UN Malawi to pursue the twin-track strategy of gender mainstreaming and targeted interventions to advance gender equality was very effective in achieving results across outcomes. Targeted initiatives focusing specifically on women or the promotion of gender equality have been important in reducing existing disparities, while gender mainstreaming across outcomes supported potential assessment of the implications for women and men of all planned actions, policies or programmes.

The UN in Malawi pursued gender mainstreaming in all Outcomes, as a strategy to ensure that women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences are an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the UNDAF and that gender disparities and discrimination are not continued or made worse in terms of opportunities, capabilities, empowerment and security.

From the formulation of the UNDAF, the UN Gender Technical Working Group (UNGTWG) provided leadership in gender equality, with UNFPA as chair. In the formulation of the UNDAF, the UNCT created performance indicators for gender equality, using an existing a "Gender Scorecard” which was updated annually by the UN-GTWG.

There is strong leadership at the UNCT level for delivering as one for gender equality. Good practices in gender can be found in girls education, private sector investment in women’s productive groups, and gender in agriculture. Despite these and other good efforts, there are still gaps to be addressed in a number of Outcomes.

Also, broadly speaking, excellent policies have been developed, but they lack resources for implementation. There has been mixed progress on the four gender related MDGs. The UN was late to address issues of gender in the 2014 elections – these issues are now understood to require patient, long-term efforts. Linking gender responsive planning with budgeting has progressed, but not as planned.

UN Women opened a country office in Malawi in late 2012, and its additional capacity greatly supports the general consistency of the UN’s actions furthering this commitment. But not all other agencies are truly active in gender. The GTWG does not function to full potential and participation remains low. There is a seeming need for UN Women to build better linkages with other agencies, and for other agencies to provide increased technical support and commitment. Without these, there cannot be consistent and effective mainstreaming. Coordination for gender programming issues in the UNDAF outcomes is still a huge task.

Data on anticipated expenditure on gender equality by outcome is not readily available. There are indications that only a small amount of total resources for the UNDAF was allocated for gender equality.

In order to promote gender equality women’s and girls’ empowerment (GEWGE) the UNCT also pursued a specific Outcome (4.3): “National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016,”delivered through the Ministry of Gender Children Disability and Social Welfare (MoGCDSW). The outcome aims to strengthen the national gender machinery to create fundamental structural changes in institutions, policies, legislation and allocation of resources especially in areas where blatant gender discrimination prevails. These include governance structures, enactment and implementation of laws and policies, violence against women and women’s participation and representation in politics and all levels.

This year, in a very positive step, agencies working with the MoGCDSW prepared their first Joint Annual Work Plan (JAWP). Previously, delivery was agency-driven. However, the JAWP revealed that the UN had not adequately taken into account the limited absorptive capacity of the Ministry of Gender. A huge burden was being placed on the MoGCDSW, with nine agencies rolling out 7 outputs and 150 activities to be completed this year, further weakening the Ministry’s capacity.

#### Adolescent girls

The situation of the adolescent girl has been very rightly selected as a central focus for the UNDAF, as the betterment of her condition would dramatically improve the national situation in several key respects. Keeping girls in school is effective in both delaying early marriage and in giving girls possibilities for livelihoods other than subsistence farming, reducing rural poverty. This should also lead to smaller families and therefore reduce the growing pressure on arable land.

Improved reproductive health and AIDs awareness, access to health services, better nutrition, private sector investment in support of women farmers, protection against pervasive violence and opportunities for empowerment are just some of the suite of initiatives supported by the UN.

The first UN joint programme (other than HIV/AIDS) was on adolescent girls. It was initially funded by the UN foundation with UNICEF, UNFPA and WHO as participating agencies. A donor partner funded the UN Joint Programme on Adolescent Girls (JPAG) from 2011. The JPAG funding comes to an end in 2015. However, lessons learnt from this joint programme are feeding into a UN Joint programme on Improving Access and Quality of Girls Education (JPGE).

The Joint Programme on Improving Access and Quality of Education for Girls in Malawi, undertaken by UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA, is an important step. The overarching aim is to improve access, quality and relevance of education for girls, through a holistic and human rights-based approach. Simultaneously, the programme addresses key known threats such as poor food and nutrition, inadequate protection, poor quality schooling, and violations of girls’ sexual and reproductive rights. The programme harnesses a “whole school approach”, focusing specifically on girls from standard 5 to 8. Seventy-nine (79) primary schools are targeted across the districts of Salima, Mangochi and Dedza. Depending on the level of success, a more comprehensive, scaled-up programme on girls and youth should be considered for the next UNDAF.

#### Environmental Sustainability

The UNDAF sought to improve management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risks at national and district levels.  National level policy and legislative initiatives have not been fully effective, in the absence of appropriate implementation and enforcement. A major programme was planned to promote affordable alternative energy sources for the poor, but the UN withdrew from this as it lacked donor support.  Significant good work was done in forest protection, but results have been poor as necessary government commitment was lacking. The UN now needs to rethink its national energy and forest conservation strategy.

#### The Sustainable Land Management (SLM) approach has demonstrated that when rural communities realize the tangible benefits of conserving the environment, they can become active agents of afforestation and forest regeneration. Communities can therefore hold the solution, rather than be regarded as the problem. There is much potential for this approach to be scaled up across Malawi.

#### These are critical issues, but environmental sustainability cannot be achieved in Malawi without also robustly addressing its relentless population growth, a root cause of its poverty and of its serious and growing environmental degradation.  Ever-increasing numbers of rural poor people who lack affordable modern energy cause an unsustainable annual loss of forest cover.

#### There is no crosscutting work on environmental sustainability within the UNDAF beyond the work across Outcome 1.2 devoted to Environment, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management.  There is some linkage with Outcome 1.1 on Resilience, but this needs to be strengthened.

#### The UNDAF now addresses environmental unsustainability through a number of discreet initiatives, mostly projects of one agency.  The UNDAF has worked in Environment and Natural Resources (ENR) policy at national and district levels.  There have been good results on these, but national follow through implementation has been lacking. Emphasis now needs to be placed on ensuring policies are implemented, and systems are in place to adequately support the implementation of such policies, so results can be achieved on the ground.

Achievements have been made in strengthening coordination for the climate change sector, through national steering and technical committees, development partner coordination groups and joint government and development partner working groups. Furthermore, climate change continues to be mainstreamed into a number of policies at the national level. Achievements have also been made in mainstreaming climate change into the education sector. However, improvements need to be made in strengthening the connections between climate change, Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and resilience, to avoid duplication of efforts and improve synergies.

#### The DRM Policy and Implementation Plan was recently approved, and average response time to a disaster has decreased. Work must continue to ensure the policy integrates gender and vulnerable groups appropriately, and builds on ongoing work to ensure a strengthened coordinated system on disaster risk management is achieved, which adequately links local and national efforts.

#### The cycles of flood and drought that have plagued Malawi these past few years have shown the value of that work, and of the importance of reforestation of watersheds.  A renewed emphasis on forestry and environment is likely to be successful, if the UN learns from the hard lessons of this UNDAF and pursues a more modest, focused strategy around Climate Change, DRM and community based environmental regeneration linked to its resilience efforts.

#### Resilience of communities and institutions

Work toward resilience is at the heart of the current UNDAF. Building resilience looks at vulnerability in a holistic way, effectively linking and sequencing ongoing interventions so the vulnerable can be lifted out of poverty and avoid falling back when shocks hit.

Malawi provides access to basic social services, and significant resources are channeled to the vulnerable each year through programmes like the Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP), Social Cash Transfer, Public Works, School Meals, Village Savings and Loans and the Humanitarian Response. However, the lives of the vulnerable were not improving as a result. Additionally, economic and climatic shocks over the past few years have made deprivation acute for many.

The Sector Wide Approaches (SWAp) have been an important step toward greater coherence, and a more impactful approach. Unfortunately, basket funding has diminished. The UN has participated in service level agreements provided through the Health SWAp. For instance, UNFPA has been contributing to the Health SWAp funding basket.

The UN looks to help government create integrated social support systems characterized by:

* Effectively targeted social protection schemes instead of patchy interventions.
* Coherence and synergies within existing investments as well as with economic development.
* Institutional arrangements to make them work.

The UN is currently working with government in resilience interventions in: agriculture and food security; social protection; economic recovery & livelihoods; health & nutrition; disaster risk management; environmental management & climate change; and HIV/AIDS, governance, gender, data management and capacity building.

The UN has done an integrated context analysis at the national level, and seasonal livelihood programming (SLP) at the district level in Balaka, Zomba. Phalombe and Karonga Districts and community based participatory planning in Balaka and Zomba. This multi-agency process is co-facilitated and led by government partners, and involves a number of NGO partners, and has strong community representation.

After the 2015 floods, WFP and the government also undertook a Rapid SLP process in affected districts to assess with the district council and communities the priority early recovery requirements set against the seasonal calendar. These allowed for coordinated, multi-partner and sector planning at district level.

A FAO-led multi-agency Joint Programme is underway in Phalombe District. Separately, WFP is undertaking resilience work in several additional districts. Their methodologies and approaches differ though WFP’s Three Pronged Approach (3PA) has many similarities with FAO’s approach, building on government work, obtaining ownership and strengthening linkages.

FAO is building up from the local government plans, linking government programmes together more effectively. WFP is rolling out a Seasonal Livelihood Approach (SLP). WFP’s approach builds on evidence-based analysis, bringing in the seasonality and multi-sectoral component at the district level (a process led by the district government) and on community participation and ownership.

Both approaches integrate gender responsive strategies to ensure women’s empowerment as well as mitigation of critical issues such as feminization of poverty, violence against women and children and participation of key groups in decision-making.

The roll out of two separate approaches reflects differing perspectives on development, and different technical and operational strengths of the two agencies. In Malawi where the UNCT is operating as One UN[[8]](#footnote-9), further steps should be taken to integrate and harmonize the UN work in this area, to improve the coherence of the UNDAF.

#### Capacity Development

The UN has a long and fruitful history of capacity development in Malawi, beginning with the institution building initiatives of the early years of independence. It continues this history with capacity building support for economic governance, and for service provision institutions such as in health, education and agriculture, with a number of positive results.

In this UNDAF a central UN strategy has been to support the development of national level policies, strategies and legislation, and develop capacities in government for their implementation. It also has undertaken a significant programme of capacity development measures in support of decentralization at the District level.

Unfortunately, several factors have made all of these efforts more difficult than anticipated. First, the absorptive capacity of the public sector was a major constraint even before the withdrawal of donor funding from government. The withdrawal of that funding has reduced the ability of government to budget for anticipated work.

Problems of absorptive capacity include gaps in national systems and technical expertise, as well as performance and productivity issues. One factor that has particularly limited absorptive capacity of UN efforts has been that a number of the UN’s areas of focus promote culture change in areas that have not been traditional priorities for government. As such, there are naturally not yet strong institutional partners within government structures. This is particularly evident in work on gender, human rights and population. The UN should provide operational support to government entities in such areas, while promoting institutional strengthening.

Second, while the recent unified donor policy against providing DSA for workshop attendance has removed a perverse incentive for attendance, it has been widely resented and has demotivated people from participating to learn.

And a third factor that greatly reduces the effectiveness of much of the UN’s capacity development work is its heavy over-reliance on one-off “workshop” methodologies. Workshops are easy to mount, but are not effective. The “I say - you memorize” model does not produce behavior change in adults. And training one or two members of a unit in a short-term workshop does nothing to change the competencies of the unit.

Adult learning is about building competencies (skills, attitudes and behaviors) and not just skills. Its methods are based on just-in-time applied learning, learning by doing, periodic reinforcement and support through guidance by leaders, mentoring and networking, and other modern techniques. These require more preparation and skill than the workshop model, but they produce results. The UN should invest, perhaps with others, in a professional capacity for adult learning and mentoring support to provide learning programmes across the UNDAF that use methods aimed at changing behaviours on a sustained basis.

## 4.2 Relevance of the UNDAF

#### UNDAF Design

The purpose of an UNDAF is to focus the work of the UN strategically, to create alignment and coherence of UN efforts, to achieve lasting national impact.

There are 9 resident and 11 non-resident UN entities with operational programmes in Malawi. These agencies vary widely in mandate, scale of operations, and methods of work. Three of the twenty (UNDP, UNICEF and WFP) programme around 75% of resources available.

The Malawi UNDAF for 2012 to 2016 is a complex framework strategy covering the sectorial and multi-sectorial work of the UN in operational activities for development over a five-year period. It is the UN System’s response to the national development plan (the MGDS II).

Three standard criteria were used to create a common, results focus for these entities:

1. Impact of UN results in addressing **key national problems** identified in the MGDS II and other national priorities and strategies;

The MDGS II was the primary basis for the substantive areas of focus of the UNDAF.

The management structure of the UNDAF is led at both policy and technical levels by government.

An open and continuous dialogue takes place between the members of the UNCT and senior national figures, in and out of government.

1. Support to national efforts to achieve **MDGs and other global goals**.

The UNDAF goals are generally well designed to contribute directly to support the achievement of the MDGs, especially in regard to lagging national efforts related to poverty and gender-related indicators.

The UNDAF priorities are framed to promote changes in national conditions that would allow achievement of MDG indicators (though efforts in some key areas like food security and health have been more fully funded than others like population activities).

The strong focus in the UNDAF on gender issues created under UNFPA leadership was enhanced by the creation of a UN Women office.

The posting of a Human Rights Advisor by OHCHR has had a similar positive impact in building on considerable previous human rights work.

3. Optimal use of **UN comparative advantages** (local and global).

A capacity assessment was undertaken by the UNCT in early 2011, which enabled it to frame the UNDAF Outcomes around the capacities of the agencies, rather than their mandates. It also enabled the UNCT to identify and address areas of required capacity that would be needed but were not present: i.e., in gender, human rights and population.

All substantive agency activities have been aligned around the UNDAF goals.

The UNCT framed its strategy well, taking all three criteria fully into account. It is considerably better designed than the previous strategy, reflecting very serious efforts by all agencies to programme fully as One UN.

#### Relevance of UNDAF priorities

The UNDAF seeks to produce or contribute to defined impacts in its four Priority Areas of:

* Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security
* Basic Social and Protection Services
* HIV and AIDS
* Governance and Human Rights

Each of these four areas addresses a critical set of national problems, and reflects UN capacity. And as set out below, planned results are largely on track to being achieved by end-2016.

However, the scale of development partner (DP) support for the Priorities and the Outcomes within them has varied enormously, as has DP support for government during this period, seriously distorting the UNDAF.

Overall, the UNDAF will have significantly exceeded its resource targets for the five years: by over $52 million dollars. But this net funding beyond the planned amount sought was achieved in fewer than half of the Outcomes. These are Outcomes in which there are large components of humanitarian assistance or direct service provision. DPs have channeled major, unanticipated resource flows through these Outcomes to address crises, and to reallocate funds away from government. They have supported other UNDAF goals, but in line with the normal range of expectations.

## 4.3 UNDAF Design and Management efficiency

As designed, the original UNDAF was a well-reasoned matrix of key national development needs, areas of global priority in which Malawi had lagged (i.e., poverty and gender-related MDG indicators), and the capacities of the UN. The resulting programme framework was comprehensive and logically integrated at the level of its four Priorities. These were organized in Clusters, with Outcomes feeding logically into overall Outcomes. Most of the Outcomes were logically framed.

However, in operation the UNCT found the structure to have significant flaws. First, it was too broad and cumbersome, with far too many Outputs and Indicators, and a plethora of agency activities feeding into those Outputs.

Second, the Framework was far too ambitious. A number of the Outcome statements and Indicators described changes that were unrealistic within five years, even in concert with other partners. The design did not realistically gauge the likely extent of positive national changes to which the UN would contribute.

Third, many of the Outcome statements and Indicators were derived from the goals of the MDGs and the MGDS II, rather than being crafted to reflect the UN’s potential contribution to those goals. This makes it difficult to measure achievement against goals and targets. The outputs in the UNDAF in most cases were framed like higher-level outputs (almost at the level of outcomes) and some annualized results were framed like outputs. This caused problems in the linkages of the UNDAF results and agency activities but also posed a problem in reporting.

#### UNDAF Management

The UN Country Team (UNCT) is highly active as a substantive management body at the strategic level. Senior government representatives join for periodic reviews. The members of the UNCT are each also involved in other leadership roles within the UNDAF management system. It is a high functioning team, very ably and collectively led.

The Programme Management Team (PMT) is made up of a mix of agency Representatives and senior programme staff, and very actively oversees the Cluster Groups for each of the four Priority Areas. A member of the UNCT heads each Group, supported by a Coordinator.

Each Cluster is made up of several conceptually related Outcomes, and is managed in the Cluster Group, bringing together Outcome Group Chairs. However, while the Clusters logically grouped related Outcomes, in practice, they did not always create synergies. This was a problem on three levels.

* There was sometimes little coordination among related issues between the Clusters.
* The Clusters themselves were often a collection of only loosely related Outcomes, implementing in silos.
* Within Outcomes, agencies often implemented independently according to the common plan, coordinating only loosely in the absence of joint implementation.

As a result, the Clusters varied widely in coherence and the degree to which they promoted synergies.

Outcome Groups and Technical Working Groups manage the work of each Outcome. They bring together all agencies working in the Outcome and are headed by senior staff, several by Representatives. Nearly all Outcome Groups have been very actively engaged in managing for results on a consistent basis, and have been a highly useful management tool. This is no mean feat, given the small number of senior programme staff and the problems of staff turnover and multiple responsibilities. These Outcome Groups have steered the strategy and technical approaches of the Outcomes quite successfully.

Agency identities are often subsumed within the Clusters and Outcome Groups. However, efforts within them are sometimes quite unbalanced, due largely to the major differences in resources among agencies, and the fact that some areas are essentially single-agency efforts. There are also long-standing technical issues between agencies in one specific area, but this is largely due to the failure of the two Headquarters to resolve global differences.

Over the course of UNDAF implementation, several positive steps have been taken to redress the imbalances among agencies (i.e., through the One UN Fund and Joint Programmes) but these are only partial solutions to these systemic issues.

The active management of the substantive content of the UNDAF has made it unusually responsive to changing circumstances: the substantive content and focus of the framework has evolved significantly and intentionally since the start of UNDAF implementation based on lessons learned and changing national circumstances.

A comprehensive review and revision of the UNDAF Outcomes, Outputs and Indicators in 2013 created a far more realistic and well-structured framework, better reflecting the necessary contributions of agencies to a more focused set of goals.

However, the suspension by DPs of channeling of their funds through government since late 2013 greatly reduced the money available to government, with significant consequences, among them:

* Government funding for capacity to implement programmes was severely curtailed, including the implementation of a range of policies just coming to approval with UN help.
* Donor funding was rechanneled through some UN agencies, increasing their delivery greatly and creating imbalances in UNDAF Outcomes.
* Donor funding was also rechanneled through NGOs, lessening coordination and coherence in the field.

#### Programme oversight

A very rigorous series of regular reviews has been held, under the supervision of the UNCT and PMT with the support of the RCO. [[9]](#footnote-10) The UNCT has also used annual UNDAF Action Plans with Annualised Key Results (AKRs) to plan, track and review progress. This has allowed the UNCT to manage the implementation of the UNDAF actively. Proactive steps have been taken to keep Clusters and Outcome Groups active and on track.

In 2013 an UNDAF Expanded Annual Review and Planning process took place with UNDAF Mid-Year and Annual Reviews. It examined the extent to which the UNDAF results are being achieved, how they were contributing to the national development priorities and drew lessons from the review processes which have since been applied in a restructured Framework. The application and mainstreaming of cross cutting issues such as human rights and gender equality have been central to this review process.

The objectives of the UNDAF Expanded Annual Review and Planning process were:

1. To establish the progress in the attainment of UNDAF Outcomes, Outputs and Annualised Key Results (AKRs) through a comprehensive review of achievement of results;
2. To document challenges and lessons learnt faced during the implementation of the UNDAF Action Plan;
3. To identify and suggest emerging opportunities where the UN has a comparative advantage in supporting Government of Malawi development aspirations;
4. To “clean”, revise and simplify the UNDAF structure, ensuring a more relevant and coherent UNDAF;
5. To develop joint annual work plans across Clusters and Outcome Groups where there are clear synergies;
6. To develop a real time monitoring framework for the monitoring of results in the UNDAF;
7. To ensure that cross cutting issues are well mainstreamed and accounted for in implementation and reporting.

The deliverables of the process were:

1. A report with the status of attainment of UNDAF Outcomes, documented challenges in the implementation of the UNDAF and a set of recommendations for moving forward
2. A more coherent and relevant UNDAF highlighting cross cutting issues
3. UNDAF Joint Annual Work Plans
4. A revised budget for the remaining three years of the UNDAF
5. Commitment to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan for the remainder of the UNDAF period, that incorporates innovative real time monitoring mechanisms

The review of the UNDAF found that: the complexity of the Results Matrix was too high to manage; several Outcomes overlapped; some Outcomes were actually Agency Outputs, and a number of Indicators could not be monitored, as they could only be tracked through a survey conducted every 5 years (a few were not directly relevant to the UN contribution).

As a result of this review, dozens of changes were made to the UNDAF:

1. The number of Outcomes was reduced from 17 to 14 by combining related outcomes
2. A few areas of work were shifted from one Outcome to another
3. Outcome statements were tightened and focused on more achievable goals
4. TWGs for mainstreaming Gender, Human Rights and Capacity Building were merged with the three Outcome Groups managing targeted interventions in those cross-cutting areas, and
5. Some indicators were replaced with better proxies for UN Outcomes, and a number were dropped, creating a more appropriate and manageable set for each Outcome

This evaluation concludes from examination of the original structure, the revision of the UNDAF, and interviews with a wide range of UN and government staff, that the revision has greatly improved the performance of Outcomes and their levels of achievement.

The deliverables of the Review have been fully achieved. This evaluation finds that as a result of the Expanded Annual Review, the UNDAF has become a more relevant, effective and efficient framework, and that its positive effects have been maintained in ongoing programme management activities.

#### One UN[[10]](#footnote-11) and the UNDAF

*“The delivering as One approach enables the UN to work toward a more efficient and effective UN through aligning UN capacities to the operational and substantive challenges, harmonization and simplification of business practices.”[[11]](#footnote-12)*

The importance of the commitment of agencies present in Malawi to operating as One UN to leverage results cannot be overstressed. Though agency identities remain predominant and accountability systems need to stress that work for the One UN is the primary work, staff now consciously contribute to UN results. This is a radical, positive change from four years ago, when this consultant last worked with the Malawi Team.

In four years the UN has moved from linking separate programmes in a common matrix to thinking together, planning together and monitoring and reporting together. And steps are being taken toward implementing together, though lack of progress globally on creating common implementation systems makes this very difficult.

In the 2014 UNDAF Annual Review it was recognised that there had been a great deal of progress in Agencies linking their plans and thinking since the first UNDAF Review. The impact of activities, rather than work plans, has become the main basis of discussion, and results from the MDG end line survey are now tracked by year, rather than sporadically, which is positive.

The very positive efforts of the UNCT on linking plans and thinking have come with high opportunity costs. Every UN staff member interviewed acknowledges that extended discussions have been required to achieve a more coherent programme and joint plans and programmes. Most believe the effort worthwhile, though some do not. Many wonder if the gains from the joint implementation the UNCT is now considering for the future will be worth the effort.

In this context, the harmonization and simplification of business practices has had a secondary priority, and has moved very slowly, as reflected in the findings of the DaO Audit (below). These issues are now coming to the fore. A major joint effort of the PMT and OMT is needed to address them, to enable the UNCT to move to the next level: joint programming that allows a donor or a government entity to deal with a single UN interface for funding or implementation.

The UNCT in Malawi is now implementing the Standard Operating Procedures for One UN countries. The areas where the UNCT is currently concentrating on deepening its capacities to perform as One UN are Joint Work Plans, Joint Programmes, and Real Time Monitoring.

#### Joint Audit of Delivering as One in Malawi

The Internal Audit Services of four United Nations organizations[[12]](#footnote-13) conducted a joint audit of Delivering as One (DaO) in 2014 focused on the five pillars of the DaO (One Leader, One Programme, One Fund, Operating as One and Communicating as One). It audited the adequacy and effectiveness of governance, risk management and control processes.

The joint audit assessed that “internal controls, governance and risk management processes were generally established and functioning, but needed improvement.” This rating is mainly due to the weaknesses observed in One Programme and One Fund.

The high priority recommendations of the audit were to address:

|  |
| --- |
| * Absence of robust quality review of the [matching of detail between the] UNDAF and joint Annual Work Plans * Weaknesses in the [original] design of the UNDAF [[13]](#footnote-14) * Gaps in reporting on results * Lack of joint resource mobilization strategy to the One Fund * Weakness in the Business Operating strategy and its implementation mechanism * Inadequate follow up on HACT macro assessment |

These recommendations provide guidance on strengthening required risk control measures, to support a complex and very successful substantive One UN programme. The UNCT has accepted all of these recommendations and is actively implementing them all. They have also developed a Results Management System that further strengthens reviews and reporting on results.

#### Joint Advocacy Efforts

The UN’s ability to communicate as one and undertake joint advocacy represents a powerful tool for promoting and addressing key issues in Malawi. Thus far, the UN has not made full use of this potential. Through the UN Communication Group (UNCG), the UN is increasing joint advocacy efforts, promoting common messages and positions, particularly in the cross cutting areas of human rights, gender equality and resilience. For instance, joint advocacy for gender rights and condom dispersal achieved remarkable success in 2014.[[14]](#footnote-15) The UNCT needs to invest even more heavily in these efforts, which are not as advanced or professional as the initiatives they are meant to promote.

Advocacy is not merely a function of centrally developed messages and campaigns. In any large and diverse organization it depends primarily on the alignment of all staff around key messages and positions. In other words, every staff member should know how their work supports the achievement of one or more strategic UNDAF result, and be able and motivated to advocate autonomously for those efforts. Surprisingly, this evaluation found a very high degree of awareness of UNDAF goals among staff at all levels from D-1 to G-4. This is an asset to be leveraged. First, much stronger internal communication is needed on how the work of one’s agency or unit contributes to the UNDAF. And second, accountability for UNDAF work should not be an “add on” to agency-specific annual results in individual work plans: all those results should be framed as contributions to the UNDAF.

#### Coherence in Planning and Programming

The UNCT has been working actively to more effectively and coherently programme, particularly in the areas of human rights, gender equality and resilience, through better monitoring and communications and more joint planning and programming, particularly through Joint Annual Work Plans (JAWPs) and Joint Programmes. Its objective is to avoid fragmentation, reduce transaction costs and increase efficiency and the better achievement of results.

The stated aim for the longer term is joint programming for each UNDAF outcome, with the UN speaking and implementing with one voice. To support this, dedicated windows in the One Fund have been proposed in the areas of nutrition, HIV and AIDS, local governance, resilience and food security, as well as the newly established humanitarian window. However, it will not be easy to get agencies to mobilise funds together, or DPs to resource them.

In 2014-2015 joint programming has been developed with the Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare and the Malawi Human Rights Commission. Previously, six to nine different UN agencies had been operating in parallel with both of these institutions with insufficient joint planning and sharing of work plans within the UN.

Coordination of the UN’s intervention at the district level is also being improved. To this end, a mapping of the presence of UN projects across all the districts in Malawi was done and further discussion on a UN integrated and coordinated intervention, with a lead agency approach is to follow. A district level coordination pilot is planned for Mangochi.

Progress toward joint programming has been slow and extremely time consuming in the absence of globally developed common patterns for simplified planning and implementation. The opportunity costs for UN staff are far too high and urgent global attention is required to provide the long-promised harmonization needed.

As a result, the UNCT is good at planning and reporting together, but not implementing. This has been questioned by a DP in the context of the Joint Programme on Girls Education, and the UNCT is looking to introduce joint implementation. This effort should be supported by a group of senior Programme and Operations staff, tasked with time-bound agreement on model patterns for joint implementation.

Until 2014 agencies developed individual work plans. These were brought together in the Results Groups, but the resulting work plans were primarily internal documents, The UN in Malawi has been working towards developing fully joint annual work plans, a step toward the ultimate UNDG objective of joint plans which are the “only work planning instrument, replacing agency-specific plans.”

These developments represent a major shift in the way the UN addresses its collective goals. They are being retrofitted onto an UNDAF designed based on individual agency Outputs, so transaction costs have been high, and progress slow. The next UNDAF should be designed around JAWPs as a norm, with a large number of Joint Programmes.

#### Joint Annual Work Plans

In addition to improving coherence, the JAWP’s developed in 2014-2015 in Gender and Human rights have also helped to identify the scale of UN demands on partners, which can be unrealistic. The JAWP highlights the need to prioritise more strategically.

Additionally in 2015 the UN is planning to establish a joint work plan in the area of HIV and AIDS and explore a joint work plan with the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development.

While the process has been extremely useful in terms of ensuring that the UN works coherently with key implementing partners, there have also been some challenges, for example:

·         Some agencies had already identified priorities for the year and had limited ability to revise them based on identified needs and priorities.

·         The UN is now reasonably experienced at planning and reporting together, but joint implementation remains challenging, with the default being that agencies continue to implement in silos.

·         Coordinating all agencies involved in one JAWP has had high transaction costs. Hopefully once this process is more established it will become routine.

#### Joint Programmes

The UN has been developing and implementing joint programmes judiciously, choosing to make the major investment of staff time required for design and negotiation of procedures only in strategic areas where significant impact could be achieved. While joint programmes in Malawi have shown that they give the UN greater coherence and impact, opportunity costs are very high. Negotiating a design is time-consuming, and progress has been slow.

Initial joint programmes within this UNDAF have been underway on Adolescent Girls since 2011 and Development Effectiveness and Accountability (DEAP) since 2013. The two joint programmes’ aggregated budget for the period 2012-2013 amounted to $4.5 million, which was only 2 percent of the total budget for the same period ($220.5 million).

A programme in Girls’ Education has been operational since 2014. Joint Programmes for Resilience in Phalombe District, and for Right to Food have recently begun operations. A Humanitarian Window is replenished annually.

Additional programmes or proposals for programme funding are being developed in HIV and AIDS, REACH (Nutrition Coordination), Maternal Health, young people and Population and Development.

Annex D provides a table describing ongoing and planned or proposed Joint Programmes and their status.

Should all of these proposals obtain funding and begin operations before 2017, there will be joint programmes in around half of the UNDAF Outcome areas.

Thus far the quality of the design, planning and indicators for joint programmes is good, but the coordination of implementation is not as good, as the latter still takes place in agency silos.

Part of the difficulty experienced in developing joint programmes thus far may be due to the fact that in some cases it requires retrofitting existing agency plans into a common framework. When agencies conceived their plans for this UNDAF, they did so on a stand-alone basis. If joint programmes were considered the default modality for planning and implementation in each Outcome for the next UNDAF, agencies would plan accordingly and individual joint programmes would be far easier to mount.

#### Introducing Real Time Monitoring

One of the key challenges of UNDAF management is the lack of availability of timely data. Many indicators are only available every five years[[15]](#footnote-16). Monitoring of UNDAF targets is currently done semi-annually. This hampers the use of data and results for adaptive planning and decision-making and responsive programming. In 2014, the UNCT decided to develop a comprehensive but flexible monitoring framework that enables agencies to collect and analyse disaggregated data in real time so that the right decisions maximise the impact of development interventions. The purpose is to build a culture of managing for results across UN agencies.

Technical experts from UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP assisted the UNCT to build a framework based on the UNICEF Monitoring Results for Equity System (MoRES) and the MDG Acceleration Framework. Both emphasize the importance of identifying key bottlenecks that are constraining development results so that these can be effectively addressed and monitored. The UNCT has finalised the framework and are ready to begin the process of data collection and implementation.

The Real-Time Monitoring Framework is part of a broader effort to make essential management information available in real-time. Agencies are already becoming more result focussed and staff are now thinking about results in their day-to-day work.

The UN will also support selected surveys such as the end line survey and surveys funded from the humanitarian fund, for example, the MVACs[[16]](#footnote-17) and the Nutritional Surveys. This work will be coordinated with the recently launched National Social Support Programme.

The UN Malawi website has been re-designed as a knowledge hub, and is used to track progress of all UN interventions in country.

#### Non-resident agencies

A number of non-resident agencies are active in Malawi at the project level. Many, such as Habitat, ILO, UNCDF and UNESCO are integrated in the UNDAF. Others are not. ILO and UNESCO have regional representation covering Malawi. They are actively encouraged to participate in the UNCT, and do so from time to time. The RC meets periodically with non-resident agency staff. The staff members of non-resident agencies consider themselves to be fully part of the UN community.

The priorities of the UNDAF would benefit from broader support than project personal can give. Out-posting an Assistant Representative from ILO or UNESCO in particular would be helpful.

#### The One UN Fund and the HACT

The UNDAF Action Plan focuses on the One UN Fund as a preferred financial management modality. The One UN Fund has indeed proved to be a highly useful tool through which the UNCT has been able to channel funds for humanitarian activities through a dedicated window.

It has also been used to address imbalances in funding among agencies engaged in joint activities. A most impressive good practice was the use of the Fund by UNICEF to support an under-resourced partner. However DP commitments through the Fund have been limited, greatly reducing its usefulness. The UNCT should continue to promote this invaluable facility. The One UN Fund is discussed in more detail in Part 4.6 below.

During 2014 the serious concerns around national financial management systems occasioned by accountability concerns led agencies participating in the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) to reexamine their assessments of national systems on a precautionary basis. Unfortunately, this was done by each participating organization separately, driven by agency audits or financial regulations and rules. Differing conclusions were reached and the harmonization achieved by HACT was lost. Urgent action is required to reestablish a common pattern.

## 4.4 Effectiveness of the UNDAF

The UNDAF, as designed, contained 17 Outcomes in the four Areas in which the UNCT believed it could make a considerable impact. At the broadest level, this proved to be the case, and the original Priority Areas and Outcomes have generally been retained and have produced positive results. As detailed above, in the first two years of implementation (2012-2013) the UNCT came to realize that the UNDAF was too complex and not optimally organized. In late 2013, the UNCT undertook an internal restructuring of the Results Matrix, while maintaining the substantive content of the UNDAF.

The 2013 revision of the UNDAF Results Matrix was a very important step, and greatly increased the relevance of the document and the ability of the UNCT to manage toward the planned Outcomes. It is an excellent example of managing for relevance.

Throughout the period of the UNDAF, the collective leadership of the UNDAF has been very active and all agencies contribute to the leadership of its overall management, Cluster and Outcome leadership, and operational collaboration. While there are capacity issues and resource constraints within the team, and control risk issues to be addressed, these are secondary. **Overall,** **the One UN Team in Malawi is performing at a very high level of coherence and result orientation, in comparison with other UN teams, and the UNDAF is consequently achieving considerable impact.**

#### Factors affecting the performance of the UN in Malawi

There are four significant factors that have constrained the performance of the UN:

1. The failure of the global reform processes to produce promised, standardized operational methods, rules, processes and procedures

In 2008 the UNDG undertook to produce common rules for finance, human resources and procurement, within three years. To date, there has only been partial progress in procurement. The continued absence of common methods of operation seriously discourages joint programming, and is a real barrier to joint implementation.

Joint planning has very significant transaction costs, but organizing joint implementation requires far more tricky negotiation among agencies, to allow each to maintain required, differing operational standards while operating jointly. This has proved very difficult and time consuming to negotiate locally, and some programme staff rightly resists what is indeed a huge waste of their time.

The UNDG must act at last to address the problem of multiple UN operational processes and procedures. Without common globally produced operational systems, the One UN cannot move to the next level: the Malawi team is ready.

In the interim, the Malawi UNCT Programme Management Team and the Operations Group should be jointly charged with creating a “toolkit” of operational solutions that have been developed locally or in other countries to enable multiple agencies to implement together. There have been experiences to draw from, and a number of Joint Programmes are starting or planned.

1. The tendency of DPs to continue funding specific agencies and activities, rather than coherent or underfunded areas of work

The DPs have largely been highly supportive of the One UN effort in Malawi. However, globally available funding has been reduced, while funds received at country level from capitals are largely tied to specific themes or sectors.

As a result, two agencies are resourced beyond their stated needs, while most other UNCT members increasingly find themselves unable to fund essential but less “popular” inputs to Outcomes. The One UN Fund is meant to provide a mechanism to fill these gaps, but it has not been strongly supported.

A graphic depiction of the expected expenditure against the planned budget for 2012-2016 by Outcome starkly illustrates the problem:

Table 1: Anticipated 2012-2016 UNDAF Expenditure by Outcome – Variance from Budget

Strangely, though the funding imbalances seen in this UNDAF are not at all unusual, there does not seem to have been a global effort by the UNDG and DPs to address this long-standing, debilitating pattern. One is needed if the One UN is to succeed.

Nationally, in preparation for the next UNDAF the UNCT might create an informal tripartite group among UN, Government and DPs to jointly examine the issue. Such a group would seek to promote more balanced funding, and to encourage greater burden-sharing, to allow the UN to focus more narrowly on areas of foreseen support, and to act in future in fewer areas that (however important) are perennially under-funded.

1. Limited support to the UNCT from the UNDG Regional Directors Team (RDT)

The RDT is meant to provide substantive support and accountability oversight to the UNCT. While the RDT is active in providing substantive support at the technical level from its Peer Support Group, the RDT itself does not play a strong role.

As a One UN team, Malawi is grappling with joint programming and implementation issues that require a step-change in mutual accountability, if they are to be successful. This in turn requires a more active role by the RDT.

1. The shift in the foundations of the development paradigm in Malawi since 2012

The strategy of the Malawi UNDAF is based on the expectation that substantial resources would continue to flow through government from DPs, at previous levels, allowing government to use those funds to provide the capacities necessary to implement the policies and laws developed with UN support, and to provide the services that the UN plans to strengthen.

#### *Figure 1: The UNDAF’s development support approach for Malawi*

In the Malawi context, a successful UN strategy of this nature requires at least four mutually supportive elements:

* Significant investment in he development of national policies, strategies and legislation in a number of areas of UN priority
* UN support to the capacity of national enabling systems, primarily government but including others, to carry out the policies or laws
* Consistent UN support to Government of Malawi structures in their initial implementation of the policies or laws, and in their provision of better access to and quality of basic services
* Robust and targeted UN advocacy to promote public and institutional alignment around the policies or laws, and to address public attitudes and norms preventing change

This strategy is illustrated in Figure 1. The intended strategy of the UNDAF focused heavily on two of these elements: Policy & Legislation, and Implementation Support. Activities in the other two areas (Enabling Capacity and Advocacy) were not of the same magnitude but were directed at supporting the specific investments made by the UN.

A great deal of investment has been made in supporting and promoting **policies and legislation** required for the achievement of the national priorities supported by the UNDAF. Though progress has generally been slower than anticipated, the UN has largely succeeded in helping government achieve policy formulation goals.

At the same time, UN implementation support, especially in Food Security and Resilience, and Basic Social Services, has buttressed development of Government implementation capacities, especially at District level. And UN advocacy has promoted key campaigns.

Government was meant to provide the enabling capacity, with UN support. However, the efforts made by the UN to build the required Government capacity have not been seen as fully successful.

First, the preferred method of capacity building for functions or units has often been through short-term workshops for individuals (rather than intact teams). This is not a very effective method for adult learning, and some UN agencies have now shifted away from this model. A new approach is needed, and requires careful thinking at the level of the UNCT, with external professional support.

Second, donor reactions to national issues since 2011 have led to withdrawal of bilateral donor funds from Government, which has reduced funding and so constrained its capacity to deploy human resources. As a result, many policies, strategies and laws in which the UN has invested have languished, unimplemented. And the UN has not consistently or fully effectively revised its strategy to take reduced government capacity into account.

Consequently, UN development support can be depicted as in Figure 2:

* Strong support to the development of a broad range of Policy and Legislation, albeit slowed by limited government absorptive capacity, and left somewhat unsupported by a diminishing Government Enabling Capacity.
* Government Enabling Capacity greatly reduced by the need to spread scarce resources more thinly to make up for withdrawal of donor funds.
* Strong UN Implementation Support in some areas of work, especially the social sectors, but increasingly partnering with or even independent of a diminished Government Enabling Capacity
* UN Advocacy that is not fully adequate, nor fully linked to supporting the cultural changes intended by the policies and laws

#### Figure 2: Current composition of the UN development support approach for Malawi

The issue of how best to address the impact on Government of the withdrawal of donor funds is well beyond the scope of this evaluation. However, its effects threaten the achievement of the UN’s own programme outcomes, and its methods of work now need to be adjusted.

Specifically, the UNCT should examine the impact of reduced government capacity on the partnership, and develop appropriate measures in response. At present, the bilateral funds diverted from SWAPs are flowing through NGOs and the UN. The UN is actively seeking those resources for its programmes, especially in basic services, but it does not seem to be using them to support the government capacities needed to implement the policies and laws in which it has invested.

At the same time, increased funding is flowing to NGOs, international and national. This is leading to less coherence and reduced government leadership of development. The UN should work more closely with NGOs to promote strategic coherence and coordination.

The UN also needs to reexamine its capacity for collective advocacy, and devote significantly more resources to it in select areas, for example the critical nexus of keeping girls in school, preventing early marriage and preventing pregnancy in early adolescence.

#### Responsiveness of the UN to changing circumstances

The UNCT developed a clear common understanding of the risks and assumptions underlying its strategy, which have proved very helpful in developing a collective response to changing circumstances. The team has rallied very well for humanitarian response and resilience, the magnitude and duration of which were quite beyond expectations.

In the same manner, the team rallied commendably around the 50/50 campaign for the election of women candidates in the 2014 elections. These examples show that the team has built a strong common identity around the UNDAF, and its members are responsive to punctual needs in changing circumstances.

The extensive revision of the UNDAF in 2013 was undertaken to increase the focus and impact of the UNCT in addressing the UNDAF goals, and in this sense is a notable good practice in responding to circumstance.

However, neither the UNDAF nor its revision anticipated the ever more acute consequences of issues affecting Malawi’s development. Since 2011, political tensions around human rights had caused DPs to withhold funds. In response to the resulting national budget gap, the Kwacha was devalued by 33% in 2012, which greatly affected the country. Concerns about accountability, as well as a lack of performance management and public sector reform became ever-greaterissues, leading to withdrawal of DP funds once again in early 2014.

The diversion of donor funding from pooled funds and government’s budget have seriously reduced counterpart capacities to implement policies on which the UN has worked. At the same time, significant portions of the funds so diverted have been channeled through UN agencies for direct implementation support. The UNCT is only now feeling the full impact of these double imbalances, and is grappling with how to adjust the UNDAF in response.

The large number of policy initiatives taken through the UNDAF has also revealed the limitations of national absorptive capacities, and the funding gap has slowed government further. The UNCT has worked commendably and successfully to help strengthen national aid coordination and coherence, and capacities, but the initial successes achieved through Sector Working Groups and SWAPs have receded temporarily as the percentage of aid through the national budget has fallen. The UN has no choice but to continue promoting these mechanisms.

On the other hand, capacity development efforts generally have not had a satisfactory level of success and new approaches are required. The UNCT recognizes this, and is trying different approaches. For instance in health the UN is moving from in-service to pre-service training. But the UNCT is not yet looking at the issue of how to more effectively build capacities on a department or ministry-wide basis.

The core of the UNDAF is its work to improve the lives of young women, through education, livelihoods and reproductive rights. Excellent work is being done. Yet the national institutions for gender, human rights and population are all quite weak[[17]](#footnote-18).

The UN has developed joint programmes and work plans that ease the burden of multiple initiatives, but these plans themselves have revealed to the UNCT the huge burden being placed on these institutions by the sheer volume of UN activities. The next step is to use these plans to manage the scope of initiatives and limit their numbers.

The UN promotes an agenda of global human right standards. Malawi is a party to most, though not all of these. However, the realization of some elements of the standards to which Malawi has acceded is culturally difficult. This has proved especially true around UN’s work on gender issues in this UNDAF. The UN has responded with a new strategy that takes cultural realities into account. The same pattern will likely occur in other human rights areas, as the UN pushes up against entrenched norms and vested interests. The flexibility shown by the UN in revising its gender strategy bodes well for future success.

Finally, many partners expressed the view that the UN takes too short-term a view, and makes too short-term commitments. The 2013 revision of the UNDAF made goals far more realistic, but this review of achievement against goals shows that many were still too optimistic. And programming does not set out markers for longer-term commitments.

## 4.5 Achievement of Outcomes and Indicators

Basic data has been gathered on the levels of expected achievement of Outcome and Output Indicators by end-2016, the initial financial envelopes proposed for those Outcomes in 2012, and the actual expected financial envelopes at the end of 2016. The data is presented below.

These three data points reveal the relationships between UN initiatives, funding and the ease or difficulty of creating development impacts in particular Outcome areas. This data has been examined along with the results of interviews with representatives from all groups and their partners to reach conclusions in each outcome area.

## 4.5.1. Cluster 1: National policies, local and national institutions effectively support equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security by 2016.

The substantive areas of work of the Cluster are very broad, varied and diverse, and some of its subjects only loosely linked. It brings together issues of resilience and food security, and the related areas of disaster risk management, along with harnessing the private sector for rural employment. It also includes management of natural resources, the environment and climate change.

Though conceptually related, the span of these subjects made coherence difficult. In addition, the differing approaches taken by agencies on food issues within the Cluster and its sub-Outcomes further reduce coherence and prevent needed synergies. An overall strategy for the Cluster is sorely needed, but this will require all participating agencies to be willing to modify their service lines.

To strengthen linkages, the overall structure of Cluster 1 was revised in 2013, with Outcome 1.1 (Food and Nutrition Security) and Outcome 1.4 (Resilience) merged. The overlap with Outcome 2.2 (Nutrition) and the nutrition component of Cluster 3 (HIV and AIDS) has also been addressed.

During the 2013 revision of the UNDAF consideration was given to reducing the cluster to the two focus areas of Resilience and Food Security (plus DRM) and Employment and Private Sector, but at the time significant work was being done in climate change, and the third area of Environment and Climate Change was retained.

#### Figure 3: Structure of Cluster One on Economic Growth and Food Security

**Original Structure**

**Current Structure**

The resulting merger of Food Security and Resilience in one Outcome has been beneficial. It is recognized that there needs to be greater integration of cross cutting issues, but this is still not evident.

The UNDAF was designed at what proved to be the end of a series of good harvest years. Since then there have been a succession of poor harvests and humanitarian crises (floods and droughts). The work of the UN has therefore rightly shifted to a more humanitarian role, refocusing from planned work building long-term resilience. If humanitarian needs are not met, there are consequences for human lives and livelihoods, as well as other major setbacks to development. Effective humanitarian response is part of resilience building.

In this changed context, the UN should integrate the humanitarian and development agendas, and the UNDAF should better link relief, recovery and resilience work, linking food security with early recovery and resilience building as well as social protection, Social Cash Transfer (SCT) and local procurement (which supports the national economy, including through purchases from smallholder farmers).

The positive response of the donor community to these unanticipated and immediate humanitarian needs has also greatly increased the resources flowing to WFP. This has been beneficial in addressing urgent human needs, but requires a shift in attention that others have seen to limit inter-agency collaboration, reducing Cluster coherence.

There has been a great deal of progress in strategic thinking since 2013, but this has not yet been fully realized in the UNDAF. The joint Programme on Resilience provides a strategy intended to become the core of a Cluster in the next UNDAF.

For the next UNDAF, a Cluster should provide for both humanitarian relief work now in Cluster 1 and direct support elements now in Cluster 2, while also building longer-term resilience, within a single framework. Climate change should also be in the new cluster, with environment separate.

## 4.5.1.1. UNDAF Outcome 1.1: Targeted vulnerable households are resilient (capable of meeting their basic needs and withstanding shocks) by 2016.

The UN works in this Outcome to bring together its capacities at the District level to support the government in providing effective, coordinated humanitarian assistance and integrating development programmes on social protection, preventive and curative nutrition, sustainable agricultural productivity enhancement, effective management of the environment and natural resources, and disaster risk management.

Analytical work has been done to enable effective, scaled-up support for resilience and now a robust response to the identified needs is required. First, the UN must fully harmonize its strategic approach. And second, national political will is required to address obstacles caused by the existence of vested interests in maize, drugs and fertilizer.

The 2013 revisions of the UNDAF resulted in the merger of two Outcomes on resilience of households, with very positive results in improved focus. Five indicators were also dropped: they were aggregate indicators, not easily measured or monitored.

### Refugees

Refugee matters are not included in the development agenda. Support to refugee resilience had originally been explicitly included under Outcome 1, but in 2013 targeting was narrowed and reference to refugees removed.

Because of national policies limiting the residence and livelihoods of refugees, they are incapable of meeting their long-term needs and are dependent on external support. Building refugee resilience is a priority for the UN. It should be addressed collectively by the UNCT, as a human rights issue.

Work has taken place around refugee human rights, social services and HIV/AIDs, but only bilaterally with individual agencies. A concerted UN effort is needed to promote national legislation in accord with international standards.

The target for ninety (90%) percent of families to have food reserves in critical months was not appropriate or realistic. The baseline was set using good harvest years, while harvests have been bad since then. There has also not been adequate funding support for the UN to go to scale under the current, worsened conditions. There will still be pockets with inadequate resources.

It is not clear what impact will be made in helping ultra poor and labour constrained households to meet their basic needs and withstand shocks, as there has been no baseline established.

The UN’s initial work encouraging investment in pro-poor private sector growth is a very promising element.

The social support programme will have an overall achievement rate of sixty (60%) percent. There is need for targeting and registration. There is an unanticipated problem of government capacity to scale up. UNICEF is bringing in NGOs and introducing e-pay as a way around this. The plan was feasible but progress was slowed due to these capacity constraints. With its constrained budget, government capacity and funding for implementation are a continuing issue. The UNCT must reexamine its approach in this period when government funding is not available for implementation while substantial international funding remains available.

With five components of social support, linkages are a problem. There is a systems support initiative and a development partner group on social support. There is a focus on gender through a vulnerable groups cluster.

A UN Joint Resilience Programme in Phalombe District has been in preparation through 2014 and has now begun activities led by FAO, coordinating across government, setting up a common District registry for all benefits, and creating harmonized structures. It is a good practice with promise for scaled up impact - a joint demonstration in one district of an integrated social support package. It was slow to begin implementation due to difficulty clarifying roles.

The UN has been highly active in DRM in the face of recurring disasters over the UNDAF period. The time required to start disaster assistance has been reduced substantially. It had been 14 days, and was 7 for the 2015 floods. The target of 5 days will likely be met by end-2016.

Government is providing leadership but its implementation capacity is lacking at national and district levels. South-South cooperation with China on DRM is planned.

The government appreciates the UN, both in providing technical assistance in Disaster Risk Management, and in providing humanitarian relief. It believes the One UN approach helped with the response through the cluster system, which worked well.

For the future, addressing resilience and root causes of vulnerability will be key priorities. Awareness on food security must be built, good farming practices disseminated and drought preparation encouraged, such as by building small dykes.

Strong links need to be created with the environment outcome through reforestation and alternate energy development.

Table 2: Outcome 1.1 Target Achievement - Targeted vulnerable households are resilient (capable of meeting their basic needs and withstanding shocks) by 2016.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 1.1: Targeted vulnerable households are resilient (capable of meeting their basic needs and withstanding shocks) by 2016.** | **Percentage of households with food reserves in critical months** | **78% (2011)** | **90%** | 80% | **EPD (MVAC report), FEWSNET Report)** |
| **Number of ultra poor and labour constrained households able to meet their basic needs and withstand shocks (need baseline and target)** |  |  | 265,000 | **Project Implementation reports (UNICEF, WFP, FAO, UNDP)** |
| Output 1.1.1: National social support programme implemented with enhanced multi-sectorial coordination and information management systems in place | Status of NSSP M&E system | Not fully functional | Fully operational | Fully operational | EPD, UNICEF Progress and Annual Reports |
| Number of programme components with M&E systems aligned to overall NSSP M&E system | 0 | 4 | 4 | EPD, UNICEF, WFP Progress and Annual Reports |
| Number of ultra poor and labour constrained households benefiting from Social support Programme | (Proxy Indicator; 2011: 26,000) | (Proxy Indicator: Dec. 2016: 215,000) | 215,000 | National Social Cash Transfer MIS |
| Output 1.1.2: Targeted vulnerable households are food and nutrition secure through increased and sustainable agricultural productivity. | Percentage of households in targeted areas with food reserves in critical months | 78% in 2011 | 90% in 2016 | 80% | **EPD (MVAC report), FEWSNET Report)** |
| Percentage of under five children underweight in targeted areas | 10.3% in 2010 | 10.3% in 2016 | 13.8% in 2016 | MDHS Report |
| Output 1.1.3: Multi-sectorial disaster risk management capacity developed and humanitarian response effectively delivered. | % of funding gap to cover the humanitarian needs |  | 0% | 0% | **Project Implementation reports (UNICEF, WFP, FAO, UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA)** |
| Average number of days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster (2011: 14 days, Dec 2016: <5 days) | 2011: 14 days | Dec 2016: <5 days | 7 | **Project Implementation reports (UNICEF, WFP, FAO, UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA)** |
| % of affected population provided with humanitarian assistance through national response | 2011/12: | 2016/17: | 100% | **Project Implementation reports (UNICEF, WFP, FAO, UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA)** |

## 4.5.1.2. UNDAF Outcome 1.2: Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016.

The Outcome supports the government in providing an appropriate policy and regulatory framework, and improving data and information on effective environment and natural resources, climate change and disaster risk management. UN support in this area enhances the resilience of vulnerable groups, but also provides the basis for increased and sustainable agricultural production to lift them out of poverty.

In the 2013 revision of the UNDAF the emphasis of the Outcome was moved upstream, providing a greatly improved collective focus (previously the Outcome reflected agency service lines).  Renewable energy technology piloting was removed, as the UN did not have a comparative advantage. Community based activities were moved to Outcome 1.1.

The UN is active at policy level, nationally and in the districts.  A review of the forestry policy has been completed, but has not yet been approved by cabinet. Furthermore, a number of policies still require approval, such as the Climate Change Policy, review of the Environment Management Act, Agriculture Policy and Land Policy. It is important that additional efforts are made to ensure these policies are approved without further delay.

The work of the Outcome now concentrates on mainstreaming policies at national and district levels, including in budgets.  This shift has somewhat reduced impact.   Recently launched projects have had a downstream and community level focus. Connections between upstream and downstream work need to be strengthened.

There has been progress in reducing the national rate of forest loss but there probably will not have been a major reduction in the rate of deforestation by end 2016, due primarily to government concessions to saw mills in the north, and fire (malicious outbreaks in protected areas).  Forest management is not adequate, and the clearance of land remains greater than the regeneration.  The forestry laws are not adequately enforced. A shift of focus to more successful community based protection initiatives is underway.

Repeated flooding in areas with denuded watersheds has shown that forest regeneration protects communities, and there is new support for reforestation. UN agencies can focus efforts towards promoting reforestation among communities through scale up of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) approaches among others, and working together to share knowledge of best practices to enhance effectiveness. As yet there is no integration of work against forest reduction across agencies.

Table 3: Outcome 1.2. Target Achievement - Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **UNDAF Outcome 1.2. Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016.** | **Yearly reduction of forest cover** | **2009: -2.5%** | **0%** | -1% | **Dept of Forestry reports** |
| **Proportion of population using solid fuel** | **98.70%** | **92%** | 89% | **Dept of Energy reports** |
| Output 1.2.1 : Environment, natural resources and climate change mainstreamed in policies, development plans and budgets at national and district level | Resources allocated to ENR, CC and DRM | 2.3 Million USD | 3.5 Million USD | 3.5 Million USD | UNDP reports |
| New policies, development plans and programmes reflecting ENR, CC and DRM concerns | None | 6 Approved | 4 | Project annual reports |
| Number of District Development Plans reflecting ENR, CC and DRM | 3 | 15 | 12 | Project annual reports |
| Output 1.2.2 Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environmental and natural resources degradation collected and made accessible to decision makers in Government, Private Sector and Civil Society | Malawi CC, ENR websites developed, linked to databases and functional | 0 | 2 websites with >1000 hits/month | 2 websites | Project annual reports |
| Number of District climate change information centres | 0 | 15 with updated information | 12 | Project annual reports |
| Output 1.2.3: Coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for CC and ENR established and used at national and district level | Functional Sector Working Groups on CC, ENR | SWG on CC+ENR established | Fully operational SWGs, planning and reporting to MoEPD) | 1 | Project annual reports |
| Number of target Districts coordinating and implementing CC and ENR programmes | 0 | 15 | 6 | Project annual reports |
| CC & ENR Sector funding mechanism in place | No SWAP or functional funding mechanism | Working SWAp or Funding mechanism | 1 | Project annual reports |

## 4.5.1.3. UNDAF Outcome 1.3: Productive poor benefit from decent work, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016

This Outcome aims to integrate smallholder farmers in supply chains and lift progressive farmers into commercial agriculture for both the domestic and export markets. The UN contributes to this goal through support to the development of policies and strategies for government to put in place an enabling environment and operational tools for inclusive private sector growth, including providing decent employment. The UN also directly supports farmers to develop into business entities (associations or cooperatives) and to integrate them into value chains.

The MDGS II looks to transform Malawi from a net importer to an exporter, thereby creating livelihoods and realizing the promise of the “demographic dividend” of a large youth population.

At the macro level, the UN has supported the development of strategies and policies to enable this economic transformation. A national export strategy, an industrial policy and a quality policy are among the products of these efforts. There has been good progress on all frameworks planned. Gender, rights of the poor, and labour standards have been completed and/or approved, while trade and trade testing frameworks are in process. However government has been slow to adopt enabling legislation to or implement these frameworks.

To help government implement, the UN helped create a Trade, Industry and Private Sector (TIP) SWAP. SWAPs for Gender and Youth have been implemented, but have not been as successful, though they brought very positive and important developments in information sharing and coordination among the UN, government and development partners. A national committee on the business enabling environment could be created, as in Rwanda.

The UN has provided a good deal of technical assistance through the SWAPs, and is working on a capacity development plan.

The UN’s focus on decent work reflects a critical perspective, but gender sensitive and rights based policies have not been fully incorporated in these frameworks, and there is no Gender TWG in the TIP SWAP. This reflects the practical limits to the over stretched capacity of UN Women.

In the revision of the UNDAF in 2013, youth and gender were no longer “headlined” but UN Women was added to the Outcome and these issues have been strongly addressed.

In the absence of implementation of the macro strategies, the limited capacities and efforts toward employment of the participating agencies are divided. A more focused strategy for mass employment is needed.

The UNDP Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund has been a major success, creating strong competition from private investors seeking to match development partner grant funding for projects integrating the poor in the supply chain.    The Fund has moved faster and has been more successful than elsewhere.  The scale of projects funded is optimal, as Malawi lacks medium sized companies and a new round of funding is planned.  Many projects have major involvement of women, and a new window on irrigation is being planned.  Over time, as the instrument evolves, the grant amount shall be reduced.  This demonstration initiative has had an outstanding response from the private sector, and should be scaled up as a highest priority, in tandem with the identification of a suitable financing institution to continue investment.

Parallel to the Outcome, WFP is looking to scale up a Purchase for Progress pilot (P4P), which has enhanced market access of over 30 Farmer Organizations. Similarly, WFP is currently talking with several private sector firms on local production of nutritious foods. In many countries including Malawi demand from programmes such as school feeding and nutrition has led to local production.

UN support for export led growth through standardization and metrology have been subject to delays and problems with counterpart resources, but remain essential. The quality act is in place and a metrology act is in process.

For the future, there is need for support to technical assistance in value addition, and support strategies for a value chain approach in existing product lines, such as oil seeds, sugar and assembly products. Support to small-scale miners is an area of potential.

A future focus on livelihoods for youth should be considered, involving advocacy with Government and programmes to support the informal sector employment with working capital, training and markets. Such programmes should linked to efforts to improve quality of livelihoods education so that dropouts and graduates can be more employable.

Targets will be met for improvement of the share of the poorest quintile in national consumption, and the share of women in wage employment in non-agricultural sector. The UN contributes to these gains but they cannot be attributed to it. The problem of livelihoods for the rural poor remains huge.

Table 4: Outcome 1.3. Target Achievement - Productive poor benefit from decent work, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 1.3: Productive poor benefit from decent work, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016.** | **Poor quintile share in national consumption** | **2009: 10.1%** | **2016: 22%** | 28% | **Integrated Household Survey** |
| **Share of women and men in wage employment in non-agriculture sector** | **2006: 15%** | **2016: 20%** | 30% | **Labour Force Survey** |
| Output 1.3.1: Policy frameworks (Employment and labour, Industrialisation, and Trade) are developed with gender and rights based lenses and are in place | # of policies / regulations adopted and gazetted | 0 | 3 | 4 | National Gazette & Database of Policies and Regulations (OPC) |
| Output 1.3.2: TIP Swap, Aswap & JSSP for gender and youth implementation strengthened. | # of capacity development initiatives delivered to respective secretariats | 0 | 3 | 7 | Capacity Development reports (FAO&UNW) |
| Output 1.3.3: National Export Strategy clusters are supported through enterprise and skills development, financial services, cooperative development, promotion of structured markets and national quality infrastructure. | # of farmer organizations (involved in NES product clusters) classified in low and medium capacity level which progress to high capacity | 2011/2012; 11 FOs classified as low capacity and 6 classified as medium capacity | 2014: 10 Fos progressing from medium to high and 17 progressing from low to medium | 15 FOs progressing from medium to high and 20 FOs progressing from low to medium | P4P reports to FICA and FO graduation matrix |
| % of commodities traded through formal platforms | 2012: WFP purchases through ACE were 62% f the total volume traded | Target; WFP purchases through ACE represent 50 % of the total traded. WFP starts purchases through AHCX. | 50% | WFP Procurement records |

## 4.5.1.4. Cluster 1 Funding and Financial Performance

Table 5: Cluster 1 Budget and Expenditure

Table 6: Expected Financing against Targets for Economic Growth and Food Security

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Indicative Resources (2012)** | | | | **Anticipated Expenditure (2016)** | | | **Anticipated Variance (%)** | **Anticipated Variance (USD)** |
| **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Gap** | **Total** | **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Total** |
| **1.1 Resilience and Food Security** | 8,800,043 | 24,663,223 | 22,484,367 | 55,947,633 | 6,000,000 | 213,028,150 | 219,028,150 | 391% | 163,080,517 |
| **1.2 Environment, Climate Change & Disaster Risk Management** | 9,631,000 | 12,839,000 | 15,025,500 | 37,495,500 | 10,980,000 | 14,945,000 | 25,925,000 | 69% | (11,570,500) |
| **1.3 Employment, Labour and Private Sector** | 18,017,000 | 13,040,000 | 2,678,000 | 33,735,000 | 7,254,193 | 22,692,712 | 29,946,905 | 89% | (3,788,095) |
| **Cluster 1 Total** | **36,448,043** | **50,542,223** | **40,187,867** | **127,178,133** | **24,234,193** | **250,665,862** | **274,900,055** | **216%** | **147,721,922** |

## 4.5.2. Cluster 2: Basic Social and Protection Services: National institutions effectively deliver equitable and quality basic social and protection services by 2016.

The Cluster is based on a positive concept of grouping together nearly the entire range of social services and support systems (HIV/AIDS excepted). Very good synergies have been achieved in health. However, except in health the Cluster reflects the service lines and approaches of UNICEF, the overwhelmingly largest agency active in these areas. This is a great strength as it provides a highly capable foundation for implementation and strong results. Conversely, it has made for difficulty integrating other partners, and the number of participating agencies has declined.

The scope of the Cluster is quite wide (Health, Education, WASH, Nutrition, Protection), and there is a need for a more compelling narrative that informs the work and results of the Cluster. The Cluster strategy is being implemented impressively, but it is not adequately linked to the work of other Clusters; its efforts needs to be more specifically supportive of efforts to build resilience, food security and employment. There needs to be a greater link between nutrition, resilience and the humanitarian response. It is also a natural vehicle for promotion of population issues.

Crosscutting issues such as Gender Based Violence have been included but there is still more work to be done. The issue of fistulas should be looked at in more detail. There should be an even greater focus than the present strong focus on the girl child with respect to education. The Protection outcome (2.5) should be better linked with the Gender outcome (4.3). Data should be disaggregated by both gender and age. There should be more of a focus on youth.

## 4.5.2.1. UNDAF Outcome 2.1: The population in selected districts has increased access to equitable and quality essential health services by 2016

With UN support, facilities providing emergency basic and comprehensive obstetric and essential new born care services increased substantially, as did skilled attendance at birth, contributing to a major reduction of maternal mortality[[18]](#footnote-19). Neonatal mortality has not made as much progress (33 to 29 per thousand) with prematurity contributing significantly to the deaths of newborns. Now work is accelerating on the quality of care.

Child mortality has decreased significantly as well, [[19]](#footnote-20) but quality of care remains a concern.

Contraceptive prevalence rate (CPR) is improving. There has been an increase to 33% (MDHS 2010) among women of childbearing age, up from 28% in 2004. Some 90% of facilities have at least three modern methods of family planning (FP). The challenge is use of short term and reversible methods with high failure and discontinuation rates. This challenge is further compounded by a shortage of staff trained to provide a wide range of contraceptives, especially in hard to reach areas. This situation limits choice and method mix. According to 2010 MDHS, 26% of women use the injectable contraception as opposed to about 2% who use implants.

Progress against these key UNDAF indicators reflects the success of the strategy to provide universal access to basic health services, and the slow rate of improvement in their quality.

Targets will largely be achieved but the quality of the services is not at the desired level. Targets on maternal mortality were overambitious, given human resource, health systems support and funding constraints. The UN is working on both access and quality but has made greater progress on access. It is now shifting emphasis to quality of care.

Progress toward UNDAF goals has been slowed by government budgetary constraints, but the diversion of DP funds has led to an increase in funding through the UN. The UN in 2013 provided essential medicines to the health system in Malawi, thereby reducing the levels of morbidity, mortality and contributing to an improved quality of life and wellbeing of the general population. Furthermore, the UN provided support to the immunisation programme for childhood antigens, with coverage of 87% in 2013.

National sources fund 65% of the health budget. A health-financing summit in 2014 addressed the gap in national financing of the sector, but the proposed revenue sources would not be sufficient, and the diversion of donor funds has worsened the problem.

Health planning is done well, but the sector is experiencing difficulties due to budgetary problems. Due to its centrally planned approach, the sector works in silos. Data is available, but not in actionable form. Human resources are also a major concern, with highly centralized systems.

The UNDAF has been effective in bringing UN agencies together around common issues, though outside the UNDAF target areas the agencies still do not work together. Delivering as One has made a significant difference in creating collaborative attitudes. The refocusing of the Outcome in 2013 improved Outcome implementation, as monitoring of the previous, complex indicators had been a challenge. They had also been unachievable, but are now realistic.

Greater effort has been made on mainstreaming gender but there is not a good understanding of issues among gender advocates at the lower levels.

There has been more money mobilized for this Outcome than planned, but this reflects fundraising for emergency medicine rather than Outcome targets.

Support provided by the UN has led to increased skilled birth attendance (SBA). Support has been provided to the government to train more midwives, improve delivery of emergency obstetric care, procure equipment and mobilize pregnant women to deliver under skilled birth attendants through the Presidential Initiative on Safe Motherhood and Maternal Health. The recent MDG end line survey shows that the rate of SBA has increased to 87%. However, more needs to be done to improve the quality of care to reduce the maternal mortality rate, which is still off target.

Measles vaccination has achieved target.

Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) training will not achieve its target. An approach using in-service training did not work, and pre-service training is now being used, which will take until 2018 to meet training targets.

District level disease prevention and control has been a success. Much progress has been made on targets except on blood pressure, which was dropped, and cervical cancer screening, which has not been done. A communication strategy is developed but not yet implemented.

National monitoring and evaluation guidelines have been adopted at district level, along with District strategic multiyear plans, though annual plans are still being used. Introduction of Health Management Information Systems (HMIS) at community level has been a clear success.

The training of District teams in epidemiology was not fruitful as District Health Officer (DHO) turnover was high, and capacity building is now shifting to pre-service training.

For the next UNDAF, a common vision and goal on child mortality are needed. District health teams should be helped to function more efficiently. And health commodities supply chain systems should be improved.

Table 7: UNDAF Outcome 2.1 - The population in selected districts has increased access to equitable and quality essential health services by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **UNDAF Outcome 2.1: The population in selected districts has increased access to equitable and quality essential health services by 2016.** | **Maternal Mortality ratio** | 675/100,000 live births | 155 / 100,000 live births | 459/100,000 | **UN estimate** |
| Neonatal mortality rate | 33/1,000 live births | 22/1,000 live births | 29/1,000 | Programme data and survey data |
| Child Mortality rate | 112/1,000 | 78/1,000 | 33/1,000 | Programme data and survey data |
| Contraceptive prevalence rate | 42% | 60% | 59.60% | Programme data and survey data |
| Output 2.1.1: Quality integrated sexual, reproductive, newborn and child health services promoted, available and accessible at facility and community levels in underserved areas in 17 districts | % skilled attendance at birth | 71% | 95% | 95% | Programme data and survey data |
| % of facilities providing Basic Emergency Obstetric and essential new born care services | 2% | 50% | 50% | Programme data |
| Proportion of one-year-olds received measles vaccination | 93% | >95% | >95% | Programme (EPI) data and survey data |
| Proportion of facilities with at least 2 health workers trained in IMCI | 55% | 100% | 100% | Programme data |
| Number of health facilities providing at least 3 methods of modern family planning |  | 100% | 100% | Programme data |
| Proportion of health facilities providing labour and delivery with functional KMC units | 24% | 75% | 80% | Programme data |
| Output 2.1.2: District Health offices, district councils, community governance structures in 17 districts have capacity to implement comprehensive integrated health promotion, disease prevention and control intervention | Proportion of women of child bearing age (15-49) screened for cervical cancer using Visual Inspection with Acetic acid (VIA) | 5% | 20% | 30% | Programme data |
| Number of districts implementing National communication strategy on Population and Development | 0 | 17 | 17 | Programme data |
| Output 2.1.3: District health offices, district councils, community governance structures in 17 districts have capacity to effectively plan, implement, monitor and evaluate the new health sector strategic plan | National guidelines for implementing the updated health policy developed and adopted at district level |  |  | 17 | Programme data |
| Number of districts with multiyear strategic plans | 0 | 17 | 17 | Programme data |
| Number of district teams trained on basic epidemiology | 0 | 17 | 17 | Programme data |
| Number of districts with functioning DHIS 2 | 0 | 17 | 17 | Programme data |

## 4.5.2.2. UNDAF Outcome 2.2: Children under five years of age, pregnant women and lactating mothers in selected districts have access to and use quality nutrition services by 2016.

Nutrition is a major challenge that must be addressed with both direct support and development interventions. Stunting of children is at emergency levels in Malawi. While the percentage of stunted children is going down significantly it will not meet the target by end-2016.

Other key indicators are being addressed strongly, but progress has been slow. The promotion of breastfeeding is gearing up. The percentage of underweight children has in fact increased, as it has worsened in peri-urban areas where the UN was not present.

Previously, the UN and DPs focused on rural areas, as NGOs are active in urban areas. However, it is now understood that the NGOs only work in discreet projects, and do not provide full coverage to the wider area, and the UN will move into those peri-urban areas with high needs. This lesson is important in the context of the diversion of pool funding from government to the UN and NGOs, and stronger coordination with NGO groups should be considered.

The issue of stunting was previously accorded national prominence through campaigns run from the Office of the President. Nutrition has now been moved to the Ministry of Health. This has delayed the national nutrition strategy.

Enabling factors to address under-nutrition in Malawi include national political will and availability of legal frameworks and policies. Factors that affected progress are inadequate funding and commitments from government in nutrition; government capacity, serious structural issues including food culture and eating habits and how nutrition is thought about in the country.

The UN contributes towards prevention of stunting through the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) roll out in 6 districts as well as the role UN has played in development of a Nutrition Education and Communication strategy (NECS), as well as WFP’s operational research in Ntchisi through it’s prevention of stunting pilot programme, which is generating evidence and best practices for the scale-up of stunting prevention activities.

The UN is also improving the situation through evidence-based advocacy, like the Cost of Hunger in Africa Study, and strengthening system accountability through investment in Nutrition Surveillance Systems.

There are still big gaps when it comes to national capacity to monitor and implement the programme of treatment of moderate acute malnutrition.

The programme to address acute malnutrition has been rolled out in all 29 districts, though the target was 17. It is government-led (it is NGO-led in most countries). It has assisted in emergencies as well. Its great achievement is due to capacity building. The Districts were ready and simply need resources.

This is an excellent example of success in capacity building. It underscores the point that in a number of core service areas (including health, education and agriculture) there is a cohort of dedicated, motivated and well-trained government staff. UN efforts can leverage these capacities for results more easily than in other areas.

Progress is being made on fortification and micronutrients, though it appears that funding has not been optimally allocated. Progress is being made on the ground, and the participating agencies are learning from each other.

The Outcome was previously poorly coordinated, but now operates collaboratively, with a division of labor between agencies. UN agencies coordinate within a donor nutrition group, never meting as UN but always with partners. The UN nutrition team uses a harmonized methodology. Each agency has a role within a multi-sectorial national platform. This is a good practice to be emulated.

The complexity of work in the Districts creates cross-sectorial problems and joint programming has been agreed upon for the future. Agencies are now doing joint monitoring. The lack of a joint information management surveillance system is a challenge.

Work on gender has been limited to disaggregation of data, which show no disparities. A gender strategy for nutrition is now being developed.

The Outcome has been very well funded, but this increase has enabled an expansion of direct support, which may divert attention from building sustainability.

Table 8: Outcome 2.2 Target Achievement - Children under five years of age, pregnant women and lactating mothers in selected districts have access to and use quality nutrition services by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 2.2. Children under five years of age, pregnant women and lactating mothers in selected districts have access to and use quality nutrition services by 2016.** | **Percentage of children under 5 years stunted** | **47%** | **39%** | 42.4% | **2014 MDG Endline Survey** |
| **Percentage of children under 5 years underweight** | **12%** | **12%** | 16.7% | **2015 MDG Endline Survey** |
| **Percentage of children 0-5 months old Exclusively Breastfed** | **71%** | **80%** | 70.2% | **2016 MDG Endline Survey** |
| Output 2.2.1 The Nutrition Act developed, policies reviewed and incorporated in relevant SWAPs and District Development Plans. | Nutrition Act in place | 0 | 1 | Draft | DNHA Report |
| NNPSP revised and timeframe extended to 2013-2017 |  |  | Revised and awaiting Cabinet Approval | DNHA Report |
| Number of DIPs with nutrition interventions incorporated and budgeted | 0 | 20 | 6 (Neno, Mulanje, Nkhatabay, Kasungu, Mzimba and Ntchisi) | 2014 UNDAF Annual report |
| Output 2.2.2 Management of moderate and acute malnutrition including PLHIV/TB program scaled-up in districts for quality services | Increased coverage of CMAM program in 15 districts | 70% | 95% | OTP = 89% (562 out 628);  NRU= 100% (100 out of 100);  SFP 84% (534 out of 628). | CMAM Database |
| Number of PLHIV reached with nutrition treatment care and support (2010 - 1319 , 2016 18,700 | 1319 | 18700 | 13,919 | WFP Program Report |
| Cure rate of moderate and severe acute malnutrition maintained in both facility and community level | 70% | 80% | SAM = 87.3% & MAM= 91.9% | CMAM Database |
| Percentage CMAM sites with demonstration gardens. | 11% | 25% | No data |  |
| Output 2.2.3 Quality assurance and surveillance systems established for fortification and capacities developed at national and district levels for micronutrient supplementation | Coverage of Vitamin A supplementation in 6 - 59 months children | 85.60% | 98% | 83% | MoH Program data (round 1 of CHDs in 2014) |
| Proportion of households consuming adequately iodised salt | 97% | 100% | 80% | Ministry of Health National Fortification Monitoring Reports |
| Percentage of under-five children and general population consuming adequately fortified sugar | 0% | 90% | 80% | Illovo Sugar Factory Production Figures from QA/QC Reports |
| Output 2.2.4 Households in 7 UN supported districts adopt recommended practices that support maternal nutrition, infant and young child feeding and care. | Scale Up Nutrition (SUN) / 1000 Special Days Campaign operationalised | 0 | 15 | 6 (Neno, Mulanje, Nkhatabay, Kasungu, Mzimba and Ntchisi) | 2014 UNDAF Annual report |
| Behaviour change communication materials standardised and being used for complementary feeding at household level. | 0 | 15 | 5 | DNHA Report |
| Proportion of households with nutrition gardens. | 10% | 20% | No data | No data |

## 4.5.2.3. UNDAF Outcome 2.3: Rural and peri-urban underserved areas in selected districts have access to integrated safe water supply, sanitation, hygiene and environmental health services by 2016.

The UN will largely realize its Outcome results statement for the Districts in which it works.

Some 84% of the population in Malawi has access to protected water sources. Malawi surpassed the MDG 7 target of 67%, as well as the national goal under the MGDS (75% by 2016). Nationally, improved sanitation is estimated to be only 53%. While this represents a marked improvement from 1990 when it was recorded as 42%, it is not sufficient to meet the sanitation MDG target. However, the UN will meet or surpass its target for water and sanitation in the 15 districts in which it works.

Malawi continues to record improvements in reducing open defecation (OD) with 94% of the population in the target districts having access to basic sanitation. These improvements mean that children and women in the communities served with clean water sources and sanitation are less likely to be affected by water-borne and sanitation related disease.

Open Defecation Free (ODF) Malawi by 2015 and the National Hand Washing Campaign strategies were rolled out to all 28 districts. This has contributed to 10% of villages in Malawi attaining ODF status. School Led Total Sanitation is being rolled out, and National School Sanitation Standards are being developed. The National Hand Washing Campaign Strategy was also rolled out to all 28 districts.

This Outcome is on track to meet or exceed the majority of its targets, and will substantially achieve the others. It has clearly had success in framing and implementing a strategy that has produced consistent results.

Table 9: Outcome 2.3. Target Achievement - Rural and peri-urban underserved areas in selected districts have access to integrated safe water supply, sanitation, hygiene and environmental health services by 2016.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 2.3 Rural and peri-urban underserved areas in selected districts have access to integrated safe water supply, sanitation, hygiene and environmental health services by 2016** | **Percentage of women and children using improved water supply in 15 districts.** | **75%** | **85%** | 85% |  |
| **Percentage of women and children using basic sanitation in 15 districts.** | **75%,** | **85%** | 93% |  |
| **Percentage of women and children using hand washing facilities in 15 districts.** | **75%,** | **85%** | 80% |  |
| Output 2.3.1: National and district coordination and strategies for the efficient and effective delivery of sustainable safe water supply, sanitation, hygiene and environmental health services to peri-urban and rural areas in place by 2016. | Number of strategies for efficient delivery of safe water, sanitation developed. | 0 | 3 | 3 | JMP |
| Number of cities implementing health cities initiative. | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| Output 2.3.2: New and rehabilitated water supply facilities equitably distributed in communities and schools in 15 districts and selected peri-urban areas by 2016 | Districts with equitable distribution of Community Water points. | 0 | 15 | 15 | JMP |
| Districts with equitable distribution of primary school water points. | 0 | 15 | 15 | JMP |
| Number of cities with equitable distribution of Urban Communal water points. | 0 | 6 | 2 | EU/UN-Habitat Grant Contract 2014/353-453 |
| Output 2.3.3: Open Defecation Free Malawi strategy fully operational in 15 districts by 2016. | Number of districts with full operationalization of the open Defecation free Malawi strategy. | 0 | 15 | 15 | JMP |
| Percentage of primary schools with adequate sanitation facilities. | 23% | 60% | 50% | JMP |
| Number of Main Urban Centres with adequate integrated and sustainable solid waste management services. | 0 | 6 | 1 | UN-Habitat/CCODE PSUP AoC 2015 |
| Output 2.3.4: Effective interventions for the promotion of hygiene practices fully implemented in communities; schools and CBCCs in 15 districts by 2016 | Number of districts with effective Hand Washing with Soap (HWWS) intervention strategy. | 0 | 15 | 15 | Welfare Monitoring Survey |
| number of schools promoting effective school hygiene promotion. | 0 | 2,000 | 1500 |  |
| number of CBCC's promoting HWWS. | 45 | 1,500 |  | UNICEF annual Reports |
| Output 2.3.5: Communities in 15 districts are able to promote use and sustainably operate and maintain their water points by 2016 | Number of trained Area mechanics supporting water point committees | 450 | 600 | 600 | UNICEF annual Reports |
| percentage of viable water supply facilities function as per specifications. | 70% | 95% | 80% | JMP |
| Percentage of water point committees with established pump maintenance fund. | TBD | 95% | 80% | UNICEF annual Reports |

## 4.5.2.4. UNDAF Outcome 2.4: Boys and Girls of school-going age in selected low performing districts enroll, are retained, learn, and complete basic education by 2016.

To contribute towards MDG 2 (universal primary education) the UN has concentrated in 10 districts of the 17 UNDAF focus districts, based on collective criteria and performance in the previous UNDAF.[[20]](#footnote-21) It is on track to make substantial progress toward realization of this Outcome result statement.

Cultural factors discourage the participation of girls in school, especially in the central and southern regions. In response, the Girls Education Joint Programme was developed for three districts, in which the UN agencies concentrate on the same schools and communities. This is a good practice that should be a model for other initiatives. Results were defined jointly first, and only then was agency programming done.

Net enrollment in primary school is on track for a significant increase by 2016, though it will fall short of the target. The percentage of girls who complete their primary education will similarly show gains, nearly reaching the target. Achievement is hampered by repetition of grades and dropouts. Repetition of grade has been between 20% and 30%, but is now being caped at 10%.

The UN should now also consider supporting a strategy for the improvement of the quality of education.

The gender parity index at Standard 8 is moving positively, but the target of full parity will not be achieved. Dropouts occur at every grade but are significant at Standards 5, 6 and 7 (ages 11 to 13) as girls are initiated as women at 12 and begin to marry. There are reasons for optimism, as the UN has helped promote the new law raising the age of marriage to 18, has worked to cut the rate of repetition of grades, and to improve the quality of primary education.

The target for increases in community-based childcare is also on track, though the target will not be fully achieved.

Ongoing reforms look to expand secondary education opportunities, which are currently quite limited. There is already a requirement of gender parity in secondary admission.

In contrast to this positive picture, the Outcome area is faced with a major systems issue: the sector is directly and seriously impacted by the diversion of aid from pooled funding. Donors are now working through discreet projects, reducing coherence and impact. This is the only Outcome in Cluster 2 that has not achieved full funding, for the same reasons.

Table 10: Outcome 2.4. Target Achievement - Boys and Girls of school-going age in selected low performing districts enroll, are retained, learn, and complete basic education by 2016.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 2.4 Boys and Girls of school-going age in selected low performing districts enroll, are retained, learn, and complete basic education by 2016.** | **NER in primary** | **83%** | **90%** | 95% |  |
| **% of girls who complete primary education** | **31%** | **40%** | 47% |  |
| **GPI in std. 8** | **0.83** | **1.01** | 0.9 |  |
| **NER in CBCC's** | **30%** | **45%** | 50% |  |
| **Enrolment of young people in youth friendly services** |  |  | n/a |  |
| Output 2.4.1 All primary schools in 10 low performing districts meet five components of the Child Friendly School standards | Pupil : classroom ratio in 10 low performing districts | 1:130 | 1:90 | 1:90 |  |
| Pupil : latrine ratio in 10 low performing districts | 1:136 | 1:110 | 1:110 |  |
| Teacher : pupils ratio in 10 low performing districts | 1:90 | 1:60 | 1:60 |  |
| Output 2.4.2 The most vulnerable out-of-school non-literate adolescents and young people have basic literacy and numeracy skills in 10 districts | Illiteracy rate among young people 14-24 years | 2010: 18 % Females and 13 % Males | 9% Females and 6.5% Males | 8% Females and 5% Males | Joint Sector Strategy  For Gender, Children,  Youth and Sports |
| Number of out of school children, Youth and Adolescents enrolled in Friendly Centers | 0 | 20,000 | 20,000 | Joint Sector Strategy  For Gender, Children,  Youth and Sports |
| Number of Youth Friendly Centers | 0 | 600 | 600 | Joint Sector Strategy  For Gender, Children,  Youth and Sports |
| Output 2.4.3 Children 0-8 years of age especially the most vulnerable in rural areas receive quality Early Childhood Development services in 10 districts | Community based child care (CBCC) net enrolment | 2010: 30% | 40% | 40% | Ministry of Gender |
| % of children having accessed some form of ECD or pre-school before enrolling in Standard 1 | (2010: 10%) | 40% | 40% | Ministry of Gender |
| Output 2.4.4 National and local institutions scale up school meals to primary school children in 13 districts. | Percentage of schools with school feeding programme | 2010: 30% | 38% | 38% | Ministry of Education |
| Pupils access to school meals | 2010: 691,000 pupils | 760,000 | 879,100 | WFP |

## 4.5.2.5. UNDAF Outcome 2.5: Children, young people and women are better protected from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect and have access to an expanded range of protection services by 2016.

Strong efforts are being made to help build protection services, but it is now clear that by the end of 2016 these will not have reduced violence, abuse and neglect significantly. Earlier estimates of Gender Based Violence (GBV) greatly underestimated the problem, and it is only now becoming clear that cultural factors maintaining complaisant attitudes are very strong. Another contributing factor to child abuse is the limited knowledge by parents and other caregivers on child rights and protection issues. Targeted advocacy interventions could be effective to help address this. A major, extended effort will be needed to change this dynamic.

Very good progress was made on creating resources for prevention and referral, and structures for the protection of women and children, such as the one-stop centres in 9 districts, 300 community victim support units, 101 police victim support units and a child helpline. Numerous early childhood Community Based Care Centres (CBCCs) and 512 Children Corners have been established and are providing support to nearly 100,000 children.

Laws and regulations for the protection of women and children will have been put in place by end-2016, but not yet implemented. There will be a major issue around implementation and enforcement.

There will be institutional systems in place in all districts by end-2016. This five-year period concludes the modelling phase. In the next phase, capacity of these systems will need to be strengthened greatly. The traditional approach using workshops has not been successful, and the programme is now focussing on mentoring and a pre-service curriculum.

Access to services has been created (albeit in 10 Districts rather than 28). Thus far these are focused on response rather than prevention, and case management is a challenge. There is also need to ensure the remaining 18 districts are targeted.

This concentration on service provision has not had the desired impact and a new approach focusing on the architecture of response is now being piloted in 7 Districts.

There remains a key gap at supervisory level and one hundred managers are being put through a degree course in social work. The perceived lower status of District Social Welfare Officers (DSWOs) is a concern.

Progress is being made on accountability mechanisms.

The Outcome has been fully funded.

Table 11: Outcome 2.5 Target Achievement - Children, young people and women are better protected from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect and have access to an expanded range of protection services by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 2.5 Children, young people and women are better protected from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect and have access to an expanded range of protection services by 2016.** | **Percentage of women who have ever experienced physical or sexual violence since the age of 15** | **25%** | **15%** | Minimal change |  |
| **Child Protection Systems Index** |  | **Level 3** | Level 2 |  |
| Output 2.5.1: Legal and regulatory frameworks and coordination mechanism for Gender Based Violence and Child Protection in place and enforced by 2016 | Number of district child protection committees that have in place plan for child protection in emergencies | 6 | 28 | 28 (Target already met by Dec 2014) | UNICEF RAM Report Dec 2014 |
| Number of districts that have implemented 75% of their multi stakeholder child protection plan | 0 | 28 | 10 | UNICEF RAM Report Dec 2015 |
| Number of districts with functioning technical coordination mechanism for GBV | 0 | 28 |  |  |
| Output 2.5.2: Institutional capacity for delivering protective services enhanced and accountability mechanism for demonstrating results in place in all 28 districts by 2016 | Number of districts meeting agreed minimum standards of human, infrastructure and financial resources for child protection | 0 | 7 | 4 | Child Protection model Districts |
| Annual government allocation for child protection increased |  | 500% | 0 (It has actually been going down in real terms) | Government Budget docs |
| A Child Protection Information management System (CPIMS) that tracks victims and survivors of violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect in place by 2014 | No | Yes | Yes | CPIMS progress reports |
| Output 2.5.3: Children, young people and women in 28 districts have increased access to prevention and response interventions including case management and referral services, by 2016. | Number of cases of violence against women and children officially reported to authorities increased | 9279 | 50,000 | 20,000 | PVSUs, Unicef supported OSCs and CVSUs |
| 75% of children under 2 years registered | ≤1 | 75% | <5% | Based on figure from 2011 WMS |
| Proportion of children officially registered in Child Protection Information System that have an individual case plan | 0 | 75% | 20% | Assuming a third of the cases registered within the year left will have case plans |

(Note: Figures given are based on UN estimates and do not represent official data)

## 4.5.2.6. Cluster 2 Funding and Financial Performance

Table 12: Cluster 2 Budget and Expenditure

Table 13: Anticipated Financing Against Targets for Basic Social and Protection Services

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Indicative Resources (2012)** | | | | **Anticipated Expenditure (2016)** | | | **Anticipated Variance (%)** | **Anticipated Variance (USD)** |
| **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Gap** | **Total** | **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Total** |
| **2.1 Health Services** | 15,674,500 | 7,045,476 | 20,334,358 | 43,054,334 | 11,448,425 | 63,384,463 | 74,832,888 | 174% | 31,778,554 |
| **2.2 Nutrition Services** | 16,592,226 | 12,156,774 | 20,724,923 | 49,473,923 |  |  | 55,744,753 | 113% | 6,270,830 |
| **2.3 Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Services** | 3,532,000 | 18,019,358 | 13,189,385 | 34,740,743 | 2,162,304 | 34,936,072 | 37,098,376 | 107% | 2,357,633 |
| **2.4 Education** | 31,752,124 | 36,073,159 | 39,150,436 | 106,975,719 |  |  | 98,472,928 | 92% | (8,502,791) |
| **2.5 Protection Services** | 4,154,990 | 6,818,335 | 7,788,985 | 18,762,310 | 1,950,000 | 18,545,000 | 20,495,000 | 109% | 1,732,690 |
| **Cluster 2 Total** | **71,705,840** | **80,113,102** | **101,188,087** | **253,007,029** | **15,560,729** | **116,865,535** | **286,643,945** | **113%** | **33,636,916** |

## 4.5.3. Cluster 3: HIV and AIDS: National response to HIV and AIDS scaled up to achieve Universal Access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support by 2016.

A separate Cluster was created for HIV/AIDs as a matter of UN regional policy, as the national prevalence rate was over 10%. This gives visibility and focus to work in the area, but has not helped in leveraging partners and resources. The approach should be reexamined.

The work of the Cluster has been impressive, especially in innovations such as the B+ model of providing immediate anti-retroviral treatment to HIV positive pregnant women, and successes in treatment. More remains to be done in prevention and the enabling environment. And sustainability of financing of the national response remains a critical concern.

The original design of Cluster 3 proved too complex, and in the 2013 revision the overall structure of the Cluster was revised from 4 Outcomes to 2 Outcomes, and from 14 Outputs to 8 Outputs. This has greatly simplified programme management and encouraged joint programming.

Outcome 3.1 (Prevention) and Outcome 3.2 (Treatment) were merged into a single Prevention and Treatment Outcome. The rationale is that globally, the latest evidence shows that treatment is prevention.

Outcome 3.3 (Discrimination/Protection) and Outcome 3.4 (Legal and Policy Environment) have been merged into a single Enabling Environment Outcome.

#### Figure 4: Structure of Outcome Three on HIV/AIDS

**Original Structure**

**Current Structure**

There has also been a focus on greater synergies across the Cluster, and on joint work. Lead agencies have been assigned to Annualised Key Results and there has been a prioritisation of activities. A Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS has been established.

## 4.5.3.1. UNDAF Outcome 3.1: Key and vulnerable populations have equitable access to and uptake of quality gender sensitive HIV prevention and treatment services

The modifications of the UNDAF Outcomes and Indicators made by the UNCT in late 2013 had radical and beneficial effects on the Outcome. Previously, Prevention and Treatment were separate Outcomes, with far too many Indicators: 14 at Outcome level. They were merged and streamlined. Agencies and their staff are now accountable for the Outcomes.

In addition to a great managerial improvement, this revision provided for an improved strategy, in which “prevention is treatment”. A recent study showed a long-term decline in HIV before ART, only ascribable to prevention efforts. The focus also changed from the less attainable “three zeros” vision to the achievable “90/90/90” targets (90% of all people living with HIV will know their HIV status, 90% of all people diagnosed with HIV will receive sustained antiretroviral therapy, and 90% of all people receiving antiretroviral therapy will have durable suppression).

This successful approach is offset by increasing “donor fatigue” after 30 years, as other emerging issues claim limited resources. The AIDS response is not sustainable in the longer term. As treatment increases, the issue of how to sustain it becomes ever more difficult, with 30,000 new cases per year, at a treatment cost of $2,000 per person. Government has committed $8.5million to procure ARVs for the period 2015-2017, indicating the priority it accords the response, but a durable solution must be sought.

Table 14: Outcome 3.1 Target Achievement - Key and vulnerable populations have equitable access to and uptake of quality gender sensitive HIV prevention and treatment services

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 3.1.: Key and vulnerable populations have equitable access to and uptake of quality gender sensitive HIV prevention and treatment services** | **% of adults 15-49 who had more than 1 sexual partner in the past 12 months and who report use of a condom during their last sexual encounter.** | **Female: 30 Male: 40** | **Female: 47 Male: 57** | Female: 35.4% Male: 35.4% | **MDHS** |
| **Percentage of women and men aged 15-24 who both correctly identify ways of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV and who reject major misconceptions about HIV transmission** | **Women:41% Men:45%** | **75%** | Women: 44.2% Men: 51.1% | **MDHS** |
| **Percentage of HIV infected pregnant women who receive ARVs to reduce the risk of MTCT** | **40%** | **70%** | 72% | **MOH** |
| Output 3.1.1. National Instistutions have the capacity to deliver evidence based high impact combination HIV prevention and treatment services for key and vulnerable populations | Number of new national institutions supported to deliver high impact HIV prevention and treatment interventions (HTC, VMMC, PMTCT, ART) | 15 | 20 | 20 | UNDAF M&E Framework |
| Output 3.1.2: National institutions and districts have adequate drugs, test kits, reagents, equipment, SRH commodities available. | Proportion of HFs and other outlets (only for condoms) reporting no stock outs of drugs, commodities and equipment for high impact interventions | 100 | 120 | 120 | HTSS |
| Proportion of condom distribution outlets (CBDAs, youth clubs, sex worker condoms distribution outlets) reporting no stock outs. | 40% | 100% | 60% | HTSS |
| Output 3.1.3: National policies and strategies are developed/updated to enable implementation of high impact HIV combination prevention interventions | National policies and strategies in place. | 1 | 4 |  | UNDAF M&E Framework |
| 3.1.4 Communities are empowered to demand, access and utilize SRH and HIV services | Number of clients accessing and utilizing the services increased by 30% | 45% | 75% | 67% | MOH |

## 4.5.3.2. UNDAF Outcome 3.2: Critical enablers for the implementation of the national response enhanced and utilized by 2016

AIDS protection, legal and policy support has been poorly funded. Non-core funding has not proved to be available to the UN for HIV/AIDS work. UNDP and UNICEF have both had shortfalls. Donors are shifting into new areas such as energy and climate change, and only funding UN in this area when it has strengths they don’t have.

The scope of the UN’s planned legislative work was reduced during this UNDAF period as there were too many controversial issues politically to address successfully. The UN will come close to achieving its target on the number of policies produced. It will fall short on the number of sector strategies produced: only seven of ten planned, and these are somewhat generic as there was only a strategic plan this year. The target for funding through local councils was unrealistic and will not be achieved. Instead, the UN will concentrate on working with the six pilot councils. M&E is starting only this year.

The national response has been suitably resourced. The UN is helping government do modeling and planning. However, the work is not yet institutionalized in the optimal location within government.

National indictors have not moved positively as resources have been cut. Donors had been providing budget support, and when this was cut, government had to scale back funding planned for HIV/AIDS.

Table 15: Outcome 3.2 Target Achievement - Critical enablers for the implementation of the national response enhanced and utilized by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 3.2: Critical enablers for the implementation of the national response enhanced and utilized by 2016** | **Percentage of Government Budget allocated to HIV and AIDS ( 2011: <3%, Dec 2016: at least 5 %)** | **< 3%** | **>= 5%** | **<3%** |  |
| **Percentage of financial resources allocated to HIV and AIDS provided to local councils (Dec 2011: 0.44, Dec 2016: 2%)** | **0.44%** | **2%** | **<1%** |  |
| **National Composite Policy Index (2010: 8.4 Dec 2016: 9)** | **8.4** | **9** | **<9** |  |
| Output 3.2.1 National institutions have capacity to develop and implement human rights and gender-appropriate HIV and AIDS related legal frameworks, policies, plans and strategies. | # of HIV sensitive legislations enacted that are also human rights- and gender-appropriate | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| # of public institutions, large private companies and informal sector associations that have HIV/AIDS workplace policies and mainstreaming programmes (2010: 105; 2016: 150) | 105 | 150 | 140 | Labour Inspection reports |
| # of sector strategies/plans that have mainstreamed HIV and AIDS 2010: 3; 2016: 10 | 3 | 10 | 6 | Sectorial reports |
| Output 3.2.2: Gendered, rights based strategic information generated, accessed and utilized by all stakeholders. | % of district councils that utilize strategic information in programme planning and implementation. | 0 | 80% | 21% |  |
| # of HIV related studies supported by the UN system for strategic information | 0 | 20 | 10 |  |
| % of district councils with staff trained in policy, monitoring, evaluation, and resource tracking in line with the Three Ones | 18% | 100% | 21% |  |
| Output 3.2.3 : National response is sustainably resourced | Domestic resource mobilisation strategy developed | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |
| % reduction of annual funding gap (Baseline: 0%, Target:20%) | 0% | 20% | 5% |  |
| Output 3.2.4: Most vulnerable populations are protected from adverse impacts of HIV and AIDS by 2016 | % of vulnerable households that benefit from IM services |  |  |  |  |
| Number of vulnerable individuals that benefit from IM (disaggregated appropriately) |  |  |  |  |

## 4.2.3.3 Cluster 3 Funding and Financial Performance

Table 16: Cluster 3 Budget and Expenditure

Table 17: Anticipated Financing against Targets for HIV and Aids

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Indicative Resources (2012)** | | | | **Anticipated Expenditure (2016)** | | | **Anticipated Variance (%)** | **Anticipated Variance (USD)** |
| **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Gap** | **Total** | **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Total** |
| **3.1 HIV Prevention and Treatment Services** | 13,137,933 | 25,455,317 | 23,645,544 | 62,238,794 |  |  | 38,825,517 | 62% | (23,413,277) |
| **3.2 Enabling Environment** | 8,255,000 | 15,056,981 | 13,109,370 | 36,421,351 |  |  | 11,328,550 | 31% | (25,092,801) |
| **Cluster 3 Total** | **21,392,933** | **40,512,298** | **36,754,914** | **98,660,145** | **0** | **0** | **50,154,067** | **51%** | **(48,506,078)** |

## 4.5.4. Cluster 4: Governance and Human Rights - National institutions effectively support transparency, accountability, participatory democracy and human rights by 2016.

The Governance and Human Rights cluster focuses on institutional capacity development to advance transparency, accountability and democracy. Themes include Democratic Governance, Integrated Rural Development with a focus on people centred decentralisation, Development Effectiveness, Population Management and Family Planning.

The UN supports the Democratic Governance SWAP and coordination of democratic governance interventions in Malawi through the Sector Working Group (SWG).

The UN supports national capacity and ownership of development assistance to ensure government capacity to negotiate, manage, monitor, report and account for aid in line with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

Focussing specifically on adolescent girls, particularly in rural areas, the UN advocates for legislative change around gender equality, early marriage and gender based violence.

The UN provides policy expertise and supports the Government to integrate population dynamics in development policies and programmes.

Governance, public sector capacity development, human rights, gender equality and population and development are all critical issues in Malawi, and are areas of strong comparative advantage for the UN, but the UNCT recognizes that it needs to do much more to make real and lasting impact. In 2014 it became painfully clear that some of the most important Outcome targets related to these crosscutting issues were not going to be met.

For instance, progress toward gender goals has been greatly slowed by the tenacity of traditional cultural norms and poor national counterpart capacity. Data on issues such as GBV has shown a far deeper problem than previously realized.

Resource mobilization and delivery have been very disappointing: by end-2016 an overall average of only 45% of plan will have been spent in the Cluster. And the situation has been particularly acute for Gender (36% funded) and Population (25% funded).

Further, accountability issues in 2013 showed that work in public sector accountability had not had the full desired effect, while the donor withdrawal of budget support in response further limited the counterpart support essential to the implementation of laws and policies developed with support of the Cluster.

In the 2013 review of the UNDAF there were no major revisions to the structure of the Cluster nor were there any major changes to Outcomes. For the Democratic Governance Outcome (4.1), a number of the Outputs were merged and a new Peace and Development Output created.

Nevertheless, there is clear need to revise and re-focus this Cluster. Governance is an issue that affects all sectors and the UN needs to be clearer on how its work supports them. Should thoroughgoing public sector reform take place, the UN must use its comparative advantages in development strategy and public sector accountability to influence the process.

There should also now be less focus on developing and reviewing policies and strategies and a greater focus on their implementation. There should also be more of a focus on statistics and using data to guide national decision-making.

And the next UNDAF should do more to address the policies needed to support livelihoods for youth.

## 4.5.4.1. UNDAF Outcome 4.1: National institutions foster democratic governance for all, especially children, women, persons with disabilities and the youths by 2016

The Outcome was designed to foster democratic governance through national institutions, reflecting a UNDP approach, rather than as a broad-based human rights based approach in support of the goals of all of the Clusters. The 2013 review of the UNDAF changed its focus to reflect the broader UN emphasis on governance and disadvantaged groups. However, the Outcome still encompasses some very different initiatives, with a consequent loss of coherence.

The democratic governance sector strategy is in place, and the UN is now working on funding for implementation. There is currently a leadership gap and the Outcome Group is not dynamic for the moment.

There are many programmes underway to enhance the ability of rights holders to hold duty bearers accountable, and information on rights is being widely disseminated. However, targets were overambitious, and the scale of the UN initiatives was not sufficient. National capacities are also limited: the Human Rights Commission has offices only in Lilongwe and Blantyre.

There has been reinforcement of the formal justice system, and systems to respond to GBV. Accessibility has improved, and there is an increase in the proportion of the population using these systems, especially for children, but the indicator was quite ambitious. More pro bono legal representation is needed, but financial sustainability is an issue.

The UN’s work to increase citizen participation in the 2014 elections did not result in much greater voter turnout, but turnout has gone up, and civic institutions are very active. The UN’s work to support strong national interest in the elections was a good practice.

Almost all of the districts have devolved powers. Now there is need to build capacity of council members and citizens. However, nationally appropriated funds are not always transferred to the Districts, and local fees go to a central fund. The UN should work on building the tax base of the Districts. Local governance is being strengthened, and work is being done toward making local planning data based and participatory.

The work of the UN in Peace Architecture materially assisted in avoiding election-related conflict: all 12 Presidential candidates signed a “peace deal”. National partners are keen that this initiative remains in place.

For the future, priority should be given to building the capacity of national institutions that have not received support, to ensure accountability. Support should also be provided to District councilors, the justice system (such as the judiciary and Ministry of Justice), and the Human Rights Commission. Assistance should also be provided to address identified gaps in the electoral system.

Sustainability is an issue that requires attention in the next UNDAF. Continuous training, reinforcement and consistency of messaging are required for lasting change. Human rights education should be included systematically within the school curriculum.

For the future, it may be useful to consider creating a separate Outcome encompassing human rights broadly.

So far, UN work on gender and children has been focused on institutions. The UN now needs to go further.

Table 18: Outcome 4.1 Target Achievement - Governance and Human Rights - National institutions effectively support transparency, accountability, participatory democracy and human rights by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** |
| **Outcome 4.1: National institutions foster democratic governance for all, especially children, women, persons with disabilities and the youths by 2016** | **Proportion of the public holding duty bearers accountable.** | **40%** | **65%** | 70% |
| **Proportion of people (men, women, youth, children) accessing formal justice.** | **10%** | **60%** | 15% |
| **Voter turnout** | **70%** | **90%** | 70.62% |
| Output 4.1.1 Democratic Governance sector strategy operationalized | Number of sector institutions with M&E frameworks aligned with DGSS | 0 | 19 | 14 |
| Number of Development Partners aligning their support to the DGSS | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| % voter turn-out | 70 | 90 | 70 |
| Proportion of women elected during Presidential and Parliamentary Election) | 22 | 33 | 16.50% |
| A gender responsive National Human Rights Action Plan for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights Developed and implemented | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of institutions aligning to a coordinated mechanism for human rights | 0 | 9 | 6 |
| % of rural and urban population able to claim human rights (disaggregated by Gender) | 16% females; 19% males; 20% urban; 17% rural | 50% Males: 50% Females; 50% Urban; 50 % rural |  |
| Output 4.1.2: Capacity of national institutions strengthened for collaborative dialogue to support the establishment and operationalization of the national peace architecture | Number of districts piloting early conflict warning early response teams | 0 | 5 | 3 (2015) |
| Percentage of Women participating in conflict mediation and dialogue initiatives at the national level | 0 | 20 | 10 |
| Number of media houses adopting conflict sensitive reporting guidelines | 0 | 8 | 3 |
| Output 4.1.3 Local governance structures strengthened in participatory planning, budgeting and managing integrated rural development | Number of Councils trained in the IRD strategy | 0 | 28 | 28 |
| Percentage of Net Government Revenues allocated to the District Councils through the General Resource Fund. | 1 | 5 | 3 |

## 4.5.4.2. UNDAF Outcome 4.2: Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016

Capacity development for economic governance is the core of the outcome. As a primary means to capacity development, the Outcome has focused on Public Service Administration (PSA) training courses. These have resulted in better interpretation of policies, regulations and procedures. However problems of accountability in 2012 showed that public finance management training, while necessary, is not sufficient. A more robust approach is required to institutionalise ethical behaviours within the public service.

For the last half of the strategy period, the UN focus will be on creating an ethical and accountable public service. The UN is supporting the Government’s use of Organisational Performance Assessments (OPAs) in all ministries, departments and agencies. The UN also supports ethics training at all levels of the public service, starting with senior public servants. A total of 60% will be reached against a goal of 70%. However, it is unlikely that training without reinforcement will create lasting improvement in the ethics and management effectiveness of government.

The development effectiveness agenda in Malawi, strongly supported by the UN, had produced tangible results as of 2013, when the percentage of aid being reported in the national budget had increased from 55% to 61%. The goal was to increase the use of government systems for aid to 75% by end-2016. However the use of government systems has dropped dramatically as DPs withdrew from pooled funding and the figure now stands at 24%.

Issues in Learning for Capacity Development

The UN uses a traditional approach to learning, based on the pedagogical *“I tell – you learn”* model of workshops for individuals. This is not an effective method of adult learning. For adults a *“My team and I see, do, apply & redo ”* model gets far better results. It is also not effective to train individuals outside their functional units, except on narrow technical skills. A more impactful programme of learning could include:

* Mentoring and periodic, ongoing support in leadership & strategic visioning, priority setting and results achievement for highest level senior elected officials
* Management skills and accountability learning for all managers of a Ministry or Department, with immediate application and ongoing follow up support
* “Just in time” learning for intact teams, which apply skills learned immediately and receive follow-up support
* Consistent messaging and feedback from leadership to reinforce learning

Programming more effective learning for capacity building requires professional expertise on the part of the UN. A small UNCT “learning team” could provide support across the UNDAF.

The Ministry of Finance has developed and launched an Aid Management Platform (AMP), which provides information on all government projects in the country, which can be accessed by the public. The geo-coding module enables stakeholders to examine the geographic focus of Government and donor support, facilitating evidence-based decision-making.

The UN is supporting work by donors and the World Bank to strengthen national systems. There is also strong support for public service reform, which would increase confidence in national systems. The UN in conjunction with donors and the World Bank should strengthen its advocacy for public sector reform.

Capacity development for economic governance is the core of the Outcome. The Joint Programme on Development Effectiveness and Accountability (DEAP) has achieved a great deal, supporting the framing of a Development Cooperation Strategy, an inclusive dialogue structure set up to strategize on and monitor development priorities and implementation effectiveness in Malawi. Gradually, the Government is moving towards a development finance agenda, integrating both domestic and aid resources for development results, as agreed at Busan. The DEAP will also be the vehicle for UN support to the framing of the new national development strategy.

The Outcome also included the continued recruitment of UNV medical doctors to bridge critical human resource gaps. These doctors provided specialised health care services over many years, but were generally not provided national counterparts to enable them to transfer skills or build capacity and the programme has now been phased out.

Overall, performance of the Outcome has been mixed. Service delivery had not been as good as had been expected, as benchmarking was not adequate. Allocation and management of resources has improved. Government has now put resources into priority areas (agriculture, health and education) though budgetary constraints have affected budget amounts and service delivery.

The UN plans and reports together but implements on an agency basis. Coherence has improved, but there is need for much greater coordination on what each agency is doing, and coherence in efforts to build capacity. The lack of flexibility is a key issue.

The Outcome has not been adequately funded. Budgeting was also ambitious and unrealistic. When designing this UNDAF, it was estimated that for every dollar programmed for capacity building, the UN would mobilize three dollars in non-core. The Outcome Group now believes that during the 2013 UNDAF review the budget should have been revised downwards in line with available resources. There is consensus on the need for better budgeting when planning the next UNDAF.

Although insufficient resources were mobilised, what was available was efficiently and effectively used and most targets will be achieved by end of 2016.

Implementation challenges include low levels of commitment and participation by the implementing partners, partly due to the new uniform DP policy of providing full board Daily Subsistence Allowances (DSA) rather then cash.

Table 19: Outcome 4.2 Target Achievement - Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 4.2 Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016.** | % of senior public servants trained in leadership and management | **2010:45:00** | **2016: 70** | 65% | OPC, DHRM |
| Percentage of aid reported in the national budget | **2009: 55%** | **Dec 2016: 75%** | 24% | MoFEPD, AMP |
| 4.2.1 Capacity for public sector management strengthened for effective service delivery. | PA SWG functional | 2011: None | 2016: Done | Done | OPC (Admin) |
| % of MDAs delivering at least 60% of their organizational performance agreements targets | 2011: 40% | 2016: 60% | 60% | OPC, PED |
| 4.2.2 Public institutions utilize RBM systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results. | No. of public institutions practicing RBM | 2010 :"0" | 2016: "16" | 11 | EP & D (Econ. Planning) |
|  |
| Timeliness of MGDS annual results reporting. | Dec | Sept | Dec | EP & D (Econ. Planning) |
| No. of public institutions utilizing MDGs based planning and budgeting tools ( 2; 2016: 16) | 2010: "2" | 2016: "16" | Indicator dropped | EP & D (Econ. Planning) |
| % of Ministries with functional M& E systems | 2010: "60" | 2016: "90" | 90% | EP & D, (M & E Div.) |
| 4.2.3 Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance | # of functional dialogue structures for development cooperation put in place | 1 (2011) | 3 (2016) | 3 | Min. of Finance, Debt & Aid |
| % of development budget (part 1 and 2) utilized | 30 (2010) | 80 (2016) | 75% | MoFEPD, Budget Division |
| 4.2.4 National institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and the MDGs | Number of functional sector working groups (baseline: 6, Target: 16). | 3 (2011) | 16 (2016) | 8 | EP & D (Econ. Planning) |
| % annual national budget allocated to key sectors (health, education, agriculture, respectively). | 2011: 12.2%, 18%, 13%. | Target - 15% (health), 21% (education), 14%(agric) | 12%-health, 20%-education, 16%-agriculture | MoFEPD, Budget Division |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 4.5.4.3. UNDAF Outcome 4.3: National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016

The UN is making substantive contributions in support of the Government to create sound, gender responsive policies and legislation. UN agencies are positively engaged in promoting change in power relations between women and men by means of the review, amendment and enactment of laws with potential to guarantee women’s and girls’ rights and outlaw discrimination and narrow the inequality gap.

This focus has helped Malawi to begin the realization of constitutional obligations and has created a “roadmap” for the implementation of the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Malawi is up to date in the submission of state party reports.

Policies and legislation can only be effective to the extent to which the people’s mindset changes. Malawi has excellent policies and legislation on paper with limited capacity and resources for implementation and advocacy.

Participating UN agencies made substantial contributions to gender responsive strategies, action plans, guidelines and manuals. While all these are necessary, they are beyond the capacity of the Ministry of Gender to manage. A more narrow, realistic and phased approach is needed, focusing on a few policy areas and institutional capacity strengthening of the MoGCDSW. So far, UN agencies have only contributed to small improvements in the capacity of the Ministry.

The Joint UN Annual Work Plan for Ministry of Gender is one of the key practical actions that the UN has undertaken to support capacity building of the Ministry.

The UN agencies have made some contribution in providing support for gender mainstreaming in SWAps. At the formulation of stage of the UNDAF seven priority sectors were identified for gender mainstreaming. There have been important differences in the extent of gender mainstreaming in the various sectors.

There is not yet a fully strategic approach in the work of the UN in gender mainstreaming in sectors. Interventions sometimes occurred late in the process of sector plan development and became an “add on” exercise. There has not been full engagement with the Joint Sector Reviews. Meantime, the withdrawal of DP funding from SWAps has slowed or stalled progress.

The UN has provided capacity building for gender responsive budgeting, but without achieving an increase in financial resources for advancing gender equality. This is to be expected in the current period of financial constraint, but the work thus far has to be consolidated and broadened.

The UN made substantive contributions towards increased women’s capacity to participate in politics and occupy decision-making positions. However, the results achieved were not only way below the 50:50 advocated, but unfortunately regressive.The UN supported public awareness, capacity of women candidates and influencing political parties to promote women’s participation. Technical assistance was provided to the Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC) for strengthening gender equality in the civic and voter education strategy, and the media and political parties’ codes of conduct. Post-election support to female parliamentarians is a positive move.

Only one donor provided funds to the UN. The UN supported the work on women political empowerment for elections primarily with limited core funds.

The absence of multi-year engagement and lack of a realistic strategy have been addressed in a new strategy that does not treat women’s participation as a one off event during election time. An electoral quota system to increase women’s representation in parliament is being discussed. But it is acknowledged that deep and abiding cultural norms hamper progress. These need to be addressed on a long-term basis.

The UN approach of working with traditional leaders was strategic in addressing harmful cultural practices, allowing re-admission to school of girls after childbirth, integration of gender into village actions and advocating for raising the age of marriage. But it is difficult to change attitudes and promote ownership of gender mainstreaming strategies with one-off gender training for one week or less (such as with traditional leaders); there is a need for creative approaches to mentoring, follow up and promoting ongoing cycles of learning and reflection.

There has been fairly good progress toward achievement of the UNDAF Outcome indicators.

There have been gains in the numbers of women in decision-making positions in the civil service and parastatals, although there were substantial losses in numbers of women Parliamentarians.

The share of women in wage employment is improving, albeit from a low base. The main factors leading to improvement are girls’ education and awareness raising.

There is now gender parity in primary education, but the ratio declines in secondary education. Half of girls marry before age 18. Analysis has been done, but it is seen as Ministry of Gender analysis, not analysis accepted across the government. A strategy is needed.

To improve the ranking on the gender status index the UN is supporting better data, policy and advocacy in key areas. The new Real Time Monitoring system will support this.

Overall there is need for a programmatic approach to gender work, in which the UN approaches gender in a coherent manner, implementing and tracking progress on limited, achievable goals, and in a sustained manner.

Table 20: Outcome 4.3 Target Achievement - National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 4.3: National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016.** | **1. Proportion of women in decision making at all levels** | **22% in parliament (2009) 8.3% Local Councils (2000) 23% in civil service (2010) 22% in parastatals (2010)** | **50% in parliament 20% in local councils 30% in civil service 25% in parastatals** | Parliament 16%  Local Councils 11% Civil service 30% Parastatals 27% | **Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC) website** |
| **2. Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector** | **15% (2006)** | **20%** | 30% | **Gender Equality Act, Public Service Act** |
| **3. Ratio of Girls to Boys in Secondary Education** | **0.79 (2010)** | **1** | 1.01 |  |
| **4. Gender Status Index** | **0.639 (2010)** | **0.75** | 0.639 | **Malawi Gender and Development Index (NSO)** |
| Output 4.3.1 Government capacity to integrate gender in prioritized sectors enhanced | 1. Number of sectors reporting on Gender in the MGDS annual reviews | 1 (2010) | 7 | 7 | **MGDS Annual Reviews** |
| 2. Proportion of ministries (institutions and districts) exercising gender budgeting. | 0 (2010) | 6 | Six | **GEWE Programme** |
| Output 4.3.2.Women have the capacity and benefit from an enabling environment to claim and exercise their right to participate in decision making in public and private sectors | 1. Number of political parties participating in the 2014 election with quotas for women | 2 (?) | 4 | 2 | **MEC Website** |
| 2. Percent of women holding senior positions in the Civil Service | 23% (2010) | 50% | 30% | **DHRMD Gender Audit 2014** |
| 3. Percentage of women Parliamentarians | 22.3% (2010) | 50% | 16% | **MEC Website** |
| Output 4.3.3 Advocacy for effective response to key gender issues enhanced | 1. Number of gender related laws revised to promote gender equality | 1 (2010) | 3 | 6 | **Law Commission (reports)** |
| 2. % of GBV cases reported and prosecuted | 36% (2010) | 50%- we can only report numbers that have been captured by our partners. The total is **129 cases** . | 2,000 cases | Reports from Partners. Currently training is being done by Law Commission to all our partners and GBV TWGs on how to capture and record data on prosecution of GBV cases. |

## 4.5.4.4. UNDAF Outcome 4.4: National policies and public behaviour responsive to population dynamics for sustainable development by 2016

National capacities in population are very limited. The government made population a priority at the 2012 Family Planning summit, and Malawi is a FP 2020 country.[[21]](#footnote-22) Government now has a budget line for family planning. The presence of the topic in the UNDAF has been important.

This Outcome was not well designed to create a coherent crosscutting capacity in the UNDAF on population, in spite of the best efforts of UNFPA to assure a more appropriate architecture for the UN’s work on this highest order national issue.

The Outcome was charged with a focus on data and reporting rather than on operational activities around family planning or reproductive health. These fell under other Outcome areas (for instance health surveys fall under 2.1). The narrowness of the Outcome’s defined scope meant that many agencies carrying out population-related activities did not have activities within this Outcome. Unfortunately, this meant that for purely practical reasons they soon ceased to participate in the Outcome Group. As a result, only UNFPA and Habitat are still active of the 6 agencies originally involved.

By end-2016 it will have spent only 25% of planned resources, the lowest of all Outcomes. Still, it has achieved 30% of planned results.

The Outcome has produced an Urban Plan, the national population policy and action plan are in place, three districts have integrated population in district development plans, and the millennium end-line survey has been conducted. The extended policy engagement process is a key issue.

The lesson learned is that population issues must be integrated in the entire national plan process, from the beginning, starting with the district planning processes and plans.

Practical steps are being taken in 2015 for: district level work, reporting on results, gender mainstreaming, HR: consistency, greater programme coordination, capacity development and advocacy.

Strategies exist for future work and the UN now has a funded programme for family planning implementation, commencing shortly. Population issues are resource intensive yet if well supported would produce tangible results. They should be a high priority for UN resource mobilization.

The UNCT has been fully engaged with a range of gender and reproductive health issues. But given that population growth threatens the sustainability of gains in all other areas, the UN cannot allow population policy and advocacy to be given such limited attention. Population issues should be linked within a more coherent structure and population should be an issue at the center of the next UNDAF, in a new grouping of issues.

Moving forward, the demographic dividend concept[[22]](#footnote-23) is a tangible point the UN can rally around to work with government in a sustainable manner in the next UNDAF. Government is amenable to the idea and is already taking leadership though the Ministry of Economic planning and Development. The UNCT needs to build on this openness, to intensify support on population issues as a human rights agenda.

Table 21: Outcome 4.4 Target Achievement - National policies and public behaviour responsive to population dynamics for sustainable development by 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome/Output** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Estimated Status at end-2016** | **Source** |
| **Outcome 4.4 National policies and public behaviour responsive to population dynamics1 for sustainable development by 2016.** | **Percentage of Ministries who have incorporated population policies and programs** | **50%** | **90%** | 85% | **MoFEP&D** |
| **Number of Government ministries, civil society organisations and academic institutions implementing population advocacy programmes** | **4** | **21** | 40 | **MoFEP&D** |
| Output 4.4.1: Key national and selected local institutions have the capacity to generate data and integrate population dynamics into development policies, strategies and programmes | Percentage of districts with up to date**3** Health Management Information System (HMIS) | 20% | 80% | 70% | HMIS |
| Proportion of district plans integrating population dynamics | 20% | 60% | 35% | MoFEP&D |
| Up to date**3** MASEDA database | 79% | 90% | 90% | MoFEP&D |
| Output 4.4.2: Selected national population-related Policies developed and strategies in place | National Urban Policy approved (2011: 0; 2016: 1) | 0 | 1 | 1 | Min of Lands |
| NPP Action plan developed | 0 | 1 | Done | MoFEP&D |
| Output 4.4.3: Selected government ministries, civil society organisations and academic institutions have capacity to conscioutise the public on the impact of population growth, urbanisation and other dynamics on socio-economic development | Number of ToT conducted that will facilitate policy advocacy meetings at all levels linking population dynamics and development | 0 | 10 | 10 | MoFEP&D |

## 4.5.4.5. Cluster 4 Funding and Financial Performance

Table 22: Cluster 4 Funding and Financial Performance

Table 23: Anticipated Financing Against Targets for Governance and human Rights

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Indicative Resources (2012)** | | | | **Anticipated Expenditure (2016)** | | | **Anticipated Variance (%)** | **Anticipated Variance (USD)** |
| **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Gap** | **Total** | **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Total** |
| **4.1 Democratic Governance** | 10,757,997 | 12,820,000 | 24,982,003 | 48,560,000 |  |  | 29,518,960 | 61% | (19,041,040) |
| **4.2 Capacity Development** | 18,390,000 | 19,200,000 | 17,010,000 | 54,600,000 | 12,932,922 | 8,978,576 | 21,911,498 | 40% | (32,688,502) |
| **4.3 Gender Equality** | 3,585,000 | 18,050,000 | 11,280,000 | 32,915,000 | 4,736,000 | 7,082,000 | 11,818,000 | 36% | (21,097,000) |
| **4.4 Population and Development** | 2,494,000 | 4,016,000 | 4,200,000 | 10,710,000 | 1,389,246 | 1,339,855 | 2,729,101 | 25% | (7,980,899) |
| **Cluster 4 Total** | **35,226,997** | **54,086,000** | **57,472,003** | **146,785,000** | **19,058,168** | **17,400,431** | **65,977,559** | **45%** | **(80,807,441)** |

## 4.6. Effect on the UN’s contribution of Funding flows and gaps

The UNDAF was originally planned as a rather balanced set of initiatives, with most Clusters looking to undertake between $100 million and $150 million in programme spending. Cluster 2 – Social and Protection Services planned considerably more spending – above $250 million, as it includes a range of high cost direct implementation support activities.

Funding plans were based on best estimates of resources that would come from agency central or “core” resources, as well as expected “non-core” funding from donor sources. Normally, these two sets of projected resources are supplemented by a “gap” – the projected needs (or ‘wishes”) for which no current financing source is foreseen. Normally this “gap” is kept fairly modest, as total actual funding over the life of an UNDAF can be expected to be in the range of 50-60% of the amount sought.

Table 24: Anticipated Performance - Expenditure against Plan (USD)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Indicative Resources (2012)** | | | | **Anticipated Expenditure (2016)** | | | **Anticipated Variance (%)** | **Anticipated Variance (USD)** |
| **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Gap** | **Total** | **Core** | **Non-Core** | **Total** |
| **UNDAF Total** | 164,773,813 | 225,253,623 | 235,602,871 | 625,630,307 |  |  | 677,675,626 | 108% | 52,045,319.00 |

Here, the “gap” was over one-third of the total financing sought - a very large amount. And yet 108% of the funding sought will have been spent by the end of the UNDAF period (the amount mobilized will be even higher).

The reasons for this heroic initial programming, the lack of success in mobilizing resources as planned, and the unexpected windfall in resources that will allow the UNDAF expenditure to exceed plans by $52 million go a long way to explaining the misapprehensions, distortions and ultimate huge but partial financial success of the UNDAF.

At the time of the UNDAF’s design, there was a global expectation that the One UN model would attract significant resources with its promise of far more coherent and impactful results. This led many Outcome Groups in Malawi to greatly overestimate the “gap” that could be filled. Planning was quite unrealistic, especially among those working in sectors with limited resources.

These funding plans were also premised on the presumed availability of some $55 million through the then-new global One UN Fund. This funding would have allowed the UNCT to balance funding among planned priorities, creating a pattern of implementation driven by the strategic logic of the UNDAF rather than the “popularity” of topics for funding among donors. Nevertheless, even this amount would not have addressed more than 20% of the “gap”. The UNCT in 2012 simply allowed itself to dream big.

The pattern of actual funding was fundamentally different from the plan.

In the event, only a small fraction of the anticipated funding came through the One UN Fund, which was not successful globally. As shown in the box below it has nevertheless been an extremely useful mechanism for funding collective priorities through a common decision-making mechanism: a financial foundation for the coherence of the UNDAF.

Not only did the one UN Fund support a series of key, un-programmed humanitarian and development initiatives, but as funding flows became unbalanced during the course of UNDAF delivery, it was even used as a means of transferring funds from overfunded to underfunded critical activities. The UNICEF contribution to the fund is highly commendable, as it enabled the UNCT for instance to leverage the work of the newly established UN Women in gender, among others.

At the time the UNDAF began, the circumstances on which it was based changed in two fundamental ways. First, the series of good harvests came to an end, and years of drought, flood and poor harvest began. This

|  |
| --- |
|  |

shifted some of the focus of the UNCT from development work to humanitarian response and an expanded commitment to acting as the service provider of last resort. This had significant effects on programming around Food and nutrition, resilience, and DRM.

The One UN Fund

Status as of April 2015

**Humanitarian Window:**

Balance: $446k

**One Fund**:

UNICEF Contribution: $900k

UN Women $450k

UNAIDS $300k

RTM: $150k

**Delivering Results Together** $1.5 million

SMRCH (OHCHR/UNDP) $400k

REACH (UNICEF) $400k

Gender (UNW)

$300k

Population (UNFPA) $300k

RCO (M&E + Communications) $100k

**Right to Food**: $501k

CISANET $150k

UNW/ FAO $150k

**One Fund Balance**: $310k

Needed for UNDAF review and some for National Planning Process.

Joint Program on Girls Education: All allocated.

At the same time, in 2011 and again in late 2013 many donors suspended aid disbursement through government, and reprogrammed through NGOs and the UN. Outcome 1.1 and the five Outcomes of Cluster 2 were major beneficiaries of these additional funds.

For instance, the UNICEF programme finance plan, as drawn up in 20212, was highly optimistic. Yet UNICEF doubled that figure as a result of reprogramming by donors following the political events of 2011, and gained a further 50% in 2014. WHO and WFP also saw funding balloon unexpectedly.

Other agencies experienced an opposite effect. Those working closely with government around capacity building and technical advisory services at national level saw the absorptive capacity of government diminish as donor funds were withdrawn from the budget. This slowed expenditure, even as donors reduced funding to the UN for many traditional technical assistance initiatives through the central government.

The net effect of these unforeseen changes has been a shift in the UNDAF away from building national institutions to providing direct service support, and the creation of two groups of activities within the UNDAF:

* Direct implementation support, involving large sums of money, often involving a single agency, and quick disbursement.
* Technical assistance to government, with limited resources, many agencies, an often complex planning and slow disbursement.

The division of the UNCT into these two groups has put strain on what is otherwise a highly functioning team. The first group needs to “get on with the job” urgently. The second, larger group needs to make elaborate plans. A two-track approach is needed.

Table 10: Total Expenditure by Cluster – 2012-2016

The shift in the UNDAF away from the plan is most starkly seen looking at expenditure by outcome (below). The UNDAF addresses a number of key, interrelated national challenges, but the funding imbalance shifts the focus of the UNCT so strongly toward being the “service provider of last resort” that it may find it difficult to maintain hard-won momentum in helping Malawi onto a more sustainable development path. Here the UN is simply affected by circumstance. And the current pattern will surely change in future. But there is a significant risk that the UN could become a source of support to an unsustainable national status quo, rather than a partner for sustainable development. This must be addressed in the next UNDAF.

Table 11: Total Expenditure by Outcome – 2012-2016

New approaches are also needed for the areas of work contained in the half of the Outcomes that did not succeed in securing increased funding, or did not spend the funding available. These areas address particularly critical national challenges but their strategy or methods have not borne fruit. Some, like population, have developed new strategies and partnerships. Others like capacity development and the environment (part of environment, climate change and DRM) need a radical reexamination of approach. And all should be examined with a view to doing fewer things better.

## 4.7. Partnerships

#### UN Coherence and Development Partners

The evaluation conducted two informal discussions with DPs during April 2015. Eight were represented at the discussions. Those participating took a very supportive view of the UN role and potential, but were highly critical of the realities of development assistance in Malawi, and aspects of UN agencies’ work.

Some held that aid has failed Malawi. They believe some DPs and those UN agencies providing direct support services are subsidizing unsustainability. They see very few efforts to assist people to graduate out of poverty and call for a new, more results-oriented direction.

They believe the UN should support policy dialogue. Several strongly urged a role for the UN in defining and supporting government efforts to lead and provide a vision for development, stressing that it will be very difficult to make the Development Cooperation Strategy (DCS) work without such a strong vision.

There is an important role for the UN in the coordination of development assistance with government, in the context of DP withdrawal from pooled funding. However the UN will need to clarify whether it is a “critical friend” or neutral broker, or a proponent of government. It was urged that the UN position itself as the former, in order to play a coordination role around the DCS.

They also called for the UN to influence the successor strategy to the MDGS II to heavily prioritise sustainable growth.

They view implementation as being weak everywhere. The UN could strengthen accountability, but this requires government commitment, depoliticization and donor commitment on coordination.

In 2013 the key feedback from the “Friends of UN reform” was that the UN struggled to identify and communicate a clear storyline, the UN had too many small projects and there was a lack of coordination -on some of the major issues, there was no clear joint UN position.[[23]](#footnote-24)

Since then there has been much improvement. Given the current constraints within which the UN operates, it is doing very well, but in the view of several DPs it is not yet doing what it should to create lasting improvements in people’s lives. Issues of focus, implementation and alignment need to be addressed. The division of labour is still unclear, as is the balance between agency service lines and substantive Outcomes. The UN must demonstrate that agencies are serious about the UNDAF priorities, rather than agency resource mobilization.

The UN is playing the desired role on the humanitarian side, but not yet on resilience (though it is doing good work). A coordination role is seen for the UN in resilience and productive capacities, moving away from short-term responses. There is a need to shift from “handouts” to a national resilience strategy. In the view of DPs, some in the UN understand this, while others do not.

A more strategic approach to UN capacity building is also needed, around public sector reform and decentralization.

The UN should also promote inclusive growth through the private sector

There is need to support government to elaborate a green vision for Malawi. There are also gaps in coordination in energy and reforestation. Donors would support a UN role. For instance, investments in the electric grid will cover 20% of the population. The UN could provide low cost energy solutions for the other 80%.

The UN is both a partner and an implementing partner for DPs. This requires clarification of roles.

A deeper partnership with INGOs and CSOs is critical. This should not be limited to implementation for the UN.

On gender, DPs look to the UN to deal with the thorny issues of resettlement and land, and of traditional authorities and customary practices.

#### UN Coherence, Civil Society Organizations and the Private Sector

The UN works closely with a number of NGOs in most areas of its work. Increasingly, multiple NGOs are implementing DP funded programmes in lieu of government structures, and the UN finds itself in a more complex development environment.

Though it has longstanding relationships with NGOs in particular substantive areas, the UN does not have established mechanisms for coordination and collaboration with NGOs around the new patterns of implementation.

At the same time, the UN’s work toward building livelihoods for vulnerable groups has brought it into new relationships with the private sector. As with NGOs, there is no established mechanism for consultation beyond transactional agreements. There is a need for a closer and more structured relationship with both groups.

The evaluation held facilitated conversations on the UNDAF with representatives of twenty-one Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) over two days. They were overwhelmingly from national organisations. They were grouped by thematic area of interaction with the UN:

* Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment
* HIV/AIDS
* Education and Protection
* Resilience, Agriculture, Food Security, Nutrition,
* Environment and Climate Change
* Governance and Human Rights

In these thematic groups they identified and described what the UN had done well, how it had not succeeded, and the ways it could improve. These thematic perspectives were then validated in plenary discussion. The feedback from these discussions is appended as Annex F.

There was a general call from participants for true partnering with NGOs. Broadly, participants felt the UN treats CSOs as contractors, rather than as substantive collaborators. They called for substantive dialogue, as well as a commitment to treat them as national partners eligible for capacity development.

They were appreciative of the role of the RC, and their dialogue with her. However they want a more consistent involvement with all agencies, of the type they now have with UN Women. This should include dialogue in the planning process - among agencies, only UNICEF had consulted CSOs, and that had occurred after the goals of the agency programme had been decided.

Numerous good practices of the UN were cited, and there is a great deal of goodwill for the UN, but it is not now seen as a good partner to NGOs. There is a significant opportunity to leverage the UN agenda by building a more comprehensive relationship.

# Part 5: Recommendations for Improving the UN’s Contribution

The One UN Team in Malawi is performing at a very high level of commitment, coherence and result orientation. The UNDAF is consequently well designed and is achieving considerable impact in many areas in spite of very unfavorable national circumstances. The following recommendations are aimed at helping the team to build upon these achievements.

#### A new perspective and role for the United Nations

The national status quo is not sustainable, and aid is not effectively improving national outcomes. Donors have been disenchanted and may seek a new approach to development assistance. Elsewhere, donors are experimenting with payment for results.

The UN must help rebuild trust. It should reinforce coordination and accountability systems, and broaden its participation in reform efforts from economic governance to public sector reform.

It should also take new steps to reinforce its relationship with Government to help the latter achieve a step-change in improving:

* A clear, prioritized national development vision;
* The coordination of development;
* Decision-making based on data;
* Capacity development that achieves development goals; and
* Accountability around those goals.

#### Leadership visioning and a strategic National Plan

Engagement with the development of the new national plan is rightly an extremely high priority for the UNCT, both to assure that national efforts address a range of issues of concern to the UN, and to help government frame a prioritized strategy that it and all development actors, including the UNCT itself, can use to organize a prioritized response.

The new UNDAF can only be as focused as the new national plan.

Unfortunately, the UN usually lobbies for inclusion of most all of the scores of international goals and agency mandates in the national plan. This makes it extremely hard to achieve a focused and impactful UNDAF.

The UN would be far stronger and more impactful with common, aligned messages that all agencies can promote. Laudably, the UNCT is involving all agencies in the process of development of the national plan. It should also agree on a limited set of priorities for plan focus.

In support of a more focused national plan, the UN should offer world-class coaching and mentoring on strategic visioning, management and decision-making for the highest levels of government.

The UN should also offer support to government for a national visioning process, to generate legitimacy and support.

The MDGS successor plan must also be managed actively against clear targets. The UN should strongly advocate for and support a process to build its strategic focus on an analysis of root causes. It cannot be another “catalog” of issues.

The UN should seek to assure human rights and gender mainstreaming throughout the plan and integrate follow up to the UN human rights mechanism recommendations, particularly the accepted 2015 UPR recommendations.

And it should help develop meaningful goals and targets, and offer support to plan management and monitoring.

Coordination of development: The UN is strongly involved in government and donor coordination mechanisms. It should continue broadening its role, involving the entire UN team. It should provide a bridge between government and its donors.

It should support the review of coordination groups, and provide support toward increasing the number of them that function fully.

To the maximum degree possible, UN Outcome Groups in the new UNDAF should be aligned fully with SWGs.

Decision-making based on data: Over the next UNDAF period, donors are likely to reengage with government around development funding. This may take the form of payment for results. The UN may have a role to play as a trusted “scorekeeper” of results. It should position itself to support national statistical series, and to conduct a comprehensive programme of surveys around key national targets.

Donor funds may also continue to be disbursed parallel to government. The UN should help organize and support sector or district implementation coordination mechanisms involving government, donors, NGOs and the UN. The UN should promote and help generate common targets and data, and monitoring.

The UN’s new Real Time Monitoring system will be an important element in this. The UN should look to build data series around the goals of the new national plan

(including acting as neutral scorekeeper for potential “payment for results”).

Capacity development that achieves development goals:Capacity development has been an adjunct to specific interventions, generally designed by non-specialists and delivered using methods (like workshops) that have not been generally effective.

The UN should continue to build support around the development coordination architecture, and concentrate heavily on coordination of public sector reform. This should be tied to performance targets, which the UN should help to monitor

The UN should help government develop a new approach, using proven adult learning theory and methods (see above).

The UN itself should create an internal Capacity Development Team that provides professional guidance and design support to capacity development initiatives of all agencies. The team should be headed by an experienced learning professional, and deploy expertise in mainstreaming capacity building, human rights and gender.

Accountability around national goals: The withdrawal of donor funds from the budget has increased the difficulty of assuring that development expenditures produce results. By increasing support for coordination mechanisms around results, and expanding the architecture to include NGOs, the UN can help improve the ability of government to understand and take responsibility for the results of development activities.

#### The Millennium Development Goals and the post-2015 development framework

Malawi has achieved significant results, reaching MDG targets for four of eight goals, and making progress toward the others.

The four remaining goals to be attained are Eradicating Extreme Poverty and Hunger; Achieve Universal Primary Education; Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women; and Improve Maternal Health. All of these have a major gender component.

The UN should give highest priority to these four areas, considering them “unfinished business.” It should address them through the programmes developed in the recommended root cause analysis (above).

The highest priorities within the post-2015 framework are not yet entirely clear, but its goals and targets are currently worrisomely numerous. The UNCT should again be guided by its analysis, and select a highly limited number of goals to promote.

#### Addressing root causes of Malawi’s development issues in a coherent and effective manner

The UN should begin the development of a new UNDAF with a strategic review of the chronic, most fundamental problems facing Malawi, to determine root causes.

Such problems include: poor governance, including a lack of accountability and lack of access to justice; land rights issues particularly a lack of security of tenure and access to land; poverty, particularly for women and other vulnerable groups; malnutrition, especially of children and lactating women; discrimination against marginalized and excluded groups; harmful gender roles and practices; population growth; lack of livelihoods; and energy and deforestation.

Currently, much of the work of the UN addresses symptoms rather than the underlying causes of major issues. As a result, the UNCT largely acts as “a provider of last resort” for basic services. This serves clear and urgent humanitarian needs but perpetuates dependency. A root cause analysis should yield a clear set of insights on what is needed to affect lasting change for the better in key areas. This should allow the UNCT to rebalance its interventions toward making a more lasting impact (bearing in mind that change takes considerable time and that limited results can be achieved in 5 years).

Focus: all agencies have instructions to create a narrower, sharper substantive focus and to create collective synergies and efficiencies (though mixed messages from headquarters undermine this). However, the current UNDAF is largely defined by the service lines of the Agencies.

The current UNDAF is designed to match agency service lines with national problems. The new UNDAF should be designed around select root causes of key national problems, and UNDAF Clusters should be designed to address those root causes.

Within the Clusters, UNDAF Outcomes should correspond to the working groups in the national coordination architecture.

Outside of humanitarian and direct service initiatives, which should be handled flexibly and independently within a separate Cluster, the bulk of the UNDAF Outcomes should be conceived as joint programmes, and agency Outputs developed to contribute to those joint programmes.

Funds should be mobilized jointly for each joint programme, and contributions should be pooled to allow more flexible allocation within the programme to essential but underfunded activities.

With agency programmes designed around UNDAF Outcomes, agency performance appraisals should state annual results defined in terms of UNDAF deliverables.

#### UNDAF 2017-2022 Preparation

Creating a more effective and impactful UNDAF requires designing results by first defining the Outputs necessary to achieve impacts on specific addressing root causes of a few, key national issues. At times, the UN has instead designed results from Agency service lines.

Agency Outputs and resources should be organized around thematic UNDAF Outcomes, based on comparative advantage. For instance, WFP and UNICEF should pursue more integrated efforts, with others,. in providing basic services support. In the same manner, WFP and FAO should programme around a common definition and goals in resilience. And UN Women and UNDP should pursue an integrated advocacy strategy around women’s empowerment and elections.

Outcome and Output goals and targets in the current UNDAF are often unrealistically ambitious, or set based on national-level changes, which the UN cannot really influence very much. More appropriate Outcomes and Indicators are needed to make the UNDAF the primary management instrument for the UNCT. Currently mid-level committees of programme and M&E people develop these over a day or two, immediately after the design of the Priority Areas.

The UNCT should sponsor a more thorough process for the development of Outcomes, Outputs and Indicators, and Cluster and Outcome leaders should carefully review the proposals in detail at a multi-day retreat.

Mainstreaming gender equality and women’s empowerment into the new national development plan is highest priority, as it a prerequisite for the allocation of resources for priority activities to promote gender equality. It requires a special initiative.

#### Substantive issues and programming principles

Gender and gender mainstreaming

The next UNDAF should include a UNCT gender equality strategy. This should continue to take a multi-track approach to gender mainstreaming in the UNDAF.The next UNDAF should pursue a coherent and limited set of achievable gender goals both in a stand-alone Outcome and integrated in all other Outcomes.

The UN is active in elections and gender, but should also become active in building management and implementation capacity in health, education, infrastructure, linked to public sector reform and delivery.

Some areas for continued work emerged in the process of implementation of the current UNDAF (2012-2016) such as: end violence against girls and women; end early marriage, girls’ education; and promoting gender-responsive adolescent/maternal health.

In all of these areas, change comes slowly and a long-term commitment is needed.

The UN-GTWG should be supported actively by all agencies as an accountability mechanism.UN Women provides coordination, which entails promoting the accountability of the United Nations system on gender equality and women’s empowerment, and ensuring greater coherence and gender mainstreaming across the UN. The work on gender mainstreaming in the UNDAF should be a collective effort of the UNCT and agencies with collective accountabilities.These should be managed and monitored through the UN-GTWG.

The UNCT needs to commit to at least one result for gender equality in its annual work plans. This is missing in its 2014 and 2015 work plans.

The UN should strengthen coherence on gender: among UN agencies in working with the MoGCDSW; across other Ministries and with other partners. The UN should take programmatic approaches in working with any Ministry/Sector, to strengthen coordination and avoid duplication.

The UN should strongly and consistently support interventions to reduce the impact of socio-cultural practices that hamper progress on gender equality. The implementation of the Gender Equality Act and the Marriage, Divorce and Family Act, and the JSSP need to be top priorities. The UN should also strengthen partnerships and collaboration with custodians of culture such as traditional and religious leaders.

Gender-responsive interventions require dedicated and adequate resources and efforts. To assure adequate support, the next UNDAF needs to reinforce the use of gender markers for systematic tracking of resources and monitoring of budget expenditures for gender equality.

For more Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB), the UN should emphasize gender in the development of the new national plan and in a realistic number of sector plans (the GoM will not be able to apply GRB in all sectors within a 5-year UNDAF).

Outcome result areas should be informed by gender analysis and gender integrated in each identified outcome. The UN should formulate more focused, realistic and achievable gender outcomes and indicators, and should continue to prioritize sex-disaggregated data.

The UN should continue support for gendermainstreaming in sectors/SWAps but engage most strongly at the level of monitoring and evaluation to ensure that indicators are gender sensitive and reported upon at the sector annual reviews.

The UN should focus on scaling up initiatives that were successful in the current UNDAF so as to consolidate gains and achieve impact.

The full implementation of laws, policies and strategies developed under the current UNDAF requires that they be costed, funded, enforced and monitored. It is very important that the UN support the implementation of this “unfinished agenda” in the next UNDAF. The UNDAF could focus on implementation of a few policies, laws and plans that are programmatically linked to crosscutting results.

The UN should provide electoral cycle or multi-year support to women’s political participation rather than a one off event.

Opportunities for economic empowerment of women and girls at district and local levels through private sector investment (outcome 1.3) should be strongly promoted.

The UN should balance the upstream policy level support and downstream community level empowerment.

The next UNDAF should focus on strengthening the capacity of women and girls to organize to claim the right to information about laws, policies and government budget allocations.

The UN needs to strengthen capacity for women’s engagement in the formulation of the MDGSIII.

One critical area that needs to be continued is prioritization of acceleration of MDGs with a particular focus on the girl child in terms of girls education, adolescent health and protection – elimination of GBV.

The UN should enlist men as agents of change and champions of gender equality. Continuing efforts should be made to partner with traditional leaders on these, and a range of other issues.

#### Human Rights

|  |
| --- |
| The next UNDAF should be based on a thorough human rights and gender analysis, identifying root causes of challenges, barriers for rights holders to exercise rights, and patterns of discrimination and exclusion. There should be a thorough capacity gap analysis, drawing on the analysis and recommendations of the UN human rights mechanisms.  Human rights must be mainstreamed throughout the UNDAF. Recommendations of the UN Human rights mechanisms, where possible, should be systematically integrated, with suitably defined human rights indicators.  The UNDAF should contribute to accountability and the rule of law by making much stronger linkages to Malawi’s international human rights obligations, and human the rights principles. It should target marginalised and discriminated groups, and build the capacity of duty bearers to meet their obligations, including through support to revising legal frameworks in accordance with international standards and enabling rights holders to claim their rights.    The UNDAF should give priority to advancing land rights and awareness around land rights, including through the adoption and implementation of the land bills. Access to land, especially for women, together with security of tenure to protect against land grabbing, are critical issues.    Given the prevalence of child stunting in Malawi, the UN should prioritise the right to food agenda, in particular advancing a legal framework on the right to food, with adequate nutrition being an element of the right to food. |

#### Adolescent Girls

The current focus and approach of the Joint Programme on improving education through a “whole schools” approach, if successful, should lead to a more comprehensive, scaled-up programme on girls and youth in the next UNDAF.

In scaling up, the UN should maintain the approach taken in the UNJPAG and JPGE, which have large components on sexual and reproductive health, which contribute to reducing maternal mortality. It should also consider additional programming on livelihoods

#### Environmental Sustainability

#### The UN should pursue a more modest, focused strategy around Climate Change, DRM and community based environmental regeneration linked to its resilience efforts.

#### The SLM community approach has proven itself, and it should be scaled up across Malawi.

Crosscutting work on population should be added to an integrated approach to environmental sustainability.

#### Improvements also need to be made in strengthening the connections between climate change, DRM and resilience, to avoid duplication of efforts and improve synergies.

The UN has invested heavily in ENR policies at national and district levels. Now emphasis needs to be placed on ensuring systems are in place to adequately support the implementation of such policies, and that they are actually implemented.

#### Work must continue to ensure DRM policy integrates gender and vulnerable groups appropriately, in a strengthened, coordinated system, which adequately links local and national efforts.

#### Resilience of communities and institutions

#### The UN’s work on resilience is central to the UNDAF. The current roll out of two separate approaches reflects differing perspectives on development and technical issues of two agencies. These affect the coherence of the UNDAF.

The UNCT should request WFP and FAO headquarters help to propose a joint approach, in the absence of a global resolution of differences.

Every effort should be made to create a single, comprehensive strategy for UN work on resilience. This may well contain two different approaches, aimed at humanitarian and developmental responses. Such a single strategy is essential for the UN to scale up its efforts.

Work on resilience should also be linked closely to work on basic services, and a clearer distinction made between humanitarian work (or work as “service provider of last resort”) and development. The former should be characterized by a very close partnership between WFP and UNICEF.

#### Capacity Development

The UN’s extensive work in capacity building has been made less effective by national circumstances. And the UN’s over-reliance on workshop training has further reduced the impact of its efforts.

A new approach is needed. An inter-agency Capacity Development Team should be set up to provide professional support for adult learning methods. A full time professional learning manager, supported by experts in human rights and gender mainstreaming, should head the team. It should provide design services to all capacity development interventions, and delivery of select, high profile events.

The capacity development efforts of the UN should concentrate on leveraging and sustaining change.

At the national, leadership levels, the UN should provide mentoring and periodic, ongoing support in leadership & strategic visioning, priority setting and results achievement for senior officials

Each major intervention should include management skills and accountability learning for all managers of a Ministry or Department, with immediate application and ongoing follow up support.

At the operational level, “just in time” learning should be provided for intact teams, which apply skills learned immediately and receive follow-up support.

Consistent messaging and feedback from leadership should reinforce learning. A proposed Advocacy Team under the Communications Group should elaborate key messages.

At district level, officers of some ministries are well grounded in their work, while others have significant skills gaps. Decentralization being new, elected officials are not fully experienced. A district capacity development needs assessment and plan should be developed for use in in districts of UN concentration.

Within the UN itself, the proposed Capacity Development Team should be charged with supporting efforts by technical specialists to assure all agencies mainstream human rights and gender fully.

#### UNDAF implementation management

The UNCT has done a very good job of actively managing the UNDAF, adapting it significantly and successfully in response to experience.

It did not anticipate the full impacts on its programme of reduction in government capacities that followed the withdrawal of donor, pooled funds. And it has not fully come to terms with the ballooning of UN work in direct implementation of services, as some of those funds were diverted to it. This points to two needs:

There are many policies, plans, strategies and laws developed with UN help that have either not been approved or implemented. A review should lead to a holistic strategy and timeline for achieving approval, and additional commitment of resources for implementation.

Within the UNDAF, the direct implementation of services has become a huge undertaking. To avoid overshadowing the remainder of the UNDAF, this work should be managed within a new Cluster.

The UNCT should charge the RCO with a regular review of risks and assumptions, for discussion of possible mitigation measures.

The PMT has been doing well. The recent addition of a Special Assistant to the RC should free up the time of the Strategic Planning Advisor to enable him to provide the PMT with regular analyses of issues for resolution.

The leadership of Clusters, Outcome Groups and other bodies has been generally impressive. Where there have been gaps, there is sometimes hesitation to intervene. There is also a need to involve more senior programme people in management of the UNDAF. Rotating the chairs of several groups each year could help.

The Clusters have an integrative role to play, with other Clusters and between Outcomes. Cluster performance has been somewhat mixed. In this UNDAF, the OG has often been the primary management mechanism.

For the design of the next UNDAF, the UNCT should explore how the Clusters can build linkages and integrate efforts across groups, adding greater value without further time-consuming “coordination”. There are already too many UNDAF groups, and Clusters seem to be the least essential layer. It may be that a set of PMT task-teams around specific linkages would be more effective.

Outcome Groups and others have been highly productive for the most part, requiring a great deal of effort from chairs and members. The UNCT should assure that active contribution to group achievements is recognized both in individual performance assessments and in internal communications.

Capacity building and advocacy efforts in support of the UNDAF have not been fully adequate. A Capacity Development Team headed by a full time learning professional should advise on the design of programmes.

In the same manner, a full time, professional development communications person should lead an Advocacy Team to improve messaging and campaigning.

#### Delivering as One

The UNCT has made huge progress in planning and reporting together, and coordinating implementation. They now need to address obstacles to implementing together (described above). To do so, they must accelerate harmonization and simplification of business practices. A major joint effort of the PMT and OMT is needed to enable the UNCT to operate through joint programming that allows a donor or a government entity to deal with one UN for funding or implementation.

The UNCT in Malawi is now implementing the Standard Operating Procedures for One UN countries. The areas where the UNCT is currently concentrating on deepening its capacities to perform as One UN are Joint Work Plans, Joint Programmes, and Real Time Monitoring. In the next UNDAF these should be made fully operational, and expanded to encompass all UNDAF Outcomes.

Reporting is still often being done in both UNDAF and agency formats, as agency headquarters require different reporting than for UNDAF. These requirements, and other mixed messages about DaO, undermine UNCT efforts. The UNCT should raise these issues, directly and through the RDT.

The RDT is not providing the support needed by the UNCT for DaO. It should reexamine its organization and methods.

#### Joint Advocacy

The UN Communication Group (UNCG) is increasing joint advocacy efforts, particularly in cross cutting areas, but greater support is needed as the UN seeks to change norms and entrenched practices.

Much stronger internal communication is also needed so that everyone is clear on how the agency or unit contributes to the UNDAF.

The work of the UNCG should be strengthened through the creation of an Advocacy Team, professionally led, providing technical support to programme initiatives.

#### Creating a better balance between UNDAF plans and funding flows

In the current unusual national circumstances, funding flows are acutely distorted. Two or three agencies providing direct implementation services are resourced well beyond their stated needs, while most other UNCT members are underfunded.

Gender, population and HIV/AIDS Enabling Environment are the worst affected, but there are others. The One UN Fund was meant to fill such gaps, but has not been strongly supported.

The UNCT was very unrealistic in its proposals for UNDAF funding, anticipating an expected windfall from the One UN Fund. In the next UNDAF, funding proposals should reflect hard, practical estimations.

The Outcomes in the next UNDAF should be designed as Joint Programmes, and funded through joint resource mobilisation.

A renewed global effort by the UNDG and DPs to address this long-standing, debilitating pattern is imperative if the One UN is to succeed.

Nationally, in preparation for the next UNDAF the UNCT might create an informal tripartite group among UN, Government and DPs to jointly examine the issue. Such a group would seek to promote more balanced funding.

It should also encourage greater burden-sharing, to allow the UN to focus more narrowly on areas of foreseen support, and to act in future in fewer areas that (however important) are perennially under-funded.

#### Recommendations on UNDAF Clusters and Outcomes

Cluster 1 – Equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security. An overall strategy should be developed for the further integration or reorganization of this very diverse Cluster. This will require all participating agencies to be willing to modify their service lines, which is not currently the case.

The cluster’s three Outcomes include efforts to address three fundamental national issues. All three should scale up activities piloted in the past few years. The three are not well linked, and there are differences of agency approach within them.

For the next UNDAF, the relationships and structure among the three should be examined carefully. As discussed in the text, this report recommends dividing direct implementation support from development initiatives. Other possible groupings should also be examined carefully. The UN should seek maximum impact above logical coherence of Outcomes.

Resilience. Work must be scaled up, but with a single, harmonized approach: there are now two. WFP and FAO globally are working towards a joint resilience approach, as are the regional bureaux. The absence of a resolution of this global and regional issue impedes progress in this critical area.

And the UN must look again at its approach to and partnerships in social support, given continuing, reduced government funding and capacity.

Addressing root causes of vulnerability will be a key priority. The UN should help to open a national conversation on maize and fertilizer subsidies, as well as on the right to food and related land rights issues.

The needs of long-term refugees are a specific issue requiring the attention of the UNCT in support of UNHCR. Help is needed on resilience, and on promoting national legislation in accord with international standards.

#### Environment, natural resources, climate change and DRM. The UN’s focus is now primarily at policy level, nationally and in the districts.  A number of policies still require approval, such as the review of the Forestry Policy, the Climate Change Policy, review of the Environment Management Act, the Agriculture Policy and the Land Policy in line with international standards. It is important that these policies are approved without further delay, and implementation begun with UN support.

#### The shift in forest protection to community-based SLM initiatives is positive, but a plan for funding scaled up efforts is needed if this work is to have cost-effective impact.

#### This year’s floods have amply demonstrated the importance of the UN’s work in policy, information and management. Work must continue on the recently approved DRM Policy and Implementation Plan to ensure the policy integrates gender and vulnerable groups, and ensures a strengthened coordinated system, adequately linking local and national efforts.

UNDP, WFP and FAO bring differing perspectives to the work in environment (as well as resilience). The three institutions are already working together under the Joint Resilience programme, as well as in other fora. Partnership should be strengthened. A starting point for stronger partnership could be the ‘general resilience programming principles’ from the southern Africa Regional Resilience Framework (2014). The three agencies should create a unified approach before the next UNDAF.

Decent Work, livelihoods and pro-poor private sector growth Expanding the economy is the single, key issue to be addressed to change the national trajectory.

Several positive initiatives in this area are creating a policy and technical capability for Malawi to become an exporting country: these must be continued.

The Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund has been a great success, and is being scaled up. Now other means of supporting similar investments should be tried. For instance, the UNCT could look to create partnerships in which substantial amounts of WFP food assistance is used to support investment in creating small and medium enterprises.

Additional attention should be given to the gender dimension of food production: women are primary smallholder producers, and the “Coalition of Women Farmers” has 500,000 members.

A skills development programme at community level for youth is needed.

Both ILO and UNESCO have a valuable project presence in Malawi, but the UNCT would benefit from hosting an out-posted representational staff member from these agencies, given the importance of their roles in building sustainable livelihoods. Important to address will be Malawi’s minimum wage, (currently one of the lowest in the world) and the plight of tenant workers, as highlighted by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food. ILO has a project CTA working on child labor, and UNFPA is hosting a staff member of UNESCO and working with UNESCO on comprehensive sexuality education in schools.

#### Cluster 2 – Access to quality basic services. There is growing demand on government from citizens for services. Through this Cluster (as in Cluster 1,Outcome 1), the UN is both assisting government in meeting that need, and acting itself as the “provider of last resort.”

#### The UNCT is very strong in the social sectors, and has achieved strong results in every Outcome, but is not always using those strengths optimally to build sustainable development. While providing essential social support, some of the UN’s current work distorts markets and perpetuates dependency.

#### There is a need for a more compelling narrative that informs the work and results of the Cluster, aimed at creating a path toward sustainable development and growth in the longer term, while improving national capacities and conditions of life for the Malawian people in the shorter term.

#### National systems (notably for health, education and agriculture) are stronger and more universal than in other countries at similar levels of development, but domestic financing alone is unable to sustain these services. This Cluster should assist with these policy issues, and focus more on strengthening national systems and strengthening linkages with international human rights standards.

#### This report suggests grouping all humanitarian and direct service work of the UN in a single new Cluster, with its own strategy, including for transition to national systems.

The Cluster strategy is being implemented impressively, but it is not adequately linked to the work of other Clusters; its efforts should specifically support efforts to build resilience, food security and employment.

There needs to be a greater link between nutrition and the humanitarian response: this is a point WFP has really focused on since the 2012 humanitarian response, but with difficulty from donors on funding. However, the UN has increased behavior change communication (to address some root causes) about nutrition, hand washing, dietary diversity and etc. during distributions, in collaboration between clusters.

Nutrition work is also a natural vehicle for promotion of population issues.

#### Access to health services A good national strategy and strong UN support have achieved major gains in access to essential health service, but the quality of those services remains a concern. The current shift in emphasis to quality of care is supported.

The UN’s temporary role in providing direct support (essential medicines and immunization) has been important, but further highlights the financial unsustainability of the national healthcare system. The UN should engage with donors to develop short and longer-term solutions.

The UN should also help the sector: develop more decentralized planning and human resource management; reduce silos; and more fully include NGO providers. It should help develop more actionable data.

UN agencies now work together around common issues in the UNDAF target areas. This collaboration should be expanded to all areas.

Progress has been made on gender mainstreaming but the UN needs to develop better understanding of issues among gender advocates at the lower levels.

For the next UNDAF, a common vision and goal on child mortality are needed. District health teams should be helped to function more efficiently. And health commodities supply chain systems should be improved.

A greater focus on promoting the right to highest attainable health is needed, particularly in view of high maternal mortality in Malawi.

Quality nutrition services Stunting of children is at emergency levels in Malawi. The UN response should be treated as such, and included in a proposed humanitarian and direct service Cluster.

At the same time, the UN should work to identify root causes of malnutrition, develop policy responses (including implementation of the pending national nutrition strategy and supporting the Government in its commitment to integrate right to food legal framework into the Food and Nutrition Bill), and assist government to implement more sustainable subsidy and support strategies. The WFP Cost of Hunger report contains recommendations for further multi-sectoral initiatives that should be taken up.

The Outcome operates collaboratively, with a division of labor between agencies. UN agencies coordinate within a donor nutrition group, never meeting as UN but always with partners. The UN nutrition team uses a harmonized methodology. Each agency has a role within a multi-sectorial national platform. This is a good practice to be sustained and emulated.

There is also need for better coordination with NGOs. These have come to play a larger role but only work in discreet projects. The UN should help with mapping and coordination for filling of gaps.

A joint information management surveillance system should be created.

WASH The UN will meet targets in the 15 districts in which it works.

For the next UNDAF, it should consolidate this success and replicate it in the other 14 districts.

Open defecation and hand washing improvements are not as advanced, and work in these areas will need to be intensified.

Enrolment, retention and completion of basic education The UN has worked successfully in 10 of 17 UNDAF focus districts. The school meals programme is in operation in 13 districts. The home-grown school feeding model is proving to be a success model for a government-led decentralized school feeding programme in the future.

In three districts it has addressed the cultural factors limiting girls’ retention through the Girls Education Joint Programme. The coordinated approach of bringing together complementary interventions in the Girls Education Joint Programme is helping to strengthen the impact of the initiatives as well as improving primary school outcome indicators. This work should be scaled up, if it meets its initial promise.

Girls often drop out at ages 11 to 13. The UN has promoted the new Marriage Act (raising the age for marriage), reduced repetition of grades, supported reenrollment, and helped improve quality, but these measures will not be sustained through a short-term effort. The WFP take home rations (“food scholarship”) for older girls and orphans during the lean season have been shown to reduce drop outs. The UN should extend and deepen its commitments, linked to a greater focus on the right to education.

For the next UNDAF, the UN should look to promote expanded numbers of girls in secondary and tertiary education.

The withdrawal of donors from pooled funding has led to project proliferation and reduced coherence and impact. The UN should play an active role in brokering a commitment by donors to a new, coordinated approach.

#### Access to protection services The UNCT set out to reduce significantly the rate of violence and abuse by 2016. Instead, it finds the problem to be far more extensive than previously understood, and efforts to address it have had limited results.

The UN should redouble its efforts. It has helped create law and regulations, resources and systems. Now it must help make them work.

In the next UNDAF the law and regulations will need to be implemented. Capacity of systems must be improved, using more effective capacity building techniques.

Access to services will need to be expanded using the new approach being piloted in 7 districts. And most importantly, prevention services must be strengthened.

The UN should also give attention to raising the case management capacities and status of District Social Welfare Officers.

#### Cluster 3 - HIV and AIDS The work of the HIV/AIDS Cluster has been impressive, especially in innovations (the OptionSB+ model) and successes in treatment.

#### Work on prevention and the enabling environment has not been fully funded. More remains to be done and this should be a priority in the next UNDAF.

#### Sustainability of financing of the national response remains a critical concern, and the UN should work actively to maintain donor commitment while working toward a long-term solution to this difficult problem.

#### A separate Cluster was created for HIV/AIDs as a matter of UN regional policy, given the unacceptably high HIV prevalence (above 10%) in Malawi. This gives visibility and focus to work in the area, but has not helped in leveraging partners and resources especially in protection, legal and policy work (which are seriously underfunded). The approach should be reexamined.

#### Prevention and treatment services The combination of treatment and prevention efforts, and the shift to a “90/90/90” fast-track approach after 2013 have proven themselves and should be the basis for future action.

Sustaining treatment is ever more difficult financially. The UN must rely on global initiatives for longer-term, lower cost approaches, while encouraging government to continue increasing its own contribution, in part to promote donor matching. The most helpful role of the UN on this deeply worrisome issue may be to advocate loudly and forcefully for continued support, through the global advocacy channels of its agencies, in addition to technically supporting the exploration of programme efficiencies as an option for expanding fiscal space for the national AIDS response.

#### Whereas HIV prevention has not been as successful as treatment so far, the impressive viral suppression rates realized among PLHIV has effectively enhanced Treatment as Prevention (TasP). To accelerate further reduction of new HIV infections, the UN should partner with others for a full-scale, multi-year combination prevention efforts, in line with the newly developed HIV Prevention Strategy.

#### Prevention has not been as successful as treatment so far. The UN should partner with others for a full-scale, multi-year national advocacy campaign.

Enablers for the national response. AIDS protection, legal and policy support has been poorly funded. This is not likely to improve. Another way must be found to support work on these essential tasks. Perhaps “bundling” them with related issues in other Clusters would provide a partial solution. What is clear is that stand-alone UN work in these areas is not likely to attract sufficient support.

Planned legislative work was slowed because there were a number of issues that proved too controversial. A more gradual approach could be more successful as could technical and advocacy support for targeted actions (such as litigation) by partners to challenge discriminatory legislation.

There were a number of policies and strategies produced. The UN must support implementation. It must also undertake planned work with pilot district councils, and on M&E.

The institutionalization of the work in government depends on responsibility being placed in the best location: the UN can help with advice from other, similar countries.

Cluster 4 – Governance and human rights Governance, public sector capacity development, human rights, gender equality and population and development are all critical issues in Malawi, and are areas of strong comparative advantage for the UN, but progress in these areas has not generally met expectations. Funding has also been disappointing.

Governance is not strong in Malawi, and public institutions are not working well together. It has also been a very difficult national period.

The UN needs to re-focus this Cluster. Governance is an issue that affects all sectors and the UN needs to be clearer on how its work supports them. Should thoroughgoing public sector reform take place, the UN must use its comparative advantages in development strategy and public sector accountability to influence the process.

The addition of Peace and Development in 2013 was very helpful during the 2014 elections. Continued support is very important to manage conflicts.

For the next UNDAF, government informally indicates that it may wish the UN to take an active role in public sector reform, in addition to pursuing results not fully achieved under the current UNDAF.

It should also address the capacity needs of national institutions on accountability that have not received support. Support should also be given to strengthening the justice system and the Human Rights Commission and for identified gaps in the electoral system.

Decentralization is not complete: the UN should promote decentralization of revenue, and strengthen the capacity of district councilors and systems while further integrating it own work at district level.

There should also now be less focus on developing and reviewing policies and strategies. The UN should plan and support efforts to help government approve and implement the backlog produced under the current UNDAF.

Some new policies will be needed, including those required to support livelihoods for youth. Gender-related policy work is needed on the girl child, safe motherhood, abortion and GBV. And the next UNDAF should do more to address the policies needed to support livelihoods for youth.

There should also be a significant effort to produce the statistics needed for result management under the new national plan.

Crosscutting UN principles of Human Rights, Gender and Capacity Building are of foremost importance. A number of recommendations have been made on each, above.

Population is the one fundamental national issue on which there has been least national commitment and institutional support. The UN must collectively increase its efforts to promote population policies and systems that will contribute to reducing poverty.

Participation in the HRWG needs to be strengthened to enable to mainstreaming of human rights more successfully across the UNDAF.

Democratic governance for all The transition from a traditional institution building approach to a broad-based human rights oriented sector strategy is well underway and should be pushed to completion. However there still are far too many and diverse initiatives under the Outcome.

Priority should be given to building the capacity of national institutions on accountability that have not received support, the justice system, and the Human Rights Commission.

Human rights initiatives should receive high priority in a streamlined Outcome. For the future, a separate Outcome should be considered. Recommendations regarding human rights are set out separately, above.

The UN should address known gaps in electoral systems, but its main focus in this area should now shift to women’s empowerment and citizen awareness and Human rights.

The UN should work on building the tax base of the Districts, to strengthen local governance. Support should also be given to District councilors.

Should there be an appropriate role for the UN, among other partners, it should provide niche support to efforts underway to join the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative, and to ensure adequate taxation of companies operating in the country.

There is strong support from national partners for the UN to remain active in in Peace Architecture.

#### Public management of resources The work on capacity building of the public service in this Outcome had concentrated on training for financial accountability. The focus has now shifted from training on rules to training on ethics and accountability.

Unfortunately, stand-alone training is not very effective in promoting lasting change in institutional cultures. A number of recommendations for more effective approaches are set out in the section on Capacity Building, above.

The work of the UN in support of the government’s aid coordination and management efforts is highly important, helping government move towards a development finance agenda, integrating both domestic and aid resources for development results, as agreed at Busan. The DEAP programme should also be the vehicle for UN-wide support to the framing of the new national development strategy.

The UN should seek to build further on this work, adapting it to the new realities of increased off-budget aid flows.

A great deal of work has been done on financial systems. Now this is likely to be complemented by public sector reform. Should such an initiative be welcomed, the UN would be well placed to coordinate support to the reform process.

Within the Outcome team there should be much greater coordination on what each agency is doing, and coherence in efforts to build capacity.

#### Gender equality and the status of women This evaluation took place at the same time as another evaluation of gender (both of this gender-specific Outcome and gender mainstreaming across the UNDAF). The two evaluators worked in tandem, and the recommendations of the gender evaluation are fully shared. The recommendations are set out in the section of this report on Gender Mainstreaming, above.

Gender related initiatives are essential to deal with the root causes of fundamental national issues, and the UN has taken good approach in this UNDAF. It should continue to both target and mainstream gender.

However, a more active participation of agencies is needed, and gender must be mainstreamed across all Outcomes. Several respondents related that there is a tendency for agencies, overstretched as they can be, to take an attitude of “let UN Women do it.” The UN has significantly greater capacity to address gender issues since UN Women opened its office less than three years ago. But the drop of in agency participation in the GTWG is unfortunate. This must be reversed.

#### Population and development Population dynamics are the single root cause of Malawi’s difficulties for which the UN has a mandate and capacity that has not received adequate attention. Unfortunately, they have not achieved the support they deserve from the enabling environment.

The UNCT needs to build support among its own members for a greater role for the issue, as part of its review of root cause issues. It also needs to make strong linkages to reproductive health rights as now contained in the Gender Equality Act.

#### On the government side, the extremely limited current capacity (3 people in the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning) must be strengthened. The UN should promote the creation of a national institution.

#### On the UN side, the placement of the issue in a stand-alone Outcome with a narrow responsibility and participation did not prove helpful. The UNCT should recast its population work as a crosscutting issue, and combine future population policy and operational work.

Population issues should be linked within a more coherent structure and population should be an issue at the center of the next UNDAF, in a new grouping of issues.

Strategies exist for future work, and funding, and they should be supported.

#### UN Operations

The UN needs to implement better together. There should be a single approach to all activities in specific districts and with specific partner institutions. JAWPs are a good start, but they must become more strategic, with fewer annual activities. They should also rapidly lead to joint implementation.

Joint programming and/or joint resource mobilization should be the norm for all Outcomes. This does not necessarily mean joint implementation, but coherence, with joint implementation whenever beneficial to the national partner. Normally, joint implementation should be used whenever more than one agency works with a national partner.

A joint PMT/OMT Task Team should address the following issues with tight deadlines.

The UN needs to develop a more coherent approach to how it works with government. At present there is no consensus on this. Nor is there clarity on what business processes government wants the UN to use.

Coherence is also very difficult. Currently it brings steep transaction costs locally: the failure of the UNDG globally to provide planned, harmonized rules in finance, human resources and procurement stymies Delivering as One. DOCO is urged strongly to press UNDG principals for action on these long-promised reforms.

In the absence of global solutions, a joint PMT/OMT Task Team should develop pre-negotiated patterns for joint planning, implementation and reporting, using the thematic windows of the One UN Fund. There is good practice in other countries to draw from.

Differences around cost-recovery are the most critical bottleneck to joint implementation. The absence of a single interface with national partners is a major issue. For instance, JAWPs in gender and human rights have rationalized UN plans but still require weak national institutions to use multiple UN procedures. UNDP and UNICEF should lead the way in negotiating a common approach to cost recovery in Malawi, under the auspices of a PMT/OMT Task Team.

During the last several years HACT has fractured in Malawi.Currently, each agency has a different approach to cash transfers, burdening partners and making joint implementation within true joint programmes impossible. HACT should be used, post-cashgate, for enhanced risk management. The UNCT must fast track plans to conduct new micro-assessments, to create a unified reengagement strategy at the UN-system wide level.

The UN needs to find ways of speeding up funds disbursements to enable timely implementation of UNDAF activities without compromising accountability.

A UN House would greatly enhance the ability of UN staff to work more flexibly together across the many UN “silos.” One has been planned for a decade, land has been dedicated for it, and financing organized in principle. However government has not moved on creating formal arrangements. A concerted effort is needed by the UNCT to raise and resolve 5the matter at a political level.

The Operations Management Team has operated apart from the UNDAF and has surprisingly limited results to show for years of effort on issues like joint procurement, though a number of useful improvements have been made. This is because joint services are seen to threaten local jobs, and when initiatives are resisted there are no consequences for obduracy by administrative staff of one agency or another.

The new UNDAF should set out a vision and goals for the OMT, around joint implementation, and also the range of operations functions: finance, procurement, administration, human resources and logistics. It should address each of these operations areas jointly with a senior “client” representative from the PMT.

To support the OMT, data is needed for the BOSS to show the benefit of joint rather than single-agency work. Such cost-benefit analyses have been done elsewhere and should be pursued in Malawi.

The UNCT should also engage more directly in managing the OMT for assigned results, and require time-bound actions on a much more ambitious work plan. All members of the OMT should be accountable for their contributions to those results. And none should be allowed a “veto”.

Any agency that cannot agree with others on a specific joint approach must be allowed to maintain their own procedures, but this can no longer prevent the others from going ahead. And lack of support for a joint approach should be noted in annual reporting.

#### Partnerships

The UN should build true partnerships with NGOs and others including the private sector, through a partnership strategy. This includes supporting better UN/GoM/DP/NGO coordination around common work in provision of basic services. It also includes providing capacity building support beyond working with them as implementing partners, in a relationship limited to the duration of UN funding.
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**1. Background**

In 2007, Malawi was one of the countries that volunteered to “Deliver as One” (DaO) Ultimately, it was not one of the eight selected “pilots”, but instead was an early “self-starter.” The DaO reform agenda in Malawi has been built on the tenets of the five ones: One Leader, One Programme, One Budgetary Framework, Operating as One and One Voice. Pursuing the UN reform agenda, Malawi is one of the countries globally to develop and utilize the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) planning methodology under the DaO Approach. The UNDAF represents the One Programme component of DaO. It replaces the joint UN programmes and the multiple UN-supported initiatives with a single, coherent plan for all UN funds, programmes and agencies in Malawi, in which each agency is responsible for delivery on a set of key actions that jointly contribute to shared results.

Since 2008, there have been two successive UNDAFs that have been developed since the reform agenda was adopted, with one cycle for 2008-11 and the current cycle for 2012-2016. The UNDAF 2012–2016 is the common plan of 21 resident and non-resident UN agencies, funds and programmes in Malawi[[24]](#footnote-25). It is in response to the needs and priorities of Malawi and based on the objectives of the[Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS)](http://www.malawi.gov.mw/" \t "_blank) II. It sets out specific outcomes that the UN and the Government of Malawi together aim to achieve by 2016. This ‘One plan’ for Malawi supports the achievement of the international development goals, the Millennium Declaration and related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), national development priorities that are consistent with the MDGs, and the realisation of international human rights in the country, including the right to humanitarian assistance for refugees.

Guided by the UN comparative advantage, and the goals and targets of the MGDS II, the UNDAF had four inter-linked and mutually reinforcing priority areas:

1. Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security
2. Basic Social and Protection Services
3. HIV and AIDS
4. Governance and Human Rights

The UNDAF is fully aligned with the MGDS II. These priority areas are bound together by key overarching issues including a focus on adolescent girls as a means to accelerate development; building resilience among communities and institutions; advancing human rights and gender equality, and advocating for changing attitudes and behaviours. Focuses on results backed by solid monitoring and programme oversight are key principles for how we implement our programmes.

In the implementation of the UNDAF, the UN in Malawi focuses on four Key Priority Areas:

1. National policies, local and national instituions effectively support equitable and sustainable econmic growt and food security by 2016
2. National instituions effectively deliver equittable and quality basic social and protection services by 2016
3. National response to HIV and AIDS scaled up to achieve Universal Access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support by 2016.
4. National instituons effcetively support transparency, accountability, partipatory demonracy and human rights by 2016.

The UNDAF enhances the UN’s focus on results by bringing together agency specific planning requirements in a consistent manner, ensuring “necessary and sufficient” programme logic in the results chain and resource requirements. The Plan comprises of a Programme Results Matrix, a framework of Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound Outcomes and Outputs that includes indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification.

The UNDAF is organized in four Clusters with 14 Outcome Groups that allow UN agencies working in development sectors (food security, economic growth, health, governance, etc) to coordinate their implementation under the sector/ cluster. The Outcome Groups have a UN lead agency to facilitate decision-making, coordination and coherence.

To operationalise the UNDAF, an UNDAF Action Plan (AP) was developed which provided Annualised Key Results (AKRs) for each Outcome for each of the five years of the programme. However, more recently, the UNCT, with guidance from the UN Development Group (UNDG), has made the decision to move away from the rigid five year AP and instead focus on more flexible, rolling Annual Work Plans (AWPs). AWPs follow a normal year planning cycle, January to December. The AWPs are developed at the activity level using a common process and template, with the Outcomes and Outputs remaining fixed. This approach provides greater flexibility for revising programme activities based on national priorities and/or developments.

The Joint Strategy Meeting (JSM) is an annual high level forum between the Government of Malawi and the United Nations Country Team which seeks to provide an oversight to the implementation and monitoring of the UNDAF. The JSM comprises the Heads of UN Agencies and Senior Government officials from key line Ministries and is chaired by the Chief Secretary, with the UN Resident Coordinator as co-chair.

**2. Country Context**

Malawi, officially known as the “Republic of Malawi,” is one of the seven countries that belong to both the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) trade blocs. It is a landlocked country that neighbours with Tanzania, Zambia and Mozambique. Its surface area is approximately 118,484 square kilometres, of which 20 percent is covered by Lake Malawi. Malawi has a population of 16.4 million, with 85% of the population living in rural areas. Life expectancy at birth is 55.3 years and the country is marked by high levels of vulnerability.

After independence from British rule in 1964 and more than 30 years of subsequent autocratic rule, Malawi continues to make steady progress in good governance. In May 2014, the current President, His Excellency Prof. Peter Mutharika was elected in Malawi’s first ever Tripartite Elections in which presidential, parliamentary and local government elections were conducted at one time. Mutharika replaced former president Dr. Joyce Banda who ascended to power in April 2012 following the sudden death of the then president, Bingu wa Mutharika, late brother to the current president.

Malawi has a GDP of US$3.705 billion and a per capita income of US$226. With an estimated population of 15.4 million as of July 2012, almost 75% of the population earns less than US$1.25 per day. Agriculture is Malawi’s largest economic activity contributing 28.7% of GDP and more than 80% of export earnings. Malawi achieved encouraging economic results between 2006 and 2010, with an average growth rate of 7.5% but suffered serious setbacks in 2011 and 2012. As a result, it took the decision to devalue its currency in 2012. The 49 percent devaluation of the Kwacha and subsequent depreciation of the currency inevitably contributed to the rise in inflation. Inflation, due to adherence to strict financial polices, has declined and stands at 22.3% for August 2014.

Current development policies and strategies for Malawi reflect the “Vision 2020” strategy which was developed in 1998 and presents the country’s development goals by the year 2020. The MGDS II (2012 to 2016) is the second medium term poverty reduction strategy, which provides a framework for implementing the MDGs. The strategy places emphasises on wealth creation and sustainable economic growth. To ensure that financial resources are directed to the priority areas of the MGDS, government uses Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP). However, significant challenges remain, including weak implementation of a number of government strategies and action plans often attributed to lack of modern public service capacities and incentives. With public dissatisfaction growing, the Government must ensure delivery of minimum quality services including education, health care and social protection. Corruption is a major problem in both the public and private sectors and seen by the electorate as a critical issue.

Poverty in Malawi remains high, widespread and concentrated in rural areas with a Human Development Index of 0.414 (in 2013), placing it below the Sub-Saharan African average of 0.502. According to the 2012 Integrated Household Survey (IHS) report, Malawi’s poverty level is estimated at 50.7% a marginal reduction from an estimated 52.4% in 2005. Incomes remain very low with GNI per capita of USD$ 348 and a Gini Coefficient of 41.5 in 2010 reflecting acute income inequalities with large sections of society marginalized.

The country also ranks as one of the most densely populated countries in Africa with a population density estimated at 139 persons per km2. The 2008 Population and Housing Census (PHC) estimated the population growth rate of 2.8% giving the country one of the fastest growing populations in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. Whilst Malawi is the least urbanized country in Africa, it has one of the highest urbanization rates in the world at 6% per year. This poses a challenge for urban development, green and inclusive growth.

Furthermore, Malawi has been experiencing different natural and economic shocks that have eroded the resilience of most poor and vulnerable households and compromised their ability to sustain their livelihoods. Malawi’s population of over 15 million people is perennially susceptible to several natural and economic shocks which include prolonged dry spells, floods, pest and diseases and high food prices. The majority of these poor households are heavily dependent on subsistence agricultural production, normally cultivating less than 0.5 ha of land. The increasing frequency and scope of these natural and economic shocks despite government’s subsidy to the agricultural sector have mostly resulted in increased vulnerability of the majority of the already impoverished communities.

In 2012, food insecurity was present in 16 districts, while in November 2013, the Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committee (MVAC) reported a total of 1,855,183 people from 24 districts across the country who would have a food gap and would require emergency food assistance. Food insecurity expanded to districts which had never been reported as food insecure in the past, showing an erosion of people’s ability to withstand shocks. While the projected number of food insecure households in 2014 has reduced significantly (estimated at 690,000 people), significant work is still required to ensure households are resilient to shocks.

**3. UNDAF Evaluation Context**

Since the formulation of the UNDAF, a number of internal reviews have taken place. These are as follows:

1. UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2012
2. UNDAF Annual Review, 2012
3. UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2013
4. UNDAF Expanded Annual Review, 2013
5. UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2014

For each of these reviews, findings and lessons learnt have been documented, debated and converted into recommendations for improved programming and progression of the system-wide coherence agenda. In addition to these UNDAF specific reviews, the following reviews, assessment and evaluations of the UN in Malawi have also taken place:

1. Capacity Assessment, 2012
2. MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF), 2013
3. Post 2015 National Consultations, 2013
4. Delivering as One Audit, 2014
5. UNICEF Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014
6. UNFPA Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014
7. Universal Periodic Review, 2014

The Government has conducted reviews of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II in 2012/13 and 2013/14 and has produced MDG Reports for the years 2010, 2012 and 2013. In addition to this, a number of sector specific reviews, assessments and evaluation have been conducted as well as a range of national surveys have been conducted by the National Statistics Office (NSO). More information on these surveys can be found on the NSO website[[25]](#footnote-26). Most recently, the MDG Endline Survey was conducted and the initial findings have been released, with the full report due in December 2014.

Referencing these studies, as well as sector-specific reviews and evaluations, the proposed evaluation will focus primarily upon the UNDAF period. It will provide an independent assessment of the specific short- to medium-term results achieved and UN Malawi’s contribution to national development priorities. It will consider what has worked, what has not worked and why, in the context of Delivering as One. It will therefore provide information for strengthening UN programming, UN results and UN coordination going forward.

The primary users of the evaluation at the country level will be the UN Country Team (resident and non-resident, management and technical level staff), key government counterparts, Development Partners, NGOs and civil society, alongside. On the global stage, the evaluation should contribute to knowledge regarding good practice under UN joint Programming and Delivering as One through the UNDOCO and regional offices.

**4. Purpose, Objectives and Scope**

**4.1. Purpose**

The UN Development Group (UNDG) requires all UN country offices to undertake an evaluation of their Programme of Cooperation (UNDAF) in the penultimate year of the programming cycle. To this end, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) in collaboration with UN Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO) has issued guidance on the required Management Structure and Terms of Reference to ensure quality standards are maintained[[26]](#footnote-27). The planned UNDAF evaluation must observe the parameters of the UNEG/DOCO guidance, whilst ensuring an inclusive approach which involves stakeholder representatives in key decision-making processes. This is critical to ensure the Evaluation is nationally owned, encompasses topics of national interest and has application in the wider national sphere.

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

1. **To support greater accountability of the UN to stakeholders** – by objectively verifying results achieved within the framework of the UNDAF and assessing the effectiveness of the strategies and interventions used, the evaluation will enable the various stakeholders in the UNDAF process, including national counterparts and donors, to hold the UNCT and other parties accountable for fulfilling their roles and commitments.
2. **To support learning –** the evaluation must provide clear recommendations for strengthening programming and results at the country level, specifically informing the planning and decision-making for the next UNDAF programme cycle and for improving United Nations coordination at the country level. The UN, the Government of Malawi and UNDAF stakeholders should be able to learn from the process of documenting good practices and lessons learned which can then be shared with UNDOCO and used for the benefit of other countries.

**4.2 Objectives**

The evaluation has four key objectives:

1. to **assess the contribution made by the UN** through the UNDAF to national development priorities and results, including international and regional commitments on human rights and gender equality, through making judgements using evaluation criteria based on evidence.
2. to **identify the factors that have affected the UN’s contribution**, identifying, understanding and explaining the the enabling factors and bottlenecks that influenced the this contribution (learning).
3. to **reach conclusions concerning the UN’s contribution** across the scope being examined.
4. to **provide actionable recommendations for improving the UN’s contribution**, especially for incorporation into the new UNDAF. These recommendations should be logically linked to the conclusions and draw upon lessons learned identified through the evaluation, including a review of the UNDAF management structure and processes to identify good practice going forward.

**4.3 Scope**

The UNDAF encompasses both development and humanitarian assistance, with a focus on building the capacity of the Government of Malawi to undertake its responsibilities as the primary duty bearer as well as support to empower rights-holders to claim their rights. In response to national priorities, the UN in Malawi supports the Government in four inter-linked and mutually reinforcing priority areas: Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security, Basic Social and Protection Services, HIV and AIDS, and Governance and Human Rights. The four priority areas include the following 14 programme/outcome areas:

1. Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security
   1. Resilience and Food Security
   2. Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change
   3. Employment, Labour and Private Sector Development
2. Basic Social and Protection Services
   1. Health
   2. Nutrition
   3. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
   4. Education
   5. Protection
3. HIV and AIDS
   1. Prevention and Treatment
   2. Enabling Environment
4. Governance and Human Rights
   1. Democratic Governance
   2. Economic Governance
   3. Gender Equality
   4. Population and Development

These priority areas are bound together by key overarching issues including a focus on adolescent girls as a means to accelerate development; building resilience among communities and institutions; advancing human rights and gender equality and advocating for changing attitudes and behaviours. A focus on results backed by solid monitoring and programme oversight are key principles of programme implementation. The majority of initiatives are national in coverage and upstream. However, there are components which operate at the sub-national level, usually direct delivery (e.g. refugee assistance in Dzaleka camp) or piloting of projects/activities for extrapolation of lessons learnt and future national roll-out.

The evaluation will review delivery and achievement of results across all 14 programme Outcomes, contributed to by 21 UN Agencies. However, a number of agencies are undertaking programme/Outcome specific evaluations in early 2015. These are as follows:

* UNDP
  + Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change
  + Gender Equality
* UNICEF
  + Health
  + Nutrition
  + Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
  + Education
  + Protection
* WFP
  + Humanitarian Food Security Response

Following on this, the UN Women as Chair of the Gender technical working group and OHCHR as chair of the Human Rights technical working group will undertake a desk review of the integration of the cross cutting issues across the UNDAF 2012-2016

Therefore, rather than re-evaluating these areas, the evaluation will focus on those areas not already evaluated and build on the thematic evaluations, bringing all areas together under a common evaluation framework. In addition to this, the evaluation will build on the national review process which is likely to take place from January to March. As the UNDAF is the primary document for supporting the Government national development plan, the consultant will be expected to work closely with the consultant(s) conducting the national review and as much as possible, collaborate and work jointly to reduce duplication of efforts (for example, share consultation meetings with stakeholders).

The evaluation should also include analysis of the mainstreaming of the five UN programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) and examine DaO as an overall strategy.

**5. Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation should be a programmatic evaluation that assesses performance against the given programme framework. The UN contribution should be against national development outcomes contained in the results framework. As such, and in line with the UN System’s mandate to promote national ownership and capacity development, the evaluation is country-led, with national partners, both within Government and civil society, co-determining what is to be evaluated, jointly assessing the quality of the evaluation and its application to the wider national sphere. The overall approach should be participatory and orientated towards learning how to jointly enhance development results at the national level. The Evaluation should also be gender and human rights responsive and should conform to UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, as well as ethical guidelines.

The evaluation will assess delivery of the UNDAF Outcomes and broader contribution to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II as well as advancement of human rights in country. Given realisation of the UNDAF Outcomes involves a number of partners, establishing a causal linkage between the development intervention and the observed result (attribution) may prove problematic. The evaluation will therefore consider the contribution of the UN to the UNDAF Outcomes in light of national strategies and actions to support the planned change

The primary focus of the evaluation will be at the Outcome level. As the assessment will be undertaken during the penultimate year of the UNDAF, it will not be a standard summative evaluation and will require some degree of anticipation in terms of the likelihood of Outcome delivery. It will be for the Consultant to establish in the Inception Report how they plan to manage this challenge, whilst retaining due rigour.

The standard set of evaluation criteria across all UNDAF evaluations is to be used, namely:

* **Relevance -** The extent to which the objectives of UNDAF are consistent with country needs, national priorities (including National Strategy for Gender Development) the country’s international and regional commitments, including on human rights (core human rights treaties, including [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination, Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Convention on the Rights of Children etc.) and the recommendations of Human Rights mechanisms (including the treaty bodies, special procedures and UPR), sustainable development, environment, and the needs of women and men of all ages, young people, boys and girls and most vulnerable groups in the country. To what extent was the UNDAF informed by substantive human rights and gender analyses that identified underlying causes and barriers to Human Rights and Gender Equality?
* **Effectiveness -** The extent to which the UN contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcomes defined in the UNDAF and to the degree to which were the results were equitably distributed among the targeted groups. To what extent was a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the UNDAF? Did the intervention contribute to empowerment of rights holders, especially women and young people, to claim and duty bearers to fulfil Human Rights and Gender Equality standards? The evaluation should also note how the unintended results, if any, have affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed.
* **Efficiency -** The extent to which outcomes were achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.). The extent to which resource allocation took into account or prioritised most marginalised groups including women and girls. To what extent were adequate resources provided for integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in the UNDAF?
* **Sustainability -** The extent to which the benefits from a development intervention have continued, or are likely to continue, after it has been completed. In particular, if the transition from developing *individual* capacity in the short-term to creating *institutional* capacity in the long-term has been made. The range of requirements should be considered, including creation of technical expertise, financial independence and mechanisms through which rights-holders may participate in and assert the fulfilment of their rights. To what extent did the UNDAF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues?
* **Impact –** Assess the changes in the well-being of individuals, households and communities attributed to the UNDAF. Identify the changes that have occurred and provide accountability of the UN system. It will also provide feedback to help improve the design of the next UNDAF.

During assessment, using the above criteria, the evaluators should identify the various factors that can explain performance. Where these factors have been identified as UNDAF outcomes in their own right, they should be considered as both results and enabling factors. The evaluators must include reference to:

* **UN Coordination and Value Addition of Delivering as One -** The extent to which UN Coordination and DaO created or encouraged synergies among agencies, optimal results and avoidance of duplication? The extent to which harmonisation measures at the operational level contribute to improved efficiency and results? Factors that facilitated or adversely impacted upon implementation and commitment to the DaO approach.
* **UN Programming Principles -** To what extent were the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) considered and mainstreamed in the chain of results? Were any shortcomings due to a failure to take account of programming principles during implementation? Were adequate resources (both agency specific and One UN Fund) allocated to enable the application and implementation of UNDAF programming principles and related results?
* How well did the UN use its **partnerships** (with civil society/private sector/local government/parliament/national human rights institutions/gender equality advocates/international development partners) to improve performance? To what extent was the “active, free, and meaningful” participation of all stakeholders (in particular vulnerable groups including women and girls) ensured in the UNDAF process?
* Did the UN undertake appropriate **risk analysis** and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost?
* **Responsiveness -** How adequately did the UN during planning and implementation of the UNDAF respond to changes in national priorities and to additional requests from national counterparts, as well as to shifts caused by major external factors and evolving country context (e.g. natural disaster, elections)?
* To what extent did the UNDAF **Governance and Management Structures** promote or challenge delivery, with reference to the internal Division of Labour and Government of Malawi Dialogue Structure? Could outcome groups be better defined and operationalised in future?

The evaluation will not use a pre/post comparison design and, therefore, does not lend itself to specifically attributing effects to the UNDAF. The UNDAF evaluation should draw on a variety of data collection methods, including but not limited to:

* document review;
* semi-structured key stakeholder interviews;
* surveys;
* focus groups;
* outcome mapping; and,
* observational visits.

These should be identified based upon availability, logistical constraints (travel, costs, time, etc) and ethical considerations. Data should be systematically disaggregated by sex, age, geographical region, and to the extent possible, other contextually-relevant markers of equity. It is anticipated that the inception report will include an evaluation matrix linking the data collection methods to the evaluation criteria and questions. Analysis should combine qualitative and quantitative tools, triangulating information sources and findings where possible for validation purposes.

**6. Management and Conduct of the Evaluation**

**6.1 Evaluation Management Structure**

UNDAF evaluations are country-level evaluations. As such, they are jointly commissioned and financed by the UNCT and the national government. The Consultant is expected to work in full independence from the evaluation commissioners under the supervision of a dual-tiered evaluation management structure.

1. Direct supervision is provided by the UN Programme Management Team which for this purpose, will be expanded **to** include 1-2 representatives from the national counterparts. This group will be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation and management of the evaluation budget. The key roles of the PMT are:
   * To prepare the terms of reference for the evaluation in coordination with the Evaluation Steering Committee (UNCT);
   * To lead the hiring of the team of external consultants, reviewing proposals and approving the selection of the Consultant;
   * To supervise and guide the Consultant in each step of the evaluation process;
   * To review, provide substantive comments and approve the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework and methodology;
   * To review and provide substantive feedback to the draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes;
   * to ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation and to guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
   * To identify and ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders in coordination with the UNCT throughout the evaluation process;
   * to ensure the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable; and,
   * to contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response
2. The decision-making organ for the UNDAF Evaluation will be the UNCT. Again, for purposes of the evaluation, the UNCT will be expanded to include two national counterparts. Other key stakeholders such as national civil society organizations and donor representatives may also be added.

**6.2 Consultant Profile**

The consultant should have the following profile:

* Minimum 10 years’ experience of conducting complex evaluations, including at least one UNDAF evaluation and one Gender Equality and Human Rights responsive evaluation.
* Master’s degree in International Development, Public Administration, Evaluation or related field
* Extensive experience of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods
* A strong record in designing and leading evaluations, using a wide range of evaluation approaches
* Process management and facilitation skills, including ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders
* Strong understanding of the United Nations system and UNDAF programming processes and procedures
* Ability to assess the application of the five UN Programming Principles: human rights (the human rights based approach to programming, human rights analysis and related mandates within the UN system), gender equality (especially gender analysis), environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development.
* Understanding of DaO principles and processes
* Familiarity of national planning processes.
* Experience of the Malawian context is desirable.
* Strong management, communication, interview and writing skills
* Excellent communication and interview skills
* Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.
* Proficiency in English

The consultant is expected to be fully self-sufficient in terms of IT/office equipment, stationary, communication, office space, accommodation, transport and other logistics.

Note: the consultant should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the subject of the evaluation. Existence of any potential conflict of interest should be communicated in writing to the evaluation manager prior to signing of a work contract (see [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/documentdownload?doc_id=102&file_id=548) for further clarification about conflict of interest)

**7. Evaluation Process and timeframe**

The Consultant must prepare an inception report that operationalizes the design elements of the ToR. The report should include the results of a desk review, description of evaluation methodology/methodological approach, data collection plan, additional data collection tools and analysis methods, key informants, evaluation questions, performance criteria, issues to be studied, work plan and reporting requirements. The report should also include an evaluability assessment, foreseen limitations and risks, team composition and distribution of tasks, resource requirements and logistic support. To facilitate the development of the inception report a list of documents will be provided in to the evaluators. The PMT will review and provide substantive comments to the report, before final approval can be awarded by the UNCT.

The Consultant must then proceed with data collection and analysis. This process should be made in close consultation with the Resident Coordinator’s Office who will ensure coordination with the PMT and the UNCT. Preliminary findings should be presented to the PMT and UNCT. Based on their feedback, a final report should be produced, in accordance with UNEG Norms and Standards.

Once the evaluation report has been validated by the UNCT, it will be made publicly available through posting on the UNDG and UNCT websites. The UNCT will develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations, including a timeframe and responsibilities for follow up. Lessons learned from the evaluation will be extracted and disseminated in order to contribute to strategic planning, learning, advocacy and decision-making at all levels, including for the formulation of the UNDAF successor document.

Deadlines may require revision, dependent on the availability of data and informants.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Deliverables** | **Payment schedule/amounts** |
| **Inception Report**  Includes detailed Evaluation Work Plan, Evaluation Matrix & Tools | **9th March 2015 (5 days)**  20% of total value of contract (upon approval of report) |
| **Draft Evaluation Report**  To be assessed using UNEG Quality Checklist | **1st May 2015 (40 days)**  40% of total value of contract (upon approval of report) |
| **Final Evaluation Report**  Max. 30,000 words plus essential annexes and 2,500 word Executive Summary (submitted in hard and soft copy).  To be assessed using UNEG Quality Checklist | **15th May 2015 (5 days)**  40% of total value of contract (upon approval of report) |

# Annex B: Evaluation Objectives Matrix

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Key Questions | Means of Verification |
| **Relevance:**  Assess the role and relevance of the 2012-2016 UNDAF | To what extent are the objectives of the UNDAF consistent with country needs and national priorities (including the national Strategy for Gender Development)?  To what extent has the UNDAF addressed underlying causes and challenges?  Is the UNDAF aligned to international goals and treaties and regional commitments, including on:  • Human rights ,  • Sustainable development,  • Environment,  • The needs of women and men of all ages, young people, boys and girls and most vulnerable groups?  To what extent was the UNDAF informed by substantive human rights and gender analyses that identified underlying causes and barriers to Human Rights and Gender Equality?  How flexible and responsive has the UNDAF been to address emerging opportunities or issues during the UNDAF cycle?  Has the Results Matrix been flexible enough to incorporate and respond fully to the emerging issues? | •  Review of secondary review and analysis documents [[27]](#footnote-28) and Outcome-specific and theme-specific evaluations[[28]](#footnote-29)  •  Interviews/discussions with Outcome Group Chairs and members, UN staff members, Government departments, civil society and donor partners |
|  |
|  |
| **Effectiveness:**  Assess effectiveness of the UNDAF in terms of progress made towards realisation of the UNDAF outcomes | To what extent has the UN contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the Outcomes defined in the UNDAF?  What were the promoting and hindering factors toward achievement of the Outcomes?  To what degree were the results equitably distributed among the targeted groups?  To what extent was a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the UNDAF?  Did the intervention contribute to empowerment of rights holders, especially women and young people, to claim and duty bearers to fulfil Human Rights and Gender Equality standards?  How have unintended results, if any, affected national development positively or negatively and to what extent have they been foreseen and managed?  Were the cross-cutting programming principles namely; Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA), gender equality, environmental sustainability, Result- Based Management (RBM) and capacity development emphasized in the implementation process?  Has the UNDAF supported national programmes and enhanced national capacities? | •  Review of secondary documents, including Government and UN analytical reports/review of national policies[[29]](#footnote-30)     * Data gathering on quantitative measures:   1. Levels of achievement of indicators against Outcome targets   2. Resources mobilised against indicative resources planned   •  Interviews and discussions  with OG chairs and other UN staff, Government departments, civil society and donor partners |
| **Efficiency:**  Assess the efficiency with which UNDAF Outcomes were achieved | To what extent were Outcomes achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction costs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.)?  To what extent did resource allocation take into account or prioritise marginalised groups (including women and girls)?  To what extent were adequate resources provided for integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in the UNDAF?  In what ways and to what extent has the UNDAF contributed to reduction in transaction costs?  How can transaction costs be reduced further? | •  Interviews and discussions with OGs, UN agencies and Government departments.  •  Case study success stories provided by the agencies. |
| **Sustainability:**  Assess the sustainability of the benefits from UNDAF interventions, after their completion. | To what extent and in what ways did the UNDAF enhance sustainability of country programmes and projects of individual agencies?  Has a transition from developing individual capacity in the short-term to creating institutional capacity in the long-term been made?  Were the range of sustainability requirements established (including creation of technical expertise, financial independence and mechanisms through which rights-holders may participate in and assert the fulfilment of their rights)?  To what extent did the UNDAF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues? | • Review of secondary documents: UNDAF Annual and other Reviews, Agency evaluation reports  • Interviews and discussions  with OGs, UN and Government departments, CSOs, donors  • Case study success stories provided by the agencies. |
| **Impact:**  Assess UNDAF impacts through changes in the well-being of individuals, households and communities attributable to it. | What changes have occurred, attributable to the UN system?  What changes that were planned or expected did not occur, and why?  What changes in approach or could help improve the design of the next UNDAF? | • Review of secondary documents: UNDAF Annual and other Reviews, Agency evaluation reports  • Interviews and discussions  with OGs, UN and Government departments, CSOs, donors  • Case study success stories provided by the agencies. |
| Factors that Explain Performance | Key Questions | Means of Verification |
| **UN Coordination and Value Addition of Delivering as One (DaO)** | To what extent did DaO create or encourage synergies among agencies, optimal results and avoidance of duplication?  To what extent did harmonisation measures at the operational level contribute to improved efficiency and results?  What factors facilitated or adversely impacted upon implementation and commitment to the DaO approach? | • Interviews and discussions with OGs, UN agencies and Government departments.  • Case study success stories provided by the agencies. |
| **UN Programming Principles** | To what extent were the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) considered and mainstreamed in the chain of results?  Were any shortcomings due to a failure to take account of programming principles during implementation?  Were adequate resources (both agency specific and One UN Fund) allocated to enable the application and implementation of UNDAF programming principles and related results? | • Review of secondary documents: UNDAF Annual and other Reviews, Agency evaluation reports  • Interviews and discussions  with OGs, UN and Government departments, CSOs, donors |
| **Partnerships** | How well did the UN use its partnerships (with civil society, private sector, local government, parliament, national human rights institutions, gender equality advocates, international development partners) to improve performance?  To what extent was the “active, free, and meaningful” participation of all stakeholders (in particular vulnerable groups including women and girls) ensured in the UNDAF process? | • Review of secondary documents: UNDAF Annual and other Reviews, Agency evaluation reports  • Interviews and discussions  with OGs, UN and Government departments, CSOs, donors |
| **Risk Analysis** | Did the UN undertake appropriate risk analysis and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost? | • Review of secondary documents: UNDAF Annual and other Reviews, Agency evaluation reports  • Interviews and discussions  with OGs, UN and Government departments, CSOs, donors |
| **Responsiveness** | How adequately did the UN during planning and implementation of the UNDAF respond to changes in national priorities and to additional requests from national counterparts, as well as to shifts caused by major external factors and evolving country context (e.g. natural disaster, elections)? | • Review of secondary documents: UNDAF Annual and other Reviews, Agency evaluation reports  • Interviews and discussions  with OGs, UN and Government departments, CSOs, donors |
| **Governance and Management Structures** | To what extent did the UNDAF Governance and Management Structures promote or challenge delivery, with reference to the internal Division of Labour and Government of Malawi Dialogue Structure?  Could outcome groups be better defined and operationalised in future?  Has the UNDAF fostered synergies and strategic partnership between UN agencies, national partners and donors?  Were the agency programmes mutually synergistic towards realization of mutual, planned Outcomes?  Have these mechanisms supported reinforcement of UNDAF Outcome achievement?  Has the UNDAF promoted joint programming by UN agencies? | • Review of secondary documents: UNDAF Annual and other Reviews, Agency evaluation reports  • Interviews and discussions  with OGs, UN and Government departments, CSOs, donors |

# Annex C: List of Persons Interviewed

## National Partners

#### Government of Malawi

**Office of the President and Cabinet**

Wezi Kayira, Principal Secretary for Good Governance

**Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development**

Mussa Phale, Director of Planning Services

**Department of Disaster Management Affairs**

Paul Chiunguzeni, Secretary and Commissioner for Disaster Management Affairs

**Ministry of Education, Science and Technology**

Charles Msosa, Principal Secretary for Higher Education

**Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development**

Yona Kamphale, Principal Secretary (acting)

Peter Simbani, Director, Debt & Aid Management Division

Sipho Billiat, Principal Economist

**Ministry of Health**

Dr. Charles Mwansambo, Chief of Health Services

**Ministry of Industry and Trade**

Clement Phangapanga, Deputy Director of Industry

Joy Hara, Chief Economist

**Ministry of Labour and Manpower Development**

Patrick Kabambe, Principal Secretary

**Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development**

Walusungu Kayire, Chief Economist

**Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining**

Emma Jipson Mabvumbe, Deputy Director for Policy and Planning

#### Civil society

**Action Aid**

Blessings Botha

Chikondi Chavbuta

Julie Juma

Dalitso Kuphanga

Ken Matekenya

**Adolescent Girls' Literacy Project (AGLIT)**

Hazel Manda

**Blantyre Synod Health & Development Commission**

Lindirate Gareta

**Centre for Education Research and Training, University of Malawi (CERT, UNIMA)**

Professor Dixie Maluwa Banda

**The Centre for Multiparty Democracy (CMD)**

Betty Liwimbi

**Citizens for Justice**

Walhalha Saukila

**Concern Universal**

Heather Campbell

**The Coalition of Women Living with HIV and AIDS in Malawi (COWLHA)**

Steven Iphani

**Development Aid from People to People (DAPP) - Mikolongwe Vocational School**

Augustus Kaliyati

**Emmanuel International**

Charles Mukiwa

Esnath Gondwe

**Eye of the Child**

Maxwell Matewere

**Hygiene Village Project**

Yvonne Beauty Kasekera

**Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI)**

Wezi Moyo

**Malawi Law Society (MLS)**

Khumbo Bonzoe Soko

**Nkhadze Alive Youth Org**

Charles Sineta

**Southern African AIDS Trust**(**SAT) Malawi**

Novice Bamusi

**Shelter Cluster Malawi**

Steve Barker, Team Leader

**Women and Law Malawi (WLSA)**

Chimwemwe Kampondeni

**Women Judges Association of Malawi (WoJAM)**

Jean Kayira

**World Relief Malawi**

Angela Mwembungu Banda

**Youth Net and Counseling (YONECO)**

Charles Banda

Ajasi Hussein

## United Nations System

**UN Resident Coordinator**

Mia Seppo, UN Resident Coordinator/ UNDP Resident Representative and Cluster Convener (Cluster 4)

Richard Bailey, Strategic Planning Advisor

Lisbeth Mjoes, Special Assistant to the Resident Coordinator

Cathal Elder, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

Chancy Chilimbila, Coordination Analyst

Philip Pemba, Secretary, UN Communications Group

Lusako Munyenyembe

Patrick Byrne, Coordination Analyst

**FAO**

Florence Rolle, Representative and Cluster Convener (Cluster 1)

Alick Nkhoma, Assistant Representative and Cluster Coordinator (Cluster 1)

**ILO**

Khalid Hassan, Chief Technical Adviser, International Programme on Elimination of Child Labour & Outcome Lead (1.3)

Charles Nangwale, Liaison Officer

**OHCHR/RCO**

Neal Gilmore, Human Rights Advisor

**UNAIDS**

Amakobe Sande, UNAIDS Representative

Frances Wallace, Gender and HIV Advisor

Charles Birungi, Strategic Investments and Efficiency Advisor

**UNCDF**

Fletcher Chilumpha, Local Technical Advisor (Inclusive Finance)

**UNDP**

Carol Flore-Smereczniak, Deputy Resident Representative (Programme) and Cluster Coordinator (Cluster 4)

Katarzynia Wawiernia, Deputy Resident Representative (Operations) and Cluster Convener (Operations)

Ernest Misomali, Assistant Resident Representative

Patrick Kamwendo, Senior Economist

Clemence Alfazema, Programme Analyst, Governance & Outcome Lead (4.1)

Titus Kavalo, Programme Analyst, Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme

David Kayuni, Programme Analyst – Human Rights

Magdalena Kouneva, Programme Specialist, Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme

Peter Kulemeka, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

Terence Malamulo, Programme Analyst – DG SWAp

Ennettie Mbuka, Programme Analyst - Governance

Etta Mmangisa, Programme Analyst & Environment Outcome Lead (Outcome 1.2)

Millingo (Venge) Nkosi, Programme Analyst

Cinzia Tecce, Private Sector Development Specialist

**UNESCO**

Kazembe Jessie Chisala; National Programme Officer (Education, HIV&AIDS)

**UNFPA**

Violet Kakyomya, UNFPA Representative

Rogaia Abdelrahim, Deputy Representative

Dorothy Nyasulu, Assistant Representative & Outcome Lead (4.1)

Bernard Mijoni, M&E Officer

Bill Chanza, Outcome Lead (4.4)

Humphreys Shumba, Outcome Lead (3.1)

**UNHCR**

George Kuchio, UNHCR Representative

**UNICEF**

Mahimbo Mdoe, Representative and Cluster Convener (Cluster 2)

Charles Nabongo, Chief, Basic Education & Youth Development

Nankali Maksud, Chief of Protection & Outcome Lead (2.5)

Paulos Workneh, Chief of WASH & Outcome Lead (2.3)

Jecinter Akinyi Oketch, Nutrition Specialist & Outcome Lead (2.2)

Benson Kazembe, Programme Officer - Nutrition

Brendan Ross

Clara Chindime

Malla Mabona

Esnart Phiri

Emmanual Saka

**UN Operations Management Team**

Kasia Wawiernia, Chair of OMT (UNDP)

Janet Chikombole, Chair of Finance TWG (UNDP)

Grace Nhlema, Chair of Human Resources TWG (WFP)

Dr. Samuel Chingondole, Chair of ICT TWG (FAO)

Evelyn Jonazi (UNAIDS)

Lettice Myrie (UNDSS)

Linda Liwimbi (UNDSS)

Madalo Khoza (UNFPA)

Chikondi Dzoole (UNICEF)

Aaron Kumwenda (UN Women)

**UN Staff Welfare Committees**

Augustine Mpelembe (FAO)

Bernard Mijoni (UNFPA)

Clara Chindime (UNICEF)

Loveness Ndaziona (UN Women)

Ellen Thom (WHO)

**UN Women**

Alice Harding Shackelford, UN Women Representative, UN GTWG and UNCG chair

Emma Gausi, M&E Officer

Giulia Pelosi, Advocacy

Lily Mwandira, Programme Assistant

Pamela Mkwamba, National Programme Officer

Owen Kadewele

Edfas Mkandawire

Viwemi Chavula

Loveness Ndaziona

Aaron Kumwenda

Tiwonge Kayira

Mable Mhone

**WFP**

Coco Ushiyama, WFP Country Director

Duncan Ndhlovu, Programme Officer & Outcome Lead (1.1)

Elie Iyakaremye, Head of Programmes

Lazarus Gonani, Programme Officer

Grace Makhalira

**WHO**

Eugene Nyarko, Representative

Leslie Mgalula

## External Development Partners

**African Development Bank**

Peter Mwanakatwe

**Department for International Development, UK**

Philip Smith, Deputy Head of Office

**Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)**

Maximilian Müller, Intern

**Embassy of Ireland**

Aidan Fitzpatrick, Head of Development

**European Union**

Two programme staff

**Japan International Cooperation Agency**

Godfrey Kapalamula, Chief Programme Officer

**Royal Norwegian Embassy**

Bjarne Garden, Minister Counsellor/Deputy Head of Mission

## Consultants

**Evaluation of UNDAF Gender Mainstreaming & Outcome 4.3**

Grace Okonji

**Evaluation of UNDAF Outcome 4.2**

Prof. Oliver Saasa

Dr. Henry Chingaipe

# Annex D: Joint Programmes

#### Status of Joint Programming as of April 2015

Active Joint Programmes

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme | | Agencies[[30]](#footnote-31) | Overview | Timeframe | Location | Budget | Update | Status |
| Resilience in Phalombe | **FAO**, UNICEF, UNDP, WFP | | **Goal:** Resilience of vulnerable households and communities to shocks strengthened  **Outputs:**   1. Participatory identification of integrated actions 2. Social protection 3. DRM coordination strengthened 4. Risk reduction/ resilience capacity 5. Community based nutrition and communication | 2 years  (July 2014 to July 2016) | Phalombe | Approx $2m | Extensive discussion was required to agree on SOPs for implementation. | Started in June 2014, with substantial field level activities from early 2015. |
| Girl’s Education | UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA  (NB: To be led by a Project Coordinator: No lead agency) | | **Goal:** Improving access and quality of education for girls in Malawi | 3 years  (2014-2017) | Phase 1: Mangochi, Salima and Dedza  Phase 2: National | Total:  $18m, through One UN Fund | Programme approved and implementation has begun.  Meetings with Districts took place, which produced joint work plans and full implementation began in early 2015. | Started in July 2014, ongoing |
| Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme (DEAP)[[31]](#footnote-32) | **UNDP**, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNAIDS | | Outcome: Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate, and utilize resources for effective  development and service delivery by 2016. | 4 years (January, 2013 – December 2016) | National | $9m | Three of the four Outputs of Outcome 4.2, though both have separate work plans | Ongoing since 2013 |
| Right to Food[[32]](#footnote-33) | **FAO/UN Women**[[33]](#footnote-34) and UNDP | | Support Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to carry out policy research; monitoring, and advocacy on the right to food in Malawi at both national and group village levels | 5 years  (2014 – 2018) |  | $1.5m through One UN Fund | Project underway with Right to Food Officer in place. | Started in Feb 2015 |
| Humanitarian Window | WFP,  UNICEF,  WHO,  UNFPA,  UN Women | |  |  |  | Through One UN Fund | DFID replenishes annually. | Expanded in 2015 for flood response |

Proposal Stage/ Pipeline

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme | Agencies | Overview | Timeframe | | Location | Budget | Update | Status |
| Resilience Proposal to EU |  | FAO in lead submitting proposal to UN | |  |  |  |  | Proposal development stage |
| HIV and AIDS | WHO, **UNAIDS**, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UN Women, UNESCO, UNODC, UN Cares, ILO, UNDP | **Outcome 1:** All Key & Vulnerable populations have equitable access to and uptake of quality gender- sensitive HIV Treatment, Prevention and Care Services;  And;  **Outcome 2:** Malawi has the necessary legal and policy frameworks and a social environment which supports an effective HIV and AIDS response. | | 3 years  (2014 – 2016) | National | Total: $23m  UN Funds: $16m  Gap: $7m | Proposal developed and presented to DPs with limited uptake.  Technical support has been mobilised (supported by DFID)  Currently updating to align with new HIV strategy. | Proposal developed but no funding secured from DPs |
| REACH (Nutrition Coordination) | UNICEF, WFP, FAO, WHO | 1. Strengthened capacity for DNHA in multi-sectoral nutrition coordination 2. Policies, Strategic plans and other relevant documents 3. DNHA Monitoring and Evaluation system 4. Capacity Development 5. Resource tracking | |  | National | Total: $1,205,000 | Proposal developed and presented to DPs with limited uptake | Funding available but has not yet started due to institutional changes in GoM. |
| Maternal Health | UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA |  | |  |  |  | Consultant is currently conducting a country analysis on sexual, reproductive, maternal and new-born health rights. Based on this analysis, there may be an opportunity to develop a joint programme.  Consultancy is due to be completed in the coming weeks. | Idea stage |
| Population and Development | UNICEF, **UNFPA**, UNDP, UNAIDS, UN-Habitat |  | |  |  |  | Initial meeting in October 2014. | Concept note developed but no progress |
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#### Malawi Plans, Studies and Policy Documents

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Area/ Sector** | **File/Document Title** | **Author/Owner** | **Year Produced/ Published** |
| Government | Agriculture | MALAWI Price Bulletin July 2014 | FEWSNET | 2014 |
| Government | Agriculture | Malawi Agricultural Market Information System Assessment 2013 | Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Department of Agricultural Planning Services | 2013 |
| Government | Agriculture | The Agricultural Statistical System in Malawi Inventory of Stakeholders 2012 | Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Department of Agricultural Planning Services | 2012 |
| Government | Agriculture | Annual Agricultural Joint Sector Performance Report for 2013/2014 | Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development | 2014 |
| Government | Agriculture | Development of the Malawi Agricultural Statistics Strategic Master Plan 2012 Inception Report | Mphatso Janet Nyekanyeka | 2012 |
| Government | M&E | INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD PANEL SURVEY 2011 - 2013 | National Statistics Office | 2014 |
| Government | M&E | INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEY 2004-2005 Report | National Statistics Office | 2005 |
| Government | M&E | INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEY 2010-2011 Report | National Statistics Office | 2012 |
| Government | M&E | Malawi MDG Endline Survey 2014 Key Findings Report | National Statistics Office | 2014 |
| Government | M&E | Welfare Monitoring Survey 2009 Report | National Statistics Office | 2010 |
| Government | M&E | Welfare Monitoring Survey 2011 Report | National Statistics Office | 2012 |
| Government | Development Effectiveness | Malawi Aid Atlas 2011 – 2014 draft | Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development | 2015 |
| Government | Disaster Risk Management | Malawi Disaster Risk Management Policy | Government of Malawi | 2014 |
| Government | Disaster Risk Management | Malawi Disaster Risk Management Policy Implementation and M&E Strategy | Government of Malawi | 2014 |
| Government | Education | Education Statistics 2011 | Ministry of Education Science and Technology | 2011 |
| Government | Education | Education Statistics 2012 | Ministry of Education Science and Technology | 2012 |
| Government | Education | Education Statistics 2014 | Ministry of Education Science and Technology | 2014 |
| Government | Education | Malawi Education Sector Implementation Plan 2014-2018 | Ministry of Education, Science and Technology | 2014 |
| Government | Education | Malawi Girls Education Communication Strategy August 2013 | Ministry of Education, Science and Technology | 2014 |
| Government | Education | Malawi Girls Education Strategy | Ministry of Education, Science and Technology | 2014 |
| Government | Gender Equality | National Gender Policy | Government of Malawi | 2008 |
| Government | Gender Equality | THE GENDER, CHILDREN, YOUTH AND SPORTS SECTOR WORKING GROUP Joint Sector Strategic Plan 2012-2017 | Government of Malawi | 2012 |
| Government | Gender Equality | Women, Work, and the Economy: Macroeconomic Gains From Gender Equity | IMF | 2013 |
| Government | Gender Equality | CEDAW Report – Malawi Sixth periodic report of States parties | Malawi | 2008 |
| Government | Gender Equality | National Gender Conference 2013 - Draft Communique | Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare/ UN Women | 2013 |
| Government | Gender Equality | National Gender Conference 2013 - Main issues and plans of actions | Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare/ UN Women | 2013 |
| Government | Gender Equality | CEDAW General recom. 21. *(General Comments*) Equality in marriage and family relations | OHCHR | 1994 |
| Government | Gender Equality | CEDAW General Recommendation No. 24: Article 12 of the Convention (Women and Health) | UN | 1999 |
| Government | Health | Malawi Primary Health Care (PHC) Project Evaluation | Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI) | 2014 |
| Government | Health | Malawi Primary Health Care (PHC) Project Evaluation | Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI) - Malawi | 2014 |
| Government | Health | Malawi Health Sector Resource Mapping Key Findings | Government of Malawi | 2012 |
| Government | Health | Summative report on the external evaluation of the Catalytic Initiative (CI)/ Integrated Health Systems Strengthening (IHSS) programme in Malawi | Medical Research Council, South Africa in partnership with the University of the Western Cape and Save the Children, USA | 2014 |
| Government | Health | Malawi Health Sector Strategic Plan 2011 – 2016 | Ministry of Health | 2011 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | Narrowing the Gap Scaling up Adolescent’s Access to Quality Information and Utilisation of Services on HIV Prevention, Treatment and Support Project (2013-2016) & Addressing the SRH Rights and Unintended Teen Pregnancy - Mid Term Review Report | Alfred M. Dzilankhulani for Government of Malawi/ UNICEF/ GIZ | 2014 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | Assessment of Legal, Regulatory & Policy Environment for HIV and AIDS in Malawi | Government of Malawi/ UNDP | 2012 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | Demographic and Economic Modelling for Long Term Sustainability of HIV and AIDS Response in Malawi | Government of Malawi/ UNDP | 2013 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | Towards an improved investment approach for an effective response to HIV/AIDS | Investment Framework Study Group | 2011 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | HIV Services Quality Improvement Report Q3 2013 | Ministry of Health | 2013 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | HIV Services Quality Improvement Report Q4 2013 | Ministry of Health | 2013 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | Integrated HIV Program Report January -March 2014 | Ministry of Health | 2014 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | NATIONAL HIV PREVENTION STRATEGY 2015-2020 | National AIDS Commission | 2014 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | THE MALAWI NATIONAL AIDS SPENDING ASSESSMENT (NASA) 2010/11 - 2011/12 | National AIDS Commission | 2013 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | Potential Financing for HIV in Malawi | Oxford Policy Management | 2013 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | SUSTAINABLE FINANCING FOR HIV/ AIDS IN MALAWI | Oxford Policy Management | 2012 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | Gender Assessment of the Malawi National HIV Response | Southern African AIDS Trust (SAT)/ UNAIDS | 2014 |
| Government | HIV and AIDS | National Strategic Plan for HIV and AIDS 2015 – 2020 |  | 2014 |
| Government | Human Rights | Convention on the Rights of the Child Concluding Observations for Malawi | UN | 2009 |
| Government | Humanitarian | FOOD INSECURITY RESPONSE PLAN 2014/2015 | Government of Malawi | 2014 |
| Government | Humanitarian | NATIONAL CONTINGENCY PLAN MALAWI 2011–2012 | Government of Malawi | 2011 |
| Government | Humanitarian | The Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committee (MVAC) April 2013 to March 2014 | MVAC | 2014 |
| Government | Labour | Malawi Labour Force Survey 2013 Report | National Statistics Office | 2014 |
| Government | M&E | STUDY ON THE DEMAND FOR AND SUPPLY OF EVALUATION IN MALAWI | Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results Anglophone Africa (CLEAR-AA) | 2013 |
| Government | M&E | Malawi State of M&E Final Report | Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development | 2014 |
| Government | M&E | NATIONAL STATISTICAL SYSTEM STRATEGIC PLAN 2013-2017 | National Statistics Office | 2013 |
| Government | MDGs | MALAWI POST 2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA National Consultations on Post MDGs Report | Government of Malawi/ UN | 2013 |
| Government | MDGs | Malawi MDGs Report 2010 | Ministry of Economic Planning and Development | 2010 |
| Government | MDGs | Malawi MDGs Report 2012 | Ministry of Economic Planning and Development | 2012 |
| Government | MDGs | Malawi MDGs Report 2013 | Ministry of Economic Planning and Development | 2013 |
| Government | MDGs | Malawi MDGs Report 2014 | Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development | 2014 |
| Government | MDGs | Malawi MDGs Progress | UN | 2013 |
| Government | MDGs | Malawi MDGs Progress | UN | 2013 |
| Government | MGDS | Malawi Growth and Development Strategy Annual Review Report 2007 | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development | 2008 |
| Government | MGDS | Malawi Growth and Development Strategy Annual Review Report 2008 | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development | 2009 |
| Government | MGDS | Malawi Growth and Development Strategy Annual Review Report 2009 | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development | 2010 |
| Government | MGDS | Malawi Growth and Development Strategy Annual Review Report 2010 | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development | 2011 |
| Government | MGDS | Malawi Growth and Development Strategy Annual Review Report 2011 | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development | 2012 |
| Government | MGDS | Malawi Growth and Development Strategy Annual Review Report 2013 | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development | 2014 |
| Government | Population | Malawi Population Projections | National Statistical Office | 2008 |
| Government | Protection | Child PROTECTION WELFARE MONITORING SURVEY Thematic Report 2011 | Government of Malawi/ UNICEF | 2014 |
| Government | Social Protection | Malawi Social Cash Transfer Program Baseline Evaluation Report | University of North Carolina | 2014 |
| Government | SWGs | Malawi Review Of the Functionality of Sector Working Groups | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and Development | 2014 |
| Government | SWGs | Malawi Sector Working Group Review – Executive Summary | Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development | 2014 |
| Government | Trade and Private Sector Development | Malawi FinScope MSME Survey 2012 Report | Finmark Trust | 2012 |
| Government | Trade and Private Sector Development | Malawi FinScope SMME Survey 2012 Summary | Finmark Trust | 2012 |
| Government | Trade and Private Sector Development | Malawi National Export Strategy 2013 – 2018 | Ministry of Industry and Trade | 2012 |
| Government | Vulnerable Children | Situation Analysis for Vulnerable Children in Malawi | Government of Malawi | 2014 |
| Other | Governance | Fragmented governance and local service delivery in Malawi Report | ODI | 2014 |
| Other | Governance | Fragmented governance and local service delivery in Malawi Report Summary | ODI | 2014 |
| Other | Human Rights | MALAWI HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION Annual Report 2013 | MALAWI HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION | 2014 |
| Other | Human Rights | MALAWI HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION STRATEGIC PLAN 2011 - 2015 | MALAWI HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION | 2011 |
| Other | Social Protection | REVIEW OF SOCIAL PROTECTION INSTRUMENTS IN MALAWI | DFID | 2006 |
| Other | Social Protection | The Social Protection Policy in Malawi: Processes, Politics and Challenges | Future Agricultures | 2007 |
| Other | Social Protection | Malawi Social Protection Status Report | World Bank | 2007 |
| UN | MDGs | Africa MDGs Report 2014 | United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) | 2014 |
| UN | MDGs | Assessing Progress in Africa toward the Millennium Development Goals | United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) | 2011 |
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| UN Malawi | Education | Improving access and quality of education for girls in Malawi Project Proposal including Budget and Results Framework | UN | 2014 |
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| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Outcome 2.2 Annual Work Plan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Outcome 2.2 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Outcome 2.2 Annual Workplan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Outcome 2.2 Expanded Annual Review Report 2012-13 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Outcome 2.2 Mid-Year Review Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Outcome 2.2 Narrative Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Outcome 2.2 Technical Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Nutrition | UNDAF Work Plans 2012 – 2016 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Cluster 4 Mid-Year Review 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Cluster Annual Work Plans 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Annual Work Plan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Annual Work Plan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Annual Work Plan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Annual Workplan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Expanded Annual Review Report 2012-13 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Mid-Year Review Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Narrative Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Outcome 4.4 Technical Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Population | UNDAF Work Plans 2012 – 2016 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Cluster 2 Mid-Year Review 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Cluster Annual Work Plans 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Annual Work Plan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Annual Work Plan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Annual Work Plan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Annual Workplan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Expanded Annual Review Report 2012-13 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Mid-Year Review Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Narrative Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Outcome 2.5 Technical Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Protection | UNDAF Work Plans 2012 – 2016 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | MGDS II and UNDAF Strategic Alignment | RCO | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UN Transformation Plan and its linkage with the UNDAF implementation | RCO | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF 2011 – 2016 OPTIONS FOR UNCT CONSIDERATION | RCO | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Formulation Phase Facilitation Note | RCO | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Formulation Phase Roadmap and Milestones | RCO | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Roadmap | RCO | 2010 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF roadmap | RCO | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Validation Workshop RC Speech | RCO | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UN One Annual Report 2009 | UN | 2010 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UN One Annual Report 2010 | UN | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UN One Annual Report 2011 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UN Transformation Plan 2012 – 2013 | UN | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UN Transformation Plan Achievements 2012 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UN Transformation Plan Report 2012 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF 2012 – 2016 | UN | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Achievements 2012 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Action Plan 2012 – 2016 | UN | 2011 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Action Plan and Results Framework | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Action Plan Results and Resources Matrix 2012 - 2016 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Annual Report 2012 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Annual Report 2014 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Annual Report Matrix 2012 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Annual Workplans 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Annual Workplans 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Cluster 1 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Cluster 2 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Cluster 3 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Cluster 4 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Analysis | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome Progress at a Glance | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Outcome and Output Indicators | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reports/Plans | UNDAF Progress Report 2012-13 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Cluster 1 Mid-Year Review 2014 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Cluster Annual Work Plans 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Annual Work Plan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Annual Work Plan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Annual Workplan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Expanded Annual Review Report 2012-13 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Mid-Year Review Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Narrative Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.1 Technical Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Outcome 1.4 Expanded Annual Review Report 2012-13 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Resilience/Food Security | UNDAF Work Plans 2012 – 2016 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | HRBA AND GENDER CHECKLIST CLUSTER 1 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | HRBA AND GENDER CHECKLIST CLUSTER 2 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | HRBA AND GENDER CHECKLIST CLUSTER 3 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | HRBA AND GENDER CHECKLIST CLUSTER 4 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 AKR Graphs | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Annual Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Briefing Meeting - RC Talking Points | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Briefing Meeting Presentation | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Budget vs Expenditure | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 1.1 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 1.1 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 1.2 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 1.2 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 1.3 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 1.4 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.1 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.1 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.2 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.2 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.3 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.3 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.4 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.4 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.5 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 2.5 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 3.1 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 3.1 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 3.2 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 3.2 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.1 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.1 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.2 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.2 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.3 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.3 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.4 Narrative Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 Outcome 4.4 Technical Report | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Annual Review 2014 TOR | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review - Proposed Changes to UNDAF | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review – Summary of Proposed Changes | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Expenditure by Outcome | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Meeting Minutes | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 1.1 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 1.2 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 1.3 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 1.4 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 2.1 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 2.2 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 2.3 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 2.4 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 2.5 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 3.1 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 3.2 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 3.3 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 3.4 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 4.1 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 4.2 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 4.3 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Outcome 4.4 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Expanded Annual Review TOR | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 - PMT Recommendations for UNCT | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Briefing presentation | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Cluster 1 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Cluster 2 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Cluster 3 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Cluster 4 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Delivering as One Survey Responses | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Delivering as One Survey Results | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Results Summary | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Review Meeting notes | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 TOR | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Analysis | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Cross Cutting Issues Review | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 1.1 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 1.2 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 1.3 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 2.1 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 2.2 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 2.3 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 2.4 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 2.5 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 3.1 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 3.2 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 4.1 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 4.2 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 4.3 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2014 Outcome 4.4 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | Reviews | UNDAF Mid-Year Review 2013 Report | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Cluster 2 Mid-Year Review 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Cluster Annual Work Plans 2013 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Annual Work Plan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Annual Work Plan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Annual Work Plan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Annual Workplan 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Annual Workplan 2015 | UN | 2015 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Expanded Annual Review Report 2012-13 | UN | 2013 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Mid-Year Review Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Narrative Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Outcome 2.3 Technical Report 2014 | UN | 2014 |
| UNDAF | WASH | UNDAF Work Plans 2012 – 2016 | UN | 2012 |
| UNDP | Human Development | Human Development Report 2013 | UNDP | 2013 |
| UNDP | Human Development | Human Development Report 2014 | UNDP | 2014 |
| UNDP | Human Development | Human Development Report 2014 - Explanatory note on the 2014 Human Development Report composite indices for Malawi | UNDP | 2014 |
| UNDP | Human Development | Human Development Report 2014 summary | UNDP | 2014 |
| UNDP | Reports/Plans | UNDP RC Report 2014 | RC | 2015 |
| UNDP | Social Protection | Malawi Case Study: Social Protection Measures and Labour Markets – Discussion Paper | UNDP | 2012 |
| UNFPA | Reports/Plans | MALAWI GOVERNMENT-UNFPA ANNUAL REVIEW MEETING Report | UNFPA | 2013 |
| UNFPA | Reports/Plans | UNFPA Malawi 2013 Annual Report | UNFPA | 2013 |
| UNFPA | Reports/Plans | UNFPA Malawi 2014 Annual Report | UNFPA | 2014 |
| UNFPA | Reports/Plans | UNFPA Malawi Country Programme Document | UNFPA | 2012 |
| UNICEF | M&E | Real Time Monitoring of the Most Vulnerable Children and Women in Malawi 10th Report | UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | M&E | Real Time Monitoring of the Most Vulnerable Children and Women in Malawi 11th Report | UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | M&E | Real Time Monitoring of the Most Vulnerable Children and Women in Malawi 8th Report | UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | M&E | Real Time Monitoring of the Most Vulnerable Children and Women in Malawi 9th Report | UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | Nutrition | Nutrition Bottleneck Analysis Mulanje Report | Government of Malawi/ UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | Nutrition | Nutrition Bottleneck Analysis Nkhatabay Report | Government of Malawi/ UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | Nutrition | Nutrition Operational Plan Mulanje Report | Government of Malawi/ UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | Nutrition | Nutrition Operational Plan Nkhatabay Report | Government of Malawi/ UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | Protection | FORMATIVE STUDY ON VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN IN MALAWI – Final Report | Government of Malawi/ UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF | Reports/Plans | UNICEF Mid-Term Review of Country Programme | UNICEF | 2014 |
| UNICEF |  | Gen2030 Report- Malawi Perspective | UNICEF | 2014 |
| WFP | Agriculture | Purchase for Progress 2009 Baseline Report for Malawi | African Economic Research Consortium | 2009 |

# Annex F: Feedback on the UNDAF from Civil Society Groups

CSO Feedback on the UNDAF – Meetings with CSOs April 22 & 23, 2015 Crossroads Hotel, Lilongwe

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Thematic**  **Groups** | **What has the UN done well?** | **How has the UN not succeeded and why?** | **Ways the UN can do better/Improve** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment** | 1. Empowering women to take active roles in programs that were mainly led by men e. g public works program supervision (18 districts) leadership, economic empowerment, reducing GBV 2. UN Women spearhead issues of gender and women empowerment and gender equality, child marriage age campaign, the enactment of the Marriage Act 3. 50:50 Campaign as a coordinating entity on the representation of women in the political leadership (Coordinating the 50:50 campaign i.e. collaboration alongside other players 4. National gender conference 5. Capacity building of CSOs on issues (best practices in other countries) 6. Establishment of one stop centers (integrated services for violence victims) 7. Gender sensitive response to flood victims 8. Baseline for gbv: generating evidence 9. Support to policy development 10. Creating awareness, to respond to current issues (bringing issues of concern to stakeholders and partners) 11. National gender interventions | 1. Little coordination in implementing the framework for girls and women with HIV 2. Need for UN follow up on action points and resolutions from meetings 3. Lack of communication from the UN on gender policy and issues on gender mainstreaming 4. Ownership of development activities by the receiving country: dependency syndrome on the part of government such that it does not take up an initiative once its lifespan has expired 5. Approach: Lack of adequate analysis of what is practical in Malawi: UN just bulldozes their concepts on the country 6. Untimeliness of disbursement of resources towards initiatives, hampering implementation of activities 7. Investing in domestic institutions to facilitate local ownership of the initiative 8. Not driven by demand of people (needs assessment/needs driven) 9. Fragmentation of aid: thematic approach of UN agencies (institutional coordination) 10. Financial procedures invoked by UN have affected involvement of stakeholders 11. Procurement procedures by the UN and other donors are very involved 12. Power issues between the UN and the beneficiaries: need to level the playing field: 10% operating costs of CSOs 13. Ad hoc programs empowering women parliamentarians: there is need to work with women even outside parliament | 1. Needs assessment before implementing initiatives 2. Contextual analysis of the environment before applying initiatives e.g. marital rape program 3. Profile and visibility of UN’s programs 4. Sharing of information to put people on the same level and understanding 5. Eligibility of CSOs on accessing funding: need to revise the list on eligibility 6. Simplify rules 7. Sub contracted activity by a fellow CSO e.g. DCP. This creates inferiority 8. Supporting a few districts on initiatives on patriarchy, culture and other issues on that have affected gender work 9. Monitoring and implementation: intensify on implementation of resolutions and disseminate 10. Focused allocation of resources to attain the gender agenda: capacity for gender budgeting 11. Operational research that can inform the programing that is happening in other institutions 12. Changing the electoral laws as a way of mainstreaming gender |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HIV/AIDS** | 1. Supported with providing resources in hard-to-reach areas – good outreach 2. HIV not only seen as health issue but across sectors thanks to the UN 3. Reproductive health services to youth as a driver e.g. supporting youth friendly services – one stop centres 4. Been responsive to issues of HIV/AIDs and increase in visibility (information and data) 5. UN has identified bottlenecks in terms of maternal health 6. Empowered the youth by giving them a voice 7. Development of strategic documents 8. Leadership and coordination role was provided by the UN | 1. The role of UNAIDS is unclear – at government level, not in commitments 2. Roles in transfer of programs from the UN to the government due to lack of capacities 3. Need to balance investments between policy and communities to affect change 4. Sharing of best practices generated elsewhere to the country – as a global entity (packaging of the information to local CSOs) e.g. prevention 5. Information reaching the community e.g. viral load, 90:90:90 6. The capacity to provide the facilities to the communities e.g. viral load, 90:90:90. 7. Linking information | 1. Technologies and medicines should be available to the most remote areas 2. Need to support government building human resources at the community level 3. Scale up youth-friendly services 4. Need to re-look at the packages of youth-friendly services 5. Strengthen interventions on rights – (linking HIV/AIDs to women and youth) 6. Clear linkages between UNAIDS and the MoGCDSW 7. Invest in more efficient ways of HIV/AIDs programming 8. Clear roles, strategies of each stakeholder on the HIV/AIDs response 9. Focus on women and girls/young women 10. Invest in high impact HIV/AIDs interventions |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Education and Protection** | 1. Identification of partners to help/support national structures 2. Alignment of global and national agendas 3. Raising awareness on critical issues. Thinking locally as well as globally at policy level 4. Leadership in localization of MDGs 5. In specialization of areas under the MDGs- agency focus to prioritize action of issues 6. Providing technical and financial support 7. Development of national frameworks - national girls education strategy for example 8. Building capacity of nationals at different levels 9. Commemoration of international days such as the International Day of the Girl Child 10. Role in bringing together stakeholders 11. A hub and source of information - easy to get information from the UN | 1. Dialogue with partners and ownership (powers dynamics) - No flexibility, no consideration of partners and policies. Ownership to partners 2. System changes – not collaborative 3. Focus placed on higher level relationships with partners and less with technical staff 4. National systems - need to be strengthened 5. Inability to facilitate dialogue and leadership in cash gate response 6. Capacity building ‘on paper' 7. Building adult youth literacy - very little financial and technical support 8. Cross sectorial collaboration - lack of concentration on grass roots issues 9. Not much investment in children and people (rural communities) | 1. Support government with human resources 2. Support longer term projects 3. Investment in root causes 4. Provide structural changes to accommodate capacity building 5. Improve the understanding of policy and implementation at all levels 6. Support community volunteers more effectively 7. Commit to a stand for a substantial period of time and support continuation of initiatives 8. Utilize local human resources - failure to understand country context |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Resilience, Agriculture, Food Security, Nutrition, Environment and Climate Change** | 1. Relevance and fit in the national policies 2. High level policies/ frameworks 3. Accurate data provision 4. Responsive e.g. floods and emergencies 5. Involvement of the grassroots e.g. young people 6. Inclusivity by the UN representatives 7. Realistic allocation of funds and willingness to adjust 8. Response to youth needs in a number of areas 9. Monitoring and evaluation support IP and able to give feedback 10. Infrastructural development e.g. CBCCs multipurpose youth center development 11. Joint planning plus togetherness 12. Clear links of food aid and resilience building and decentralization to districts 13. Mobility support to IPs and government departments 14. Support to recovery programs in the community | 1. Targeting still remains a challenge - so many overlaps 2. UN concentrates at the national level but very thin on the ground 3. Heavy bureaucracy in the UN 4. Poor inclusion and planning processes e.g. UNDAC MVAC other stakeholders are mostly left out 5. Unbalanced distribution of resources e.g. advocacy vs livelihoods 6. Very weak in policy implementation 7. Lack of flexibility within the UN 8. Too many expatriates during flood responses 9. The UN do not support the land rights policy - support to access to energy 10. The UN does not support women farmers organization 11. The UN does not have a separate plan, strategies in responding to emergencies 12. Support decentralization of clusters at district level 13. Disparity on DSAs across the board 14. Not accommodative to IPs who may need capacity building 15. Continuity of successful programs is lacking/ embarks on pilot programs 16. Partnership between IPs and the UN has been third party - need for direct partnership 17. Resilience framework hasn't been rolled out | 1. Consider long term funding support in order to realize impact and sustainability 2. Taking on board human capital issues 3. Consider direct partnership with CSOs 4. Develop/finalize resilience frameworks and operationalize 5. ADDRMOs to be adequately funded - capacity built and have profile raised 6. Partner and support women farmer organizations 7. Support decentralization of cluster systems to districts 8. Support CSOs to participate at global climate change negotiations (GOP) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Governance and Human Rights** | 1. Supporting development of legal frameworks (e.g. juvenile justice ) 2. Supporting electoral process in 2014 3. Financial support towards review of Electoral Act 4. Capacity building programs 5. Promoting advocacy/awareness campaigns on minority rights 6. Providing parliamentary support 7. Conflict management during death of the former president | 1. Better advocacy on ESCR 2. Lack of leadership and poor disbursement of funds around the trust fund for the 2014 elections 3. Not enough financial autonomy to public institutions (I.E. MEC) 4. Implementation of the democratic governance SWAP 5. Interventions/funding support for legal literacy programmes 6. Support for pro-bono services (paralegals) 7. Lack of intervention in how funds are disbursed 8. Support for constitutional review 9. Support to key govt institutions (MEC,MHRC,CSOs) 10. Support to prisons 11. Training of judicial officers |  |

1. Malawi is a “self-starter” One UN country. While not one of the eight country pilots endorsed by the UN General Assembly in 2006, it Delivers as One on the basis of a formal request of the Government of Malawi, is held to the same standards of performance as the pilots, and participates with them and the other self-starters in regular global reviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. <http://www.undg.org/docs/12720/UNDAF%20ToR%20Guidance%20OCT%2022%20Draft.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. All MDG data is from Millennium Development Goals Progress Report, Ministry of Economic Planning, 2013 and the Malawi MDG Endline Survey, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (December, 2011) endorsed the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. CABS – AfDB, DFID, European Commission, Germany, Ireland and Norway [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Human Rights Based Approach [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. See footnote 9, below. Malawi is a “self-starter” One UN country. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. The reviews are those set out by the UN General Assembly in the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) and the Standard Operating Procedures (SOs) for Delivering as One. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Malawi is a “self-starter” One UN country. While not one of the eight country pilots endorsed by the UN General Assembly in 2006, it Delivers as One on the basis of a formal request of the Government of Malawi, is held to the same standards of performance as the pilots, and participates with them and the other self-starters in regular global reviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. UNDAF Malawi 2012-2016, Executive Summary, page xix. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. FAO, UNDP, UNFPA, and UNICEF [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Inconsistencies between the UNDAF and the UNDAF Action Plan in terms of baselines, targets and indicative resources per key priority/cluster and per outcome, arithmetic errors in the Resource Requirements section of the UNDAF, and inappropriate targets set in the UNDAF results matrix. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Report of UNDAF Annual Review and Planning Meeting, 11 March 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. These are linked directly to the IHS/ DHS [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committees [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Population does not have an institutional capacity or visibility at the same level as gender and human rights: population issues are handled by only four staff in the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Estimated at 460 deaths per 100,000 live births in 2013, down from 675/100,000 in 2010 (Demographic Health Survey report). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Decrease from 112/1000 live births (2010 DHS) to71/1000 live births according to UN estimates. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. WFP undertakes school feeding in 13 of the districts. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Family Planning 2020 (FP2020) is a global partnership that supports the rights of women and girls to decide, freely, and for themselves, whether, when, and how many children they want to have. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Demographic dividend refers to a period of 20 to 30 years when fertility rates fall due to significant reductions in child and infant mortality rates. As women and families realize that fewer children will die during infancy or childhood, they will begin to have fewer children. This fall is often accompanied by an increase in the working-age population relative to other age groups. This cuts spending on dependents and spurs economic growth. A country with both increasing numbers of young people and declining fertility has the potential to reap a demographic dividend. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Report of the UNRC to the UNDAF Expanded Annual Review and Planning Meeting of the UNCT, PMT and M&E Groups 11th December, 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. **Resident**: FAO, UNAIDS, UNDP, , UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UN Women, WFP, WHO

    **Non-Resident:** IAEA, IFAD, ILO, UNCDF, OHCHR, UN-Habitat, UNEP, UNESCO, IOM, UNIDO, UNODC, OCHA [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. <http://www.nsomalawi.mw/> [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. <http://www.undg.org/docs/12720/UNDAF%20ToR%20Guidance%20OCT%2022%20Draft.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. See Bibliography, below [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Three agencies are undertaking programme/Outcome specific evaluations in early 2015:

    • UNDP: Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change; Gender Equality

    • UNICEF: Health; Nutrition; Water, Sanitation and Hygiene; Education; Protection

    • WFP: Humanitarian Food Security Response

    An evaluation of UNDAF Outcome 4.2 will be undertaken.

    The Chairs of the Gender and Human Rights technical working groups will also undertake a desk review of the integration of cross cutting issues in the UNDAF. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Since the formulation of the UNDAF, a number of internal reviews have taken place. These are as follows:

    UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2012

    UNDAF Annual Review, 2012

    UNDAF Mid-Year Review, 2013

    UNDAF Expanded Annual Review, 2013

    In addition, the following reviews, assessment and evaluations of the UN in Malawi have also taken place:

    Capacity Assessment, 2012

    MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF), 2013

    Post 2015 National Consultations, 2013

    Delivering as One Audit, 2014

    UNICEF Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014

    UNFPA Mid-Term Evaluation, 2014

    Universal Periodic Review, 2014

    The Government has conducted reviews of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II in 2012/13 and 2013/14 and has produced MDG Reports for the years 2010, 2012 and 2013. Sector specific reviews, assessments and evaluation have been conducted. A range of national surveys have been conducted by the National Statistics Office (NSO). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Lead Agency is noted in bold. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. No joint funding: parallel financing [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Developed in response to the report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Shared staff member [↑](#footnote-ref-34)