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# **Glossary**

**Affirmative action**

Measures targeted at a particular group and intended to eliminate and prevent discrimination, or to ameliorate existing disadvantages.

**Focal points**

Gender focal points are individuals given a particular responsibility for gender equality in an organisation. Given the right circumstances, networks of gender focal points can be a useful method to promote gender equality in a large-scale programme.

**Gender:** The socially constructed roles and relationships, personality traits, attitudes, behaviors, values, relative power and influence that society ascribes to the two sexes on a differential basis. Gender is relational and refers not simply to women or men but to the relationship between them.

**Gender analysis**

The study of differences in conditions, needs, participation rates, access to resources, control of assets, decision-making powers, etc. - between women and men in their assigned gender roles.

**Gender budgeting**

Gender-based assessment of budgets, incorporating a gender perspective at all levels of the budgetary process and restructuring revenues in order to promote gender equality Gender equality means that all human beings are free to develop their personal abilities and make choices without the limitations set by strict gender roles. Different behaviour, aspirations, and needs of women and men are considered, valued and favoured equally.

**Gender Equality:** Gender equality entails the concept that all human beings, both women and men, are free to develop their personal abilities and make choices without the limitations set by stereotypes, rigid gender roles, or prejudices. Gender equality means that the different behaviors, aspirations and needs of women and men are considered, valued and favored equally.

**Gender gaps**

A specific difference or inequality between girls and boys, or men and women in relation to their conditions, or how they access or benefit from a resource (e.g. men's and women's access to health services, school drop-out rates of girls and boys).

**Gender blind**

Unaware of gender concepts and the impact that they have on life experiences and outcomes for girls and boys, men and women.

**Gender sensitive**

Properly aware of the different needs, roles, responsibilities of men and women. Understands that these differences can result in difference for women and men in: Access to and control over resources; Level of participation in and benefit from resources and development.

**Gender responsive**

Aware of gender concepts, disparities and their causes, and takes action to address and overcome gender-based inequalities.

**Gender Mainstreaming**

The process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and social spheres.

**Multiple-track strategy for gender mainstreaming (also known as dual mandate, or twin-track):** incorporating both *gender-targeted* interventions to support gender equality and women’s empowerment in specific social groups, specific organizations and/or processes as well as *gender-integrated* efforts to ensure that gender equality is integrated across the substantive work of all sectors. Also known as using *vertical* as well as *horizontal* programming.

**Sex-disaggregated statistics**

The collection and separation of data and statistical information by sex to enable comparative analysis; sometimes referred to as gender-disaggregated statistics.

**Special interventions**

Special interventions are efforts aimed at creating fundamental structural changes in institutions, policies, legislation, and allocation of resources to promote gender equality between men and women, based on the specific needs in the individual country, policy area or organisation. Special interventions can be stand-alone projects or programmes identified to complement mainstreamed sector programmes in a country programme.

**Theory of Change**

It visualizes the pathways through which a gender intervention’s outputs or intermediary results are expected to contribute to the gender equality-related longer-term development outcomes of a given sector.34 It translates findings from gender analysis into options for programme modalities, and provides a rationale for the programme objectives, targets and budgets, enabling donor, government and civil society agencies to develop a collective vision of what ‘success’ looks like.

**Women’s empowerment**

The empowerment of women concerns women gaining power and control over their own lives. It constitutes an important part of the efforts to bring about equal opportunities for men and women and involves awareness raising, building self-confidence, expansion of choices, increased access to and control over resources and actions to transform the structures and institutions which reinforce and perpetuate gender discrimination and inequality.

**Women’s rights**

The rights of women and the girl child are an inalienable, integral, and indivisible part of universal human rights.
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# **Executive Summary**

**Background**: This is a report of the mid-term evaluation of gender mainstreaming in the Country Programme (CP) for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Malawi covering the period January 2012 to December 2014. The evaluation was undertaken by an independent consultant over a period of March to June 2015. The purpose is retrospective to take stock of the achievements, good practices and lessons learned; and draw conclusions on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of gender equality performance of the UNDP. It makes recommendations for improving gender mainstreaming in the Country Office (CO).

**Process:** The Evaluation used secondary data collection and primary data collection. Primary data collection involved inclusive interviews conducted during March to April, with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcome 4.3/CP outcome 31 stakeholders as well as UNDP programme staff and project implementers. The interviews were performed using semi-structured questionnaires.

**Context:** Overall the evaluation found that there were significant changes in Malawi’s development context from a gender equality perspective. Findings indicate positive context for advancing gender equality as depicted in various policy and framework documents and establishment of national mechanisms on gender equality. Within this context, the evaluation assessed the progress made by UNDP to mainstream gender in its country programme. Evidence is provided on the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the CP interventions.

Based on analysis of the information collected from review of documents and interviews with key UNDP staff and stakeholders including government officials and civil society representatives, as well as development partners, the evaluation made the following findings:

**Findings**

* Some interviewees including government are not clear on what UNDP Malawi communicates as its mandate or comparative advantage on Gender Equality Women’s Empowerment (GEWE).
* In terms of programming focus, UNDP Malawi has not been strategic in translating the UNDP corporate Gender Equality Strategy (GES), 2008-2013 and 2014-2017, locally. UNDP CO foundation for gender equality lies on how it translates its corporate gender equality strategy (GES) locally.
* There is inadequate capacity for gender mainstreaming. The evaluator finds no evidence of substantive training provided to UNDP staff on gender mainstreaming and gender analysis other than basic on-line course on gender journey.
* UNDP has made great progress to commit core resources for GEWE results through the gender marker which is an accountability tool that allows UNDP to track its financial allocations and expenditures contributing to GEWE.
* The evaluator finds no partnership strategy for advancing gender equality. However, UNDP recognizes that achieving progress on gender equality and women’s empowerment requires working collaboratively with other actors. UNDP CO placed strong emphasis on partnerships with the government for delivering in all its outcomes; with UN agencies for greater effectiveness and delivering as one to advancing GEWE and with the private sector for women’s economic empowerment.
* UNDP gender equality priorities were and remain relevant to the national gender equality priorities and in making modest contribution to address glaring gaps of inequality**.**
* Gender has not been effectively mainstreamed across most of the outcomes, programmes and projects of UNDP. Several projects that are expected to contribute to the outcomes do not show gender mainstreaming in their objectives, outcomes and outputs. Gender mainstreaming in a number of outcomes has not taken place in any meaningful and effective manner that translates into concrete outcome level results.
* While outcome 26 achieved some success mostly at downstream level through direct engagement with farmers/women through ‘affirmative action’ on funding allocation, the outcome’s contribution to gender mainstreaming in policies frameworks and strategies is not yet effective. Both upstream and downstream success are necessary. However, the outcome was not informed by a systematic gender analysis to identify priority gender equality results needed in all interventions and actions.
* A gender blind Outcome 27 was implemented through projects which all had gender blind outputs and indicators. While the projects benefited from evidence based information, study findings/assessments should not be an end in themselves but should inform gender sensitive implementation. One project translated findings into gender sensitive actions, another project has not yet taken advantage of the study findings.
* Outcome 29 made great progress and was systematic to mainstream gender in its results but improvements are required to consistently use gender analysis/assessments and disaggregate the benefits and show groups of men, women, girls and boys befitting and for which changes is making a difference. Even though the projects contribute to outcome 29 which in turn contributes to UNDAF outcome 4.1, these project level successes are not vertically captured in UNDAF outcome annual reports to inform gender mainstreaming results at UNDAF level.
* Although Outcome 30 has potential to contribute to gender sensitive representation through skilled personnel, it has not been effective in monitoring the change process towards tangible results. Development of guidelines should not be an end in itself. Monitoring of its use should be factored into project. Training in leadership should be monitored to track results of placements related to training.

**Through Outcome 31:**

* UNDP has not been effective in mainstreaming gender in SWAps.
* UNDP contributed substantively to advocacy for formulation of gender equality policies and legislation
* Change in institutional capacity strengthening of the Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare (MoGCDSW) was strategic for improved coordination, policy making and leadership for gender equality. However, UNDP contributed to small change in the capacity of the Ministry.
* The UNDP and UN Women made substantive contributions towards increased women’s capacity to participate in politics and occupy decision making positions. However, the results achieved were not only below the minimum 50:50 advocated for but unfortunately regressive when compared to past elections. This was due to some factors both within and beyond the control of the UN.

**Efficiency**

* Efficiency of gender mainstreaming is mixed. Allocation of resources through gender marker is not commensurate with anecdotal results achieved for GEWE. Gender mainstreaming as a strategy, and gender equality as an outcome, cannot be achieved by over-reliance on one gender focal point. UNDP appeared to have overlap and duplication with some UN agencies.

**Sustainability**

* Sustainability involves assessing the likelihood that results of UNDP interventions will continue to be enjoyed by men and women in the long term and that gender issue mainstreamed therein will be sustained. Gender mainstreaming cuts across many sectors. It is, therefore, difficult to make an aggregated opinion of sustainability while at the same time being objective. However, some interventions by the UNDP have potential for sustainability.

**Conclusions**

* The CO has committed itself to the promotion of gender mainstreaming by implementing a corporate gender equality strategy (GES) but not in a systematic manner due to absence of strong internal institutional mechanisms such as a CO Gender Strategy or Gender Action Plan and intra gender team.
* UNDP’s initiatives on GEWE have been relevant to the broad objectives and priorities outlined in national and regional commitments. The agency’s work has, for the most part, responded to identified needs at the country and local levels, and has been relevant to UNDP’s corporate goal of advancing gender equality.
* On partnerships: UNDP engagement with partners is mixed in strength and there is room for improvements. UNDP has consistently worked with government and the UN partners to deliver as one for gender equality. However in some cases it was faced with duplication of efforts. The results of the collaborative efforts with UN agencies are mainly positive in gender mainstreaming in Sector Wide Approaches (SWAps) and participation of women in political participation. UNDP engagement with the private sector is emerging as a potential area for strengthening women’s economic empowerment. UNDP‘s partnerships with the media and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) is absent.
* Evaluation findings suggest that CO sought to mainstream gender in its CP through a stand-alone outcome which was very strategic to address special interventions for creating fundamental structural changes in institutions, policies and legislation. However, CO’s efforts are not uniform in strength across the other outcomes. Projects and programmes contributing to various outcomes depict un-even level of gender mainstreaming with a majority projects ad hoc and after thought in mainstreaming gender.
* UNDP projects are unable to demonstrate their contribution to promoting gender equality mainly due to inability to effectively link up studies and assessments to improvements in project implementation, lack of substantive gender considerations in the project design and implementation, lack of sex-disaggregated and gender-specific information in monitoring and reporting.
* On strengthening capacity of the Ministry of gender, UNDP support did influence the ongoing process of capacity development through technical assistance, skills training, advocacy, development of strategies but cannot control how effectively the Ministry used the contribution to become better in coordination and in monitoring, hence the Ministry remains weak due to among others, leadership and decision making challenges.
* Although actual expenditures on gender mainstreaming are not available, the ad hoc integration of gender in projects and programmes shows a mis-match compared to the level of resources allocated through the gender marker for the period 2012-2014. With these allocations, CO should have performed much better in terms of concrete outputs.

**Lessons Learned**

Although lessons can be learned from all the findings in the report, a few lessons are highlighted in this section.

**Internal Institutional Mechanisms**

The UNDP needs to strongly communicate its comparative advantage on GEWE not just listing of its mandate but a realistic assessment of expertise and value added relative to the country context so that partners and other UN are clear on UNDP ‘brand name on GEWE.’

**Partnerships**

The notion of national ownership should not be seen only from the perspective of the partnership with Government. The UNDP CO should also broaden strategic partnerships with other national stakeholders, including civil society in order to ensure sustainability of programme processes and results.

**Systematic Approach to Gender Mainstreaming**

Although there are cases where outcomes and outputs were not formulated in a gender sensitive manner, disaggregated gender results did emerge implying that even when the design of projects is weak from a gender lens, there is a possibility to turn things around at the implementation and reporting level.

**Financial allocation vs results**

Allocation of resources through the gender marker is not always commensurate with gender sensitive results. Tracking of expenditures need to be ensured to have a true picture of results achieved.

**Linkages of CP outcomes to UNDAF outcomes.**

All CP outcomes were linked to contribute to UNDAF Outcomes. The lesson learned is that poor performance or good performance at agency level determines its effective contribution to UN achievement at UNDAF outcomes level.

**Recommendations**

Based on the evaluation findings, the evaluator developed several actions that need to be taken as expanded in chapter 7. This section provides only the summary.

**Recommendation 1:** Strengthen the internal institutional set-up for gender mainstreaming.

**Recommendation 2:** The UNDP approach of stand-alone outcome and integration in all other outcomes was a right choice as greater results emerged through stand-alone outcome. However, UNDP should consider a multi-track approach to gender mainstreaming that allows for targeted interventions on specific priority areas.

**Recommendation 3:** The UNDP CO should plan for regular capacity building for staff on gender mainstreaming, analysis and capturing gender results.

**Recommendation 4:** UNDP should allocate sufficient funding for capacity building and staff training on gender mainstreaming so that concrete results are achieved.

**Recommendation 5:** UNDP should Strengthen Gender mainstreaming in programmes/projects by: improving gender responsiveness in project design and implementation.

**Recommendation 6:** Develop a partnership strategy for GEWE or integrate this in the overall Office partnership Strategy. Strengthen partnerships with diverse actors based on UNDPs comparative strength and partner’s strengths and mandates.

**Recommendation 7**: For the short term results to be sustained over time, UNDP will need to plan for and systematically address sustainability in its work.

# **Chapter 1: Introduction**

## **1.1 Background**

This is a mid-term evaluation of outcome 31: ***National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016*** of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Malawi Country Programme CP), 2012-2016. The outcome contributes to and is similar to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcome 4.3. Namely: ***National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016.*** It is also an evaluation of gender mainstreaming across five UNDP outcomes. The evaluation takes place at the same time as the overall evaluation of gender mainstreaming in UNDAF by the same evaluator.[[1]](#footnote-1) Ideally this could have been a case study to the UNDAF evaluation to assess how at CP level agencies mainstream gender to contribute to the UNDAF. However, it is a separate report to serve the purpose of outcome evaluation for UNDP. The reader’s attention is drawn to similarities in text in a number of sections in both reports because the report is about similar outcome at different levels. The purpose of the evaluation is to take stock of UNDP’s performance on advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) and draw conclusion and recommendations for improvement.

## **1.2 The Context**

There is positive context for advancing gender equality as depicted in various policy and framework documents and establishment of national mechanisms on gender equality. As the Country Programme (CP) responds to UNDAF priorities, the context for advancing GEWE is similar for the UNDAF and the CP. The context is, therefore, reproduced from the UNDAF evaluation of outcome 4.3 and gender mainstreaming as analyzed over the same period by the same evaluator.[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. **Policies and legal framework**

The Constitution of the Republic of Malawi provides detailed protection for women, from discriminatory and harmful practices such as sexual abuse, harassment and violence, discrimination in work, business and public affairs and the deprivation of property, including inherited property.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II[[4]](#footnote-4) and the White Paper (2011)[[5]](#footnote-5) provided evidence for reducing gender inequalities, including by advocating for affirmative action to increase representation of women in politics and encouraging 50:50 representation in decision making. It is noted that MGDS II did not adequately mainstream gender in all its priority areas, although gender is included as a stand-alone section. The absence of gender specific indicators for the respective key sectors under the MGDS II fosters weak accountability towards interventions that can specifically reduce women’s poverty in most sectoral planning.

While some progress has been made to enact and repeal laws to align them with the constitution, there is still a number of laws that need to be enacted and implemented to improve the situation of women and girls in the country. The Government and the Parliament have been slow in approving policies and Bills and the latest Bills passed by Parliament have been pending for an average of 10 years. Even the gender equality Act which was supported by UN system in late 2012/early 2013 had been pending for 14 years. This shows that legislative function is very slow and very much controlled by executive branch. The oversight function of the Parliament has been quite weak in this regard. The revised National Gender Policy (2012-2017), which is yet to be approved by Cabinet, proposes an Institutional Framework for its implementation.

**Situational changes are noted over the CP/UNDAF period:** The Gender Equality Act of 2013 was enacted and contains provisions that have the potential to enhance women’s equal rights including their sexual reproductive health rights, prevention of gender based violence and discriminatory practices and access to economic resources, i.e. through education opportunities and employment opportunities in public service.[[6]](#footnote-6) In view of this, the Government increased age of marriage to 18 through enactment of the Marriage, Divorce and Family Relations Act (2015) is another important achievement. The development of the JSSP was another critical step even if implementation has been limited. At the same time there is increased awareness and debate around GBV as well as gender inequality.

1. **Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)**

Despite the policy commitments at national and regional level,[[7]](#footnote-7) challenges remain that hamper progress on advancement of GEWGE. The achievement of four gender related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) remains elusive: eradicating extreme poverty and hunger (MDG 1); achieving universal primary education (MDG 2); promoting gender equity and women empowerment (MDG 3); and improving maternal and neonatal health (MDG [[8]](#footnote-8) Gender inequalities and challenges related to the development of girl child are the reason why Malawi will not achieve four MDGs out of eight.

**Situational changes over the UNDAF period**. While progress is witnessed in proportion of girls to boys in primary education (1.01), the ratio of girls to boys in secondary is lower (0.7). One major issue is the high levels of pregnancy amongst adolescent girls. Malawi is top 5 in Africa in this area with the adolescent fertility rate at 145 births per 1000 adolescent girls.[[9]](#footnote-9) The adolescent pregnancy rate is attributable to a multiplicity of factors, including high school dropout rate and cultural practices. The 2014 Malawi MDG end line survey indicates that 49.9% of women aged between 20 and 49 years are married or in union before age 18 years against 9.1 % of men within the same category. Some factors contributing to the negative trends of maternal and neonatal health indicators include; social, cultural and economic barriers from accessing care, including structural factors such as accessibility to health facilities with only 46 % of the population living within 5 Km radius of a formal health care service delivery point.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The MDG acceleration framework (MAF) with its action plan was developed to respond to the emerging gaps in the MDGs. The MAF Malawi Action Plan provides a list of costed interventions that Government of Malawi (GoM) and development partners and other stakeholders will implement in order to accelerate progress towards the attainment of lagging MDGs with the girl child as the entry point. It is noted that two important legislations[[11]](#footnote-11) signed during the CP/UNDAF period may contribute to some progress in these MDGs. The UN was actively involved in supporting national consultations on the post-2015 development agenda and Beijing +20 review. Through these consultations, a wide range of stakeholders, including women’s organizations, joined the discussion.

**(c ) Poverty**

Malawi is a poor country and poverty is highly feminized in Malawi. According to the Integrated Household Survey 3 (IHS3: 2012)[[12]](#footnote-12); the national poverty rate is 50.7 percent. The survey also highlights that 25 percent of the population is ultra-poor. About 49 percent of persons in male-headed households are poor, contrasted with 57 percent of persons in female-headed households are poor. The survey showed that 55 percent of people in male-headed households in the rural areas are poor, as compared to 63 percent of people who reside in rural female-headed households.

**(d ) Cultural Norms and Practices**

 Addressing issues of gender inequality and discriminatory practices is within, traditional and customary social patterns, norms, attitudes and stereotyped roles that contribute to slowing down some aspects of advancing gender equality, particularly in increasing women’s political participation, early marriage, and reducing HIV prevention as well as family planning. Most of the socio-cultural practices favour men, promote sexual immorality, use sex as a weapon to maintain superiority and are oppressive making a woman more vulnerable to Gender Based Violence (GBV).[[13]](#footnote-13) These will require focus on enforcement of laws; strong political will as well as engagement and some level of accountability for traditional and religious leaders are critical.

Furthermore, child marriage and early / adolescent pregnancies in Malawi is largely attributed to harmful cultural practices, lack of age-appropriate reproductive health information and knowledge, self- efficacy, utilization of services and inadequate legal protection. In terms of child marriages coupled with early pregnancies, Malawi is ranked 8th among the highest in the world.[[14]](#footnote-14) Statistics cited by Human Rights Watch suggest that between 2010 and 2013, nearly 30,000 girls in primary school and 4,000 girls in secondary school dropped out due to child marriage. During the same period, another 14,000 primary school girls and 5,000 secondary school girls dropped out because they were pregnant.[[15]](#footnote-15)

**(e) Women’s Representation in Decision Making**

**Situational changes over the CP/UNDAF period** shows that Malawi continues to face constraints hindering full participation of women in decision making which is also one of the MDGs lagging behind. Women’s limited participation in decision-making reflects the cultural and social perception of women’s and men’s roles in society, which can be traced to their different roles and decision-making capacity at the household level. Women have limited awareness of their electoral, legal, constitutional, and human rights including their sexual reproductive health rights, and this, coupled with the fact that many have experienced acts of violence at different moments of their lives. There was reduced number of women in parliament from 22 percent in 2009 elections to 16.7 percent in 2014 indicating a 5.5% drop in elected members. The first woman vice president who ascended to the presidency by default was a positive gain in representation in decision making but was not elected when she faced the ballot. There has been reduced number of women Ministers from 28.1 percent in 2013 to 15 percent in 2014. The Malawi Electoral Commission has reported that whereas the May 2014 elections produced 401 male councilors, there are only 56 female councilors (representing 11 percent).[[16]](#footnote-16)

In the area of participation in public service, the Gender Equality Act of 2013, which came into effect in April 2014, introducing quota in public service appointments. The quota is that when appointing or recruiting authority in the public service shall not appoint less than forty percent (40 percent) and not more than sixty percent (60 percent) of either sex in any department in the public service. By end of 2013, the representation of women in policy and management levels/decision making positions (P5 above) was still very low (24 percent for females compared to 76 percent for males).[[17]](#footnote-17) For example, there are no women in decision making positions in institutions such as the Department of Mines, Department of Geological Surveys, Accountant General, and Ministry of Transport. The other issue is also inadequate monitoring/tracking these appointments on a regular basis.

**(f) National Gender Machinery**

Although in many countries including Malawi, the national gender management system is comprised of the Ministry of Gender, gender focal persons (GFPs) in line ministries, the Parliamentary Women’s Caucus, and the women’s movement, The GoM states that “at National Level, the National Gender Machinery shall remain the Ministry of Women and Child Development particularly the Department responsible for Gender and Women Affairs’.[[18]](#footnote-18) The positioning of the Ministry, now MoGCDSW (as the national gender machinery) and its capacity to influence major processes has not changed much during the CP/UNDAF period. Prior to the CP/UNDAF it was noted that the MoGCDSW cannot fulfill its mandate as it has limited capacity to respond to the needs of its services and that the mechanisms for enhancing gender in other ministries had collapsed. At institutional level, the national gender machinery faced challenges of uncoordinated management and delivery of programmes and services, inadequate financial and human resources, weak management and supervision, and inadequate monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

**(g) Gender Based Violence**

According to Malawi Demographic and Health Survey (2010), [[19]](#footnote-19) Fifty two (52%) of women surveyed reported experiencing sexual or physical violence in the past 12 months.

**Situational changes noted over the CP/UNDAF period are:** With UN support,Malawi prepared and submitted its 5th periodic report on Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women (CEDAW). **S**everal studies and survey reports have been undertaken to establish the extent, cause and consequences of GBV in the communities and households, in the workplace and in schools. The National Statistics Offices conducted the first GBV Survey covering 17 districts in 2012 with support from the Ministry responsible for Gender, EU, UNFPA and UN Women. The Survey (2013), indicates that 40% of women report having experienced sexual violence in their lifetime while, 30 % of women report having experienced physical violence, and 44% of women report having experienced psycho-social violence. It also shows that 61 percent of female respondents reported to have ever experienced sexual violence compared to 39 percent of males. Only 4.4 percent of males compared to 12.3 percent of females reported forced early marriage.

Furthermore, Malawi has a fairly good legal framework, which, with diligent enforcement, can support efforts to eliminate gender based violence. For example, it is noted that the Joint Sector Strategic Plan (JSSP, 2013-2017), which has earmarked the reduction of violence against children, youth and women as one of its outcome.

**(h) HIV and AIDS**

Women are disproportionately impacted by HIV due to physiological vulnerabilities, gender inequalities and low socio-economic status. In all ages below 35, more women than men are living with HIV and in some age groups e.g. 15-19 years, HIV prevalence is almost three times as high amongst females compared to males. The National HIV prevention Strategic Plan 2015-2020 identifies as one of the four priority areas of focus, Young women, ages 10 -14 and 15 – 24. It further identifies as one of the key principles for success, Human rights through promoting gender equality, and improving the legal, policy and social environment for People living with HIV, key and vulnerable populations and women.

## **1.3 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation**

The scope of the evaluation is to assess how UNDP has contributed together with assistance of UN and other partners to a change in development conditions in the area of advancing gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE). UNDP adopted outcome 4.3 from UNDAF as its outcome 31 in the Country Programme Document (CPD), 2012-2016. In addition, the evaluator assessed the extent to which gender has been mainstreamed across the other five CPD outcomes.

The evidence generated through this evaluation will inform the final evaluation of the CPD and specifically responds to the UNDP country audit recommendation that required outcome evaluations be undertaken. The evaluation covers the period from January 2012 to October, 2014.

## **1.4 Main Objectives of the Evaluation**

As provided in the terms of reference, Annex 1, the objectives are as follows:

1. Determine the extent to which the planned outcome 4.3 and related outputs have been achieved or are being achieved and the likelihood of being achieved by the end of 2016. (This is covered in UNDAF evaluation)
2. Assess the contribution of UNDP to the achievement of outcome 4.3 so far.
3. Assess the extent to which gender has been mainstreamed in the UNDP country programme and related projects
4. Assess the adequacy or inadequacy of UNDP partnership strategy for the achievement of the outcome and gender mainstreaming across the CPD;
5. Examine and analyse factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome and gender mainstreaming by UNDP both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including: weakness in design, management, human resource skills and resources;
6. Explore strategic values and comparative advantage of the UNDP in contributing to the outcome and advancement of the gender agenda in Malawi
7. Document lessons learnt from the implementation of the interventions.
8. Make recommendations for the UNDP for improving the achievement of its gender equality and women socio-economic empowerment and sustainability; partnership arrangements, mainstreaming of gender across the CPD and resource mobilization strategies.

## **1.5 Methodology and Approach**

1. **The Approach**

**A performance assessment approach** is adopted to assess UNDP’s performance in achieving outcome 31 and gender mainstreaming across five UNDP CP outcomes. Similar to the evaluation of gender mainstreaming in the UNDAF,[[20]](#footnote-20) the assessment ‘situates’ gender in the mainstream to investigate what a gender mainstreamed CP outcomes would look like and focus on the incremental and substantive nature of the contributions being made by various projects/programmes towards outcomes. The CP outcomes are assessed against this expectation.

1. **Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation of UNDP contribution to outcome 4.3/CP outcome 31 and gender mainstreaming across CP is made using the five organization for economic and cooperation in development/development assistance committee (OECD/DAC) evaluation criteria:

* **Relevance**: The extent to which the outcome is consistent with the evolving needs and priorities of men and women as beneficiaries, partners, and stakeholders and the context.
* **Effectiveness**: The extent to which GEWE intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
* **Efficiency**: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
* **Sustainability**: The continuation of benefits from the intervention after major development assistance has ceased. The ability of key stakeholders to sustain intervention benefits – after the cessation of donor funding – with efforts that use locally available resources.

**(c) Sources of information**

The evaluation used secondary data collection and primary data collection. Primary data collection involved inclusive interviews conducted during March to May, with UNDAF outcome 4.3/CP outcome 31 stakeholders as well as UNDP programme staff and project implementers, United Nations-Gender Technical Working Group (UN-GTWG), Government officials from the key MoGCDSW, senior officials and gender focal points in line Ministries and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). A two day workshop was held with CSOs. (See Annex 2 for list of people met). Secondary data collection entailed the review of annual outcome reports, the results oriented annual reports, project documents, Annual Work Plans and progress reports. The documents reviewed are those produced by the UN, by the Government and other bilateral donors (see Annex 3) for documents consulted).

The interviews were performed using semi-structured questionnaires (see Annex 4). The evaluator met with programme staff from the following clusters;

1. Capacity Development
2. Inclusive Growth
3. Democratic Governances
4. Environment and Natural Resources
5. Social Cohesion

The consultations with the programmes focused on finding out how they have mainstreamed gender in their programmes and projects, what results were achieved and the challenges faced in implementing a gender mainstreaming approach.

Participatory processes were used during the inception phase where the evaluator presented draft inception report to the reference group and UN-GTWG.

**(d) Ethical issues**

The evaluation followed the *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation* set out by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) which included respect for dignity and diversity; rights; confidentiality; and avoidance of harm. These obligations were explicitly addressed in the design of the evaluation and throughout the evaluation process.

**(e) Limitations**

A visit to the districts/rural communities would have added voices of girls/boys and men/women reached and how the UNDP’s interventions is changing lives of people at community level. For example, to discuss with the traditional leaders how harmful cultural issues can be addressed; discuss with local councils women’s leadership issues; how interventions are changing lives of farmers and businesses women through the private sector initiative and citizen demanding and getting their rights at community level.

**(f) Analysis**

An analysis was undertaken which includes an assessment of what the information is saying about each of the evaluation criteria and related questions. The evaluator is guided by the performance assessment for gender mainstreaming in the five outcomes and for stand-alone outcome 31. Triangulation of information (perceptions, documents and validations) and data sources constituted the primary methodology for the assessment.

## **1.6 Overview of Outcomes and Outputs**

The UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) is designed to support four strategic and inter-related priority areas: sustainable and inclusive economic growth; climate change, energy and environment and disaster risk mitigation; MDG achievement (Gender and HIV/AIDS); democratic governance and public sector management. These areas correspond to UNDAF Outcomes (1), (3) and (4). The CPD had six outcomes as shown in Box1:

Box 1: CP outcomes from the ROAR and Linkages with UNDAF Outcomes

**Outcome 1.2** Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016

UNDP CPD Outcomes (2012-2016)

UNDAF Outcomes (2012-2016)

**Outcome 26:** Women, youth, people with disability and households benefit from decent employment, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016

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

**Outcome 27:** Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk by 2016

**Outcome 3.2** Critical enablers for the implementation of the national response enhanced by 2016

**Outcome 28** The national response to HIV is evidence-informed, coordinated, sustainably resourced, efficient and based upon a supportive legal and policy environment by 2016

**Outcome 4.1** National institutions foster democratic governance for all, especially children, women persons with disabilities and the youth by 2016

**Outcome 29:** National institutions foster democratic governance and human rights to promote transparency, accountability, participation and access to justice for all especially women and children by 2016.

**Outcome 4.2** Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016

**Outcome 30:** Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016.

**Outcome 4.3** National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016 (stand-alone outcome)

**Outcome 31:** National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016 (stand-alone outcome)

* + 1. **Strategy for Specific Outcome for Gender Equality**

In order to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment and support Malawi in achieving its national development goals, the United Nations in Malawi made the choice of adopting a specific outcome for GEWE in its UNDAF, 2012-2016, to address special interventions for creating fundamental structural changes in institutions, policies and legislation. Outcome 4.3, namely: *National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016 is delivered through the national gender machinery with support from four participating UN organisations (UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women).* UNDP adopted the Outcome 4.3 and related outputs as its outcome 31 for the Country Programme. An evaluation of outcome 4.3 has been completed as part of overall UNDAF evaluation of gender equality. However, this evaluation highlights UNDP specific contributions as part of its outcome 31. A number of findings and recommendations are similar to outcome 4.3. Four outputs are implemented to transition the change to achievement of outcome 31. These are:

1. Output 1: Gender mainstreamed in Seven Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAps).
2. Output 2: MoGCDSW and selected sectors have the capacity to plan, coordinate, monitor and evaluate the National Gender Programme.
3. Output 3: Women have the capacity and benefit from an enabling environment to claim and exercise their rights to participate in decision making in public and private sectors.
4. Output 4 Gender related laws revised and a functional implementation framework in place to address Gender Based Violence (GBV).

**1.6.2 Strategy for Gender Mainstreaming in Five Outcomes**

In addition, gender mainstreaming in all five CPD outcomes is adopted as a strategy to ensure that Malawi women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences are an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the CPD; that gender disparities and/or discrimination are not continued or made worse in terms of opportunities, capabilities, empowerment and security. A mainstreaming strategy to advance GEWE in the CPD, programmes and projects would ideally imply– explicit gender responsive outcomes/outputs and indicators; gender analysis; gender disaggregated data; gender mainstreaming mechanisms and gender transformative results and monitoring and evaluation.

# **Chapter 2: Key Findings**

# **2.0 UNDP’s Strategic Positioning to Advance GEWE**

UNDP strategic positioning to advance gender equality is important if it is to be seen as providing leadership in this aspect. The best indicators of UNDP’s positioning are found in the UNDP gender equality seal which is not within the scope of this evaluation. However, the evaluator has assessed key areas of importance for internal strengthening of gender equality within UNDP, namely: comparative strength of UNDP CO, translating the corporate gender equality locally; strengthening internal capacity and accountability for gender mainstreaming; financial resources and partnerships. These are the foundations for UNDP’s internal positioning to provide leadership for GEWE in its programmes.

## **2.1 Comparative Advantage**

**Finding 1: Some interviewees including government are not clear on what UNDP Malawi communicates as its mandate or comparative advantage on GEWE**.

A Government official indicated, that it is clear to him to relate UNFPA to reproductive health and GBV; UNICEF to Children and girls education; FAO to Food security, WHO to health. UNDP’s multi-sectoral approach while positive and responds to diverse priorities of the country, makes it difficult for partners to identify with its mandate for gender equality and empowerment of women. They are not able to relate UNDP with a particular ‘brand name’ when it comes to advancing gender equality. This concern is of critical importance and UNDP should find its niche which seems to be in gender and Governance and women’s economic empowerment and communicate it effectively the outside world.

UNDP’s comparative strength vis a vis other agencies should be seen from entry points of each agency and how they complement each other. For example, while UNDP, as the main provider of United Nations electoral cycle support, works with Malawi Electoral Commission to ensure that elections are administered in ways that take into account the different needs of women and men, UN Women works closely with women’s organizations and women candidates to ensure their participation in electoral processes and subsequently supports women parliamentarians to strengthen their capacity.

UNDP’s comparative advantage is well articulated in the corporate gender equality strategy, 2014-2017 [[21]](#footnote-21)and is corroborated with partners during interviews and CSO workshop. UNDP’s comparative advantages in achieving gender equality results include:

* Recognition as being neutral and able to act as a facilitator to broker dialogue among diverse actors.

In this aspect stakeholders share the view that UNDP is taking rather long to broker dialogue concerning donor’s withholding funds for GoM which has implications for funds flowing for GEWE.

* Its normative legitimacy and permanent presence in Malawi allows it to have long term vision in addressing GEWE.

In this aspect, interviewees share the view that UNDP interventions for GEWE are short-term and at activity level.

* The ability to leverage partnerships with central line ministries of government and other governing institutions to promote legal and policy reforms that eliminate structural barriers to gender equality and put in place policies to empower women and girls.

UNDP is seen to be making good use of this strength and performing very well to engage diverse sectors in gender equality.

* The power to convene civil society, women’s groups and other non-governmental actors to engage in policy-making processes with national authorities.

CSOs share the view that UNDP is not making good use of this strength and only engaging with the government.

* Recognition as a thought leader, including through its annual National Human Development Reports (NHDR) and other publications, which provide opportunities to advocate for policy reforms and changes in social norms and behaviours.

In this aspect- during the period of the valuation, UNDP supported the compilation of the 2014/2015 NHDR, which was as a result of MGDS I evaluation which noted the gap in inclusiveness of the National Development Strategy. Further, in preparation for the Post-2015 development agenda, UNDP supported the Post-2015 Phase II Consultation whose findings show that the MDGs were not localized and participation of women, youth and people with disabilities was minimal or none.

* The breadth of its engagement, including its capacity to leverage resources.

Interviewees share the view that UNDP’s comparative advantage to leverage resources has dwindled compared to UNICEF and World Food Programme who together control more than 70% of UN resources for Malawi during the current UNDAF period.[[22]](#footnote-22)

* UNDP can tap into its network of experts and institutions to provide support, facilitating the process through sharing of international experiences of similar contexts and best practices that can serve as useful benchmarks for GEWE in Malawi.

## **2.2 UNDP CO Commitment to Gender Equality Strategy**

**Finding 2: In terms of programming focus, UNDP Malawi has not been strategic in translating the UNDP Corporate Gender Equality Strategy (GES), 2008-2013 and 2014-2017, locally. UNDP CO foundation for gender equality lies on how it translates its Corporate Gender Equality Strategy (GES) locally.**

GES provides strong emphasis on addressing internal UNDP processes to strengthen gender mainstreaming. The CO has not developed a gender equality strategy or a country Office Action Plan which would otherwise allow it to expand connectivity across clusters, programming and operations to strengthen CO internal positioning. The Evaluator finds some ad hoc implementation of the GES but not systemized in an Action Plan that is monitored regularly. A notable achievement by the CO is in including at least one gender outcome/output with appropriate outcome indicators.

The GES indicates that all country offices will present a plan to ensure they have the necessary gender expertise for their specific programme and country context, noting that offices with a portfolio over US$25 million would be expected to have a dedicated gender adviser in their office or equivalent dedicated capacity. The Malawi Country office has a dedicated gender focal point at the senior level of Assistant Resident Representative.

The GES also expects thatcountry offices will have a multi-disciplinary gender focal teams. The CO has no gender focal team making it difficult to drive the gender agenda at any one time when the focal point is absent. The evaluator noted the over-reliance on the focal point to respond to all gender issues in the office. The gender focal team should have a terms of reference and the staff participating should be rewarded for their roles and responsibilities in the Performance Management Development tool. Partners are concerned about the overwhelmed gender focal point handling all UNDP gender work and in her absence many decisions are delayed.

The GES advocates for legal and policy reforms which the CO has to some extent responded to. “UNDP will support legal and policy reforms to accelerate women’s rights in law and practice…..This includes supporting national institutions in fulfilling international human rights obligations, including national implementation of CEDAW, as well as providing technical, policy and advocacy support in relation to constitutions, laws on gender equality, family, domestic violence, property, land, inheritance and citizenship and supporting legal literacy, advocacy and training on women’s rights for women, communities and religious and traditional leaders.[[23]](#footnote-23)

## **2.3 CO Capacities for Gender Mainstreaming**

**Finding 3: There is inadequate capacity for gender mainstreaming. The evaluator finds no evidence of substantive training provided to UNDP staff on gender mainstreaming and gender analysis other than basic on-line course on gender journey.**

A number of staff interviewed indicated inadequate practical knowledge on how to mainstream gender in their outcomes or projects. Similar to overall findings for gender mainstreaming in UNDAF[[24]](#footnote-24), UNDP staff Interviewed reveal the gap in ‘**how to’ of gender mainstreaming**, therefore, training should move to the level of “how to.”

Furthermore, despite the four participating agencies (UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women) designing an excellent advanced e-learning course on gender equality there has been no tracking to establish how many staff undertook the course. (see link at [www.unicef.org/](http://www.unicef.org/) or <https://trainingcentre.unwomen.org/course/index.php?categoryid=1>.

The programme staff generally appear to have increasing awareness of importance of integrating gender equality approaches in their work but when asked why it has not been taken up, the evaluator was referred to the gender focal point – that gender is done at inclusive growth cluster. This implies that gender mainstreaming has not permeated the work of the clusters and projects. Furthermore, reporting in the Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) 2014 confirms the weakness in presenting concrete and transformative results. In comparison to other countries (Kenya, Somalia and Zimbabwe) previously evaluated by this evaluator, UNDP Malawi has performed poorly in mainstreaming gender in its outcomes. However, performance can also be best confirmed through assessment of the UNDP corporate gender equality seal.

While it is recommended in the GES, that at least 10 percent of the learning budgets of country offices be earmarked for gender related learning activities, information on actual allocation of resources was not available to indicate progress in this aspect.

## **2.4 Financial Resources for GEWE**

**Finding 4: UNDP has made great progress to commit core resources for GEWE results through the Gender marker which is an accountability tool that allows UNDP to track its financial allocations and expenditures contributing to GEWE. However, the allocation is not commensurate with results.**

The gender marker associates projects with a gender marker score, including budget and expenditures over time. A summary of gender marker is captured by outcomes in the ROARs of 2012 and 2014 (See Table 1). Gender marker ratings in 2012, shows that only one project had a rating of GEN0 with total allocation of USD 61,390 but in 2014 this increased to 14 projects with allocation of USD 4,710,092. In comparison to GEN3, in 2012 there were 7 projects with allocation of USD 1,475,381 and in 2014 it was 8 projects with allocation of USD 1.305,275. This shows that projects giving less priority to gender equality increased over the CP period.

|  |
| --- |
| Table 1: Gender Mainstreaming by Gender Marker Rating 2012 and 2014 |
| Gender Marker rating[[25]](#footnote-25) | 2012 | 2014 |
|  | Number of Projects | Expenditure allocation ($) | Number of Outputs (Projects)[[26]](#footnote-26) | Expenditure allocation ($) |
| GEN0 | 1 | 61,390 | 14 | 4,710,092 |
| GEN1 | 10 | 2,533,874 | 39 | 15,621,419 |
| GEN2 | 15 | 9,882,068 | 18 | 3,995,089 |
| GEN3 | 7 | 1,475,381 | 8 | 1,305,274 |

Whether higher expenditure allocations to GEWE are commensurate with results for GEWE is the subject of analysis in the effectiveness and efficiency section of this report. GEN3 which is specific outcome on GEWE had the least allocation of resources. See Annex 5. If results were commensurate with allocation of resources, gender results would be expected mostly from outcome 27 and 30 with over USD2 million for GEN2 in 2012.

A notable challenge with the gender marker is that it represents intentions at the project design stage and does not reflect the actual implementation of a project nor its achievements, unless that project is GEN3. Financial tracking through a marker on gender expenditures in interventions is critical in establishing actual results of the gender marker.

## **2.5 Partnerships for GEWE**

**Finding 5: The evaluator finds no partnership strategy for advancing gender equality. However,**

**UNDP recognizes that achieving progress on gender equality and women’s empowerment requires working collaboratively with other actors. UNDP CO placed strong emphasis on partnerships with the government for delivering in all its outcomes; with UN agencies for greater effectiveness and delivering as one to advancing GEWE and with the private sector for women’s economic empowerment.**

UNDP partners can be categorized into two groups that are not mutually exclusive: (i) those partners with whom UNDP join forces with the intention to influence a third external party **(strategic partnership).** These can include media, other UN agencies, or donor agencies with which UNDP collaborates for a common purpose that is external to the individual partners (e.g. integrated joint work plan with eight other agencies; support to elections with UN Women ii) those partners which are intended to be beneficiaries of the partnership with UNDP (**boundary partners**) that UNDP aims to influence directly. These include those partners with whom UNDP provides institutional strengthening support for effective gender equality and women’s empowerment interventions. The following section attempts to categorise the nature of partners that UNDP works with.

1. **Partnership for leveraging resources, synergy and opportunities for integrated delivery and greater impact.**

**Partnership with UNCT:** UNDP partnership for GEWE is with the UN to deliver as one on specific outcome 4.3 which corresponds to CP specific outcome 31. UNDP as a member of the United Nations Gender Technical Working group (GTWG) collaborated mainly with UNFPA, UN Women, UNICEF and UNAIDS in support to the capacity of MoGCDSW.; gender mainstreaming in SWAps and development of ender sensitive policies and strategies. One other key areas of collaboration noted was UNDP CO partnered with UNICEF, UN Women, UNFPA, Ministry of Gender, Ministry of Education and other stakeholders to formulate the MDG Acceleration Framework Action Plan and implement the top priority area of promoting retention of girls in school on pilot basis in two districts. UNDP supported intervention of promoting use of locally produced sanitary pads and energy serving technologies (mud stoves) that were distributed to girls in schools in the two pilot districts to reduce their time spent on fetching firewood and reduce school dropout rate. The support also covered procurement and distribution of reading solar lamps, mathematical sets and calculators distributed to girls to improve their performance in school.

UNDP’s effectiveness in collaboration with other UN agencies rests with the commitment by members the GTWG and the leadership. The UN-GTWG is functioning effectively but with some challenges hampering effectiveness to strengthen the performance of the UNCT on gender equality. Attendance at meetings remains very low to the level of 3 to 4 agencies. Without the continued technical support and commitment from the other agencies, the GTWG will not function to full potential and will not be inclusive.

The UN-GTWG promotes dialogue and collaboration with key stakeholders (such as national and international partners and civil society organizations) on normative issues in the context of the UNDAF. The UN-GTWG has not been proactive in initiating joint programmes to enhance gender equality. In line with delivering as one, the UN-GTWG has recently in 2015 prepared the first Integrated Work Plan (IWP) to harmonize its work with the MoGCDSW. Prior to this, there was continued existence of agency-driven country level delivery; competition for limited funds which undermines collaboration. At the CO level UNDP would benefit from a UNCT gender equality strategy. The UNCT has no gender equality strategy. However, UNDP still requires its own CO gender strategy or Action Plan that translates its GES locally.

**Partnerships with bilateral donors**: DFID is providing matching funds through UNDP under the Agriculture and manufacturing window of the Malawi innovation challenge fund of which USD400,000 is earmarked for women specific empowerment. Other than DFID, UNDP has not been able to leverage resources for GEWE for the CP period. This is at a time when donors have withheld funding to the Government and direct funds through UN agencies and International NGOs. Interviews with some programme staff indicate that they did not undertake resource mobilization specific for GEWE over the CP period. Furthermore resource mobilization is constrained by the absence of a donor coordination group for GEWE in the country. The evaluator’s meetings with donors showed the lack of donor engagement with GEWE. Except for the EU who are fully engaged, the key donors met made no comments concerning GEWE in the country implying disconnection with GEWE issues. A donor coordination group on GEWE will strengthen this aspect.

**Inter-intra- project partnerships**

Private Public Sector Partnership for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project in the Shire River Basinenjoys good working relationship with World Bank Shire River Basin Management Programme, Millennium Challenge Account, PERFORM project and JICA-COVAMS who have similar programmes to SLM in the middle shire. The main objective of the collaboration is continued dialogue and the sharing of information about the projects so as to avoid duplication of efforts but also share best practices and lessons learnt.

The evaluator notes that this is a good initiative for strengthening intra –project partnerships with a number of UNDP projects undertaking complimentary interventions by linking the women farmers under the private sector development programme, the farmer groups working with SLM project to those farmers working with the One Village One Product (OVOP) programme for sharing experiences and mentorship.

1. **Partnership for setting the normative standards and policy frameworks**:

UNDP Malawi has made effort to use its ability to leverage partnerships with the MoGCDSW to provide technical assistance for strengthening the Ministry to develop the Joint Sector Strategic Plan (JSSP) for gender youth and sports and the White paper (2011). However, UNDP’s support to women’s networks and civil society movements is weak or almost absent hence missing out to bring gender equality perspectives into policy making and legal reform.

1. **Partnerships for knowledge generation, communications and research**

**Partnership with Academia:** The UNDP partnership with academia is still at nascent stage but commendable. Three public universities received grants for the development of institutional gender policies to ensure gender mainstreaming in teaching and operational programmes. The policies have not yet been finalized. However, the evaluator notes possible opportunity to deliver as one with UNFPA and UN Women in supporting the development of gender policy for LUANAR University. Partnership should ensure subsequent implementation of the policy.

Academia has potential to offer more services such as think tanks, undertake analysis and evaluations for GEWE. UNDP can also play its convening role and knowledge of South-South opportunities to link up the academia in Malawi with other academia outside the country. For example, the UN Women funded gender and leadership Centre, Kenyatta University in Kenya that offers skills training on leadership for senior level women leaders or the UNDP’s funded Gender and Economic Policy Management Initiative

Implemented through Makerere University, Uganda.

1. **Partnerships for skills and capacity building- those that UNDP aims to influence directly.**

**Partnerships with Government:**

UNDP partnership is mainly with Government in delivering GEWE interventions. Based on the indicators of progress from the corporate GES which are:

-CO has collaborated with the national gender machinery on a substantive gender issue at least once in the current Country Programme and CO has collaborated with at least one key line Ministry on a substantive gender issue at least once in the current CO programme.

UNDP CO accomplished these and established partnerships with the MoGCDSW and line Ministries of Local Government, Integrated Rural Development, Industry and Trade. Partnership with MoGCDSW is mainly as coordinating/implementing partner, coordination, consultations and networking.

**Partnership with private sector:**  UNDP works with the private sector, which is increasingly important for efforts to link gender equality with inclusive growth and sustainable development. The private sector is emerging as a major player in extending services to economically empower women farmers, such as through expanding businesses in agriculture and cooperatives. UNDP should continue working with the private sector to further gender equality through the inclusion of financial services to underserved markets and the improvement of productivity.

**Partnerships with the media:** The evaluator notes that UNDP has potential to partner with mainstream, social and alternative media organizations, including as a vehicle to engage younger men and women in advancing gender equality but this has not been exploited. An award ceremony for outstanding journalists in reporting on environment and climate change was launched under climate change project. UNDP could consider adding ‘particularly those identifying gender aspects of climate change.’

**Partnerships with NGOs, CSOs and women’s organizations.**

UNDP partnerships with NGOs/CSOs/Women’s organizations to advance GEWE is weak. There is hardly any contractual partnership. The relations were of engaging NGOs and CSOs as participants in advocacy and capacity development opportunities, including them, for example, in workshops and training activities and supporting them to attend regional or global gatherings such as the commission on status of women. UNDP has not considered strengthening partnerships by having advisory group from members of NGOs/CSO that convenes regularly to exchange on GEWE issues with UNDP, particularly on deep-rooted cultural constrains to GEWE.

CSO partners pointed out that the UN including UNDP does not provide sufficient resources for their internal organizational capacity development for gender equality. Partnerships entail transaction costs in terms of staff time and require special skills and expertise. The CSOs expressed concern that these costs need to be balanced against the expected results. They also recommend that UNDP play a more supporting role rather than a leadership role in partnership with CSOs. This supporting role should enable more ownership and leadership amongst members of civil society to champion gender issues aligned with goals in the national development agenda.

# **3.0 UNDP’ Key Contributions to Gender Equality Results**

## **3.1 Relevance**

**Finding 6: UNDP gender equality priorities were and remain relevant to the national gender equality priorities and in making modest contribution to address glaring gaps of inequality**

1. **Relevance to critical and important needs**

Gender equality priorities of the CP are aligned with the MDGSII and the GoM, White Paper (2011). It was relevant in responding to GoM priorities in accelerating progress in four MDGs with gender connotations where expectations are not being met.

The CP gender priorities remain relevant and respond directly to the acute and important needs of Malawi women and men, tackling some of the most recurrent aspects of discriminatory practices against women and girls, in particular inequalities representation and participation in decision making as well as policy frameworks and institutional capacity gaps.

The gender equality priorities remain relevant at the mid-point of the implementation of CP which coincided with two important gender reviews (the Beijing +20 review and the submission of the 7th periodic state party CEDAW report. All re-affirmermed the continued glaring gender inequalities; slow formulation and implementation of gender equality laws and policies and weak institutional structures for gender mainstreaming.

1. **Relevance of stakeholders**

The UNDP engaged in partnerships with relevant stakeholders based on their mandates, to contribute to changes on gender equality. The MoGCDSW was and remains relevant in playing strategic role in coordinating the formulation of gender policies and legislation, coordination and evaluating progress in the advancement of women including Beijing+20 review. Strengthening the MoGCDSW capacity remains relevant to advance gender equality goals. Working with other sectors such as democratic governance, Trade and Industry; integrated rural development were relevant in ensuring gender mainstreaming in diverse sector plans and policies and gender budgeting. Partnerships with traditional leaders was relevant for effecting change in behavior towards discriminatory practices and negative cultural practices such as early marriage. Private sector organizations have been relevant in promoting value for money, creating businesses and jobs and opening space for sustainability.

1. **Relevance to Regional International Commitments**

UNDP’s response to GEWE was aligned and remains relevant to several international conventions and regional protocols that Malawi has ratified and which stress the importance of gender mainstreaming. The MDGs offer valuable lessons for future goals UN’s support to advancing GEWE in constitutional process was and remains relevant to CEDAW follow-up action plan and Beijing platform for action and the SADC protocol which all emphasize gender mainstreaming across policies, legislations plans and budgets. The SADC gender protocol sets out eight points that member countries must account to including advocacy for 50:50 women representation in decision making.

1. **Relevance to the UNDAF**

The UNCT prepared an UNDAF Action Plan to replace UN system agency specific Country Programme Action Plans (CPAPs) and other similar operational documents with a single document for the coordinated implementation of the UNDAF. The CO focus on GEWE is relevant to achievement of gender mainstreaming approach in UNDAF.

**(e) Relevance to the corporate Gender Equality Strategy**

In making the choice of gender mainstreaming strategy, UNDP’s approach was aligned to the Corporate Gender Equality Strategy 2008-2013 and 2014-2017 which is sufficiently flexible and allowed UNDP to be able to remain relevant and respond to country specific issues in setting priorities**.** Gender mainstreaming strategy was and remain relevant to theUnited Nations-System Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP), which calls on all United Nations organizations to take specific measures to increase accountability and oversight for mainstreaming gender equality and women’s empowerment and ensuring gender equality results.[[27]](#footnote-27)

1. **Relevance of Conceptual Approach**

Gender mainstreaming or gender integrated in all the Outcomes is being used by UNDP 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; that gender disparities/discrimination are not continued or made worse and gender gaps reduced in the core dimensions of development which are —opportunities, capabilities, empowerment and security.[[28]](#footnote-28) Gender mainstreaming as defined is clear that it is not an end in itself but a means towards the achievement of gender equality.

## **3.2 Effectiveness of Gender Mainstreaming across Outcomes**

Effectiveness of gender mainstreaming across outcomes is assessed against the extent to which GEWE objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. The evaluator is guided by the criteria provided in Box 1.[[29]](#footnote-29)

**Finding 7: Gender mainstreaming in a number of outcomes has not taken place in any meaningful and effective manner that translates into concrete outcome level results. Gender has not been effectively mainstreamed across majority of the outcomes, programmes and projects of UNDP. Several projects that are expected to contribute to the outcomes do not show gender mainstreaming in their objectives, outcomes and outputs at formulation and design stage. However, some gender blind projects made attempts to turn things around and achieve results.**

The next section substantiates the findings by presenting an overview of the status of gender mainstreaming followed by analysis of gender mainstreaming for each outcome.

Except for outcome 29 and 31 that made great progress and were systematic to mainstream gender in their results, there is little direct evidence that gender issues and their impact on project beneficiaries are systematically taken into account in UNDP’s other four outcomes and supported projects. The evaluation found no evidence of systematic monitoring or reporting on progress related to gender equality and women’s empowerment by the clusters. In most outcomes, reporting is in fact largely confined to small paragraph in project-level activities. It is also fragmented across the outcomes in the gender section in the ROAR. This prevents a consolidated picture of the main results, opportunities and challenges associated with the topic. The situation is best described in the Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) “despite increased efforts, GEWE is still very weak within UNDP. There is superficial commitment to GEWE and inadequate understanding of gender mainstreaming. UNDP should be seen as an organization which is gender sensitive and serious in promoting GEWE,” (ROAR, 2012). This was the situation in 2012 but it remains relevant at the end of 2014.

A number of interviewees perceive gender mainstreaming as quota to be achieved by including women. They indicated that they try to address gender issues, ‘women are encouraged to participate and they try to ensure at least 30% representation by women.’ This is corroborated in a number of reports where, gender transformative results are either not available or are not reported in a results language to capture the change occurring. For example, in one project, results is reported as, ‘all activities continued to proffer special consideration to the needs and challenges besetting vulnerable groups, namely; women, the elderly, people with disabilities and those infected and affected by HIV/AIDS, youth and children. Consequently, community iterative assessments and action taking on local challenges were particularly designed to address the prevailing gender disparities and the need to prioritise the needs of women and other vulnerable groups.’ Clearly this project has no results to report other than a process which is not well articulated.

The mechanical incorporation of gender issues implies inadequate capacity of programme staff to undertake gender analysis, which also implies need for capacity building on understanding gender analysis and gender mainstreaming. Gender mainstreaming implies including women, but does not imply excluding men. UNDP at corporate level, sees gender mainstreaming as a strategy for bringing about gender equality through creating space for everyone – women and men in the organization as well as in communities – to contribute to the process of articulating a shared vision of sustainable human development and translating it into a reality.

 **Box 2: What would a gender mainstreamed CPD Outcomes look like?**

1. Informed by gender analysis/gender assessment.
2. Considers the multiple-track strategy for gender mainstreaming, incorporating both **gender-targeted** interventions to support gender equality and women’s/girls’ empowerment as well as **gender-integrated** efforts to ensure that gender equality is integrated across the substantive work of all outcomes.
3. Ensure that the results developed at both outcome and output levels are gender-responsive- at least some dedicated outcomes, outputs targets and indicators that are designed to address gender inequality, and gender-based discrimination.
4. A gender transformational resultfocusing on promoting measurable change in gender relation (show differences in access to resources, opportunities and power between and among women, men, girls and boys. *For example: Increased decision-making for women relative to men in the local councils.*
5. Addresses how structural and other causes that give rise to inequities, discrimination and unfair power relations change as a result of an intervention.
6. **Effective monitoring and evaluation system for tracking results**

**Indicators:** Indicators will reflect the variety of gender mainstreaming strategies (integrated or specific targeting), provide sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics with baselines for outcomes or outputs where possible. Indicators of a gender-integrated approach would for example, reflect the extent to which policies/sectors integrate gender perspectives (e.g. Gender integrated in Trade and Industry, Integrated Rural Development).

* **Gender-specific indicators** -specific to women *or* men, or a gender equality-related issue. *For example,* quantitative –Proportion of seats held by women and men in different in local/ national/ sub-national councils/ decision‐making bodies
* **Or qualitative example -** enforcement of legislation related to the marriage divorce and family act.
1. **Budget** - ensuring sufficient budget allocations for gender equality in related outputs and/or outcomes

**A gender blind result** does not recognize gender differences in the expected change. *For example: Increased promotion of HIV/AIDS services available to the community*

**Gender-blind indicators**, by contrast, do not make explicit the differences between women and men. *For example, literacy rate, 15-25 years old*.

The continued lack of internal capacity within UNDP in gender analysis and mainstreaming seems to have posed challenges in effectively addressing gender during formulation of project documents that were to contribute to outcomes. Interviewees indicate they have not effectively addressed gender due to lack of adequate capacity in gender mainstreaming, strategies and tools. Interviewees state that the lack of gender sensitive outcomes and output are attributed to lack of technical in-house capacity on ‘how to mainstream’ in a relevant situation, programme, projects and outcomes. Nearly all outcomes, outputs and projects are largely gender neutral.

Appropriate responsibilities will need to be assigned to ensure that gender is integrated into every project proposal before it is funded and approved for implementation. Programme staff need more practical guidance that will enable them to understand appropriate entry points for mainstreaming gender equality into the different programmes and projects. The standard tools to ensure this include gender-disaggregated baseline data; gender budgeting and gender sensitive monitoring indicators, however these were not available to most projects. Gender disaggregated data is absent in many of the projects whether in terms of beneficiaries or participants in the activities.

**The next sections presents assessment of each outcome and related projects to determine the extent to which gender was or was not mainstreamed**.

Outcome 26: Women, youth, people with disability and households benefit from decent employment, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016.

**Finding: While outcome 26 achieved some success mostly at downstream level through direct engagement with farmers/women through ‘affirmative action’ on funding allocation, the outcome’s contribution to gender mainstreaming in policies frameworks and strategies is not yet effective. Both upstream and downstream success are necessary. However, the outcome was not informed by a systematic gender analysis to identify priority gender equality results needed in all interventions and actions.**

Outcome 26 adopted the UNDAF outcome which was subsequently amended to outcome 1.3, ‘Productive poor benefit from decent work, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016.’ Although UNDAF Outcome 1.3 is gender neutral and refers to productive poor without specifying the groups, it did identify two gender sensitive outputs:

* **Output 1.3.1:** Policy frameworks (Employment and labour, Industrialization, and Trade) are developed with gender and rights based lens and are in place.
* **Output 1.3.2**: Trade, Industry & Private Sector SWAp, ASWAp and Joint Sector Strategic Plan (JSSP) for gender and youth implementation strengthened.
* A third output was gender neutral -**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.

The Private Sector Development Project (PSDP) 2013-2016 is assessed for gender mainstreaming under outcome 26. The PSDP contributes to poverty reduction through the achievement of UNDAF Outcome 1.3, the project is to support productive partnerships with the private sector, particularly between firms and poor producers and entrepreneurs, especially smallholders. The situational analysis is not disaggregated by gender of the small holders or the poor producers or the entrepreneurs.[[30]](#footnote-30)

There is no evidence that at design stage, the private sector has used a systematic gender analysis to identify priority gender equality results needed in all interventions and actions and resources to achieve the results. However, the evaluator was made to understand that gender sensitive baselines are undertaken at the start of the award of grants. In the Annual Work Plans, proportion of women (at least 30%) is indicated. UNDP should define clear results indicators based on the baselines and effectively use them to monitor results accruing to women farmers and entrepreneurs throughout the implementation to determine the actual results achieved.

Contrary to gender sensitive outputs identified for the outcome under UNDAF 1.3, the PSDP has two gender neutral outputs and one that mentions women as beneficiaries but with no progress to date. The evaluator was made aware of the revisions that were undertaken to the UNDAF in 2013 after the PSDP was approved but this does not justify gender insensitivity of the PSDP outputs at design stage. The PSDP outputs are namely;

1. **Output 1:** The Industrial development policy and prioritized sectoral policies and strategies developed and implemented.

This output is gender blind[[31]](#footnote-31) at design stage of CP but at UNDAF level it is gender sensitive following the 2013 amendments of UNDAF results. The corresponding output is ‘policy frameworks (Employment and labour, Industrialization, and Trade) are developed with gender and rights based lens and are in place’

Through the PSDP, UNDP supported the development of a National Industrial Policy (NIP) aligned to the SADC Industrialization Framework and review of the Trade Policy but the draft of the two documents are not gender sensitive. Mainstreaming gender in the policy in line with SADC framework, should state how some of the SADC gender protocol indicators contributes to this policy. In particular, article 17 on Economic Empowerment which states that “state parties shall by 2015 adopt policies that ensure equal access benefits and opportunities to men and women in trade and entrepreneurship.”

UNDP actively participates in the Trade, Industry and Private Sector Sector Working Group. A completely gender blind Trade, Industry & PSD Sector Wide Approach Joint Sector Plan has been developed.[[32]](#footnote-32)

1. **Output 2:** The Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund (MICF) is established and operational to increase inclusiveness and competitiveness of value chains in agriculture and manufacturing.

Although the output is gender neutral, the Annual Work Plan includes indicators that are gender sensitive such as the percentage increase in the incomes of existing 80,000 farmers and 10,000 new farmers, at least 30% of whom are women. Through UNDP, contributions were made to women’s economic empowerment through the private sector programme which allocated USD 400,000 USD specifically for projects that had strong ‘Economic Empowerment of Women Stream’ the contribution enables Kwithu Kitchen, a women led co-operative to create an inclusive business model sourcing fresh garden tomatoes from 500 smallholder women farmers, linking to benefits of 35% increase in income and access to markets. Another is the Msuwadzi Smallholder Tea Growers Association (MSA) which is an organization of 300 smallholdertea farmers primarily women. This project will create 70 new jobsand will integrate smallholder farmers into the supply chain thereby improving the livelihood of farmers who supply the herbs by 48%.[[33]](#footnote-33) The MSA initiative does not however disaggregate the sex of the farmers to be able to track gender results. The evaluator was not able to establish whether change is already occurring in the lives of the farmers and by gender.

In addition, women benefitted through employment in manufacturing and agriculture - Two of the MICF grantees are female-headed companies whilst the remaining companies in the agriculture and manufacturing sectors have at least 30% female labour force. Some companies have exclusively female labour force.[[34]](#footnote-34) Female manufacturers are targeted for capacity building on quality management systems and good manufacturing practices in order to gain market shares and ultimately increase household incomes.

**(c ) Output 3:** Loan facility provided to smallholder farmers, low income women and youth.

Benefits have not accrued to the women stated in this output. The third output has only been started in 2015. In its 2014 Annual report, it is stated that “ Overall, there was relatively good progress for this reporting period but not all key results in the AWP 2014 were achieved, in particular output on Loan facility provided to smallholder farmers, low income women and youth. Success was to be measured by ‘number of productive poor with access to loans (at least 30% are women and youth)’. The project has not contributed to the loans as anticipated. The factors contributing to this is the delay in establishing partnerships with United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF).

The project is in its third year with access to loans for women remaining on paper. This output shows that gender mainstreaming must go beyond just mentioning women, men, or girls and boys in a document and move to transformational gender sensitive results. A gender risk analysis must be undertaken to mitigate any possibility of access to loans overburdening women through payments.

**Outcome 27: Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources and climate change and disaster risk by 2016.**

**Finding:** **A gender blind Outcome 27 was implemented through projects which all had gender blind outputs and indicators. While the projects benefited from evidence based information, study findings/assessments should not be an end in themselves but should inform gender sensitive implementation. One project translated findings into gender sensitive actions, another project has not yet taken advantage of the study findings.**

Outcome 27 corresponds to UNDAF outcome 1.2,’ Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016’.

The evaluation assessed the following projects for their gender mainstreaming:

1. The National climate change programme implemented by the Ministry of Natural Resources Energy and Mining Environmental Affairs Department
2. Sustainable Energy Management (SEM) Programme
3. Private Public Sector Partnership for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project in the Shire River Basin
4. **The National climate change programme implemented by the Ministry of Natural Resources Energy and Mining Environmental Affairs Department**

The Project is implemented through different Ministries and government departments to mainstream climate change in all strategic planning and budgetary processes. Key result for the project was the development of Climate Change policy and National Climate Change Investment Plan. Through the support provided to district councils, there has been a general increase in the understanding that climate change should be part of the district development plans. The project has not effectively integrated gender either during design or implementation stages.

There is no single gender responsive output or indicators. There is no systematic capturing of gender results. There are small paragraphs, a ‘tick off’ reporting in both the ROAR and the Annual Report which implies no systematic approach to capture gender results leading to open ended reporting, like ‘Policy statements specifically on how to manage gender issues vis a vis climate change and the disadvantaged groups have been flagged in the policy…. Strategies on how to address gender issues in climate change management has been included’. In the development of the primary school source book on climate change, particular attention was given to examples relating to girls and all illustrations in the books are having a combination of boys and girls. This will encourage leaners of both genders to participate in the climate change management issues.[[35]](#footnote-35) The project is mainly reporting processes but little on outputs or contribution to outcomes.

The evaluator was made aware of UNDP’s contribution to a study on gender and climate change. However, how the recommendations of the study have been translated into concrete actions is missing. The study provides good evidence of gender analysis of climate change in Malawi. The conclusion of the study sums up how gender has not been mainstreamed in climate change, “Gender has generally not been adequately mainstreamed at community, district and national levels despite the recent wake of policy response to climate change by both government and development partners in Malawi. There is need for a coordinated holistic approach to gender mainstreaming by aligning existing relevant policy frameworks and instruments to grassroots gender needs engaging the key players including Ministries of Environment and Climate Change Management; Gender and Children and Social Welfare; and Economic Planning and Development. Development partners, such as the UNDP should play a catalytic role to ensure adequate gender mainstreaming as well as proper design and implementation of coping, adaptation and mitigation interventions at all levels,”[[36]](#footnote-36)

**The project has so far not implemented the recommendations of the study. The evaluator finds no evidence of any gender-targeted** interventions to support gender equality and women’s/girls’ empowerment to mitigate the effects of climate change as well as **gender-integrated** efforts to ensure that gender equality is integrated in all strategic planning and budgetary processes. The evaluator did not find evidence of any indicators at output level to monitor the impact of climate change on different groups by gender and address any gender based discrimination. Based on these, the evaluator concludes that the project did not mainstream gender. UNDP should consider moving forward with the proposed recommendations of the study such as making sure that the Climate Change Investment Plan have clear targeted plans for different gender groups based on their vulnerabilities and adaptive capacities and; to strengthen advocacy and commitment to gender mainstreaming at all levels of interventions on climate change adaptation.

1. **The Sustainable Energy Management Project**

The aim of the project is to facilitate a change process that will lead to a significant shift away from direct burning of wood to a cleaner, safer and sustainable use of modern energy. The project does not have a specific output that responds to gender differences or specific targeted on women or men. All the outputs[[37]](#footnote-37) listed below are gender blind.

Output 1: Sustainable Energy Management mainstreamed in policies and development plans at national and district level.

Output 2: Data and knowledge on the advantages and possibilities attached to use of renewable energy technologies and energy efficient behavior and technologies are made accessible to decision makers at household, district and national level.

Output 3: Establishment of a national platform for coordination of energy in particular renewable energy and energy efficiency interventions.

1. **Private Public Sector Partnership for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project in the Shire River Basin**

The project contributes to UNDAF Outcome**:** 1.2, ‘Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016’. However, this project formulated its own sub-outcomes and outputs which are all gender blind as follows:

* Policy and institutional arrangement for basin-wide SLM, including preparatory works for the establishment of the River Shire Development and management Authority
* Private public partnerships providing financial incentives for SLM (through green water credits and sustainable charcoal production);
* Improving knowledge and skills at all levels to support SLM;
* Crop insurance providing the basis for increased access to credits as well as increased use of up to date weather information in decision making in the Shire River Basin for improved livelihoods

This project has the potential to mainstream gender in all its work and encourage participation of both men and women in its interventions but it has not taken full advantage of the opportunities. The project interventions were informed by a gender assessment which disaggregated findings, for example, the study found that the average land holding size for both Male Headed Household and Female Headed Household was 0.7207 hectares and 0.6213 hectares respectively. Of the total land owned/utilized by each type of households, 0.6082 hectares of the total land owned/utilized by male household was rented, while 0.4143 hectares of the total land owned by a female household was also rented as well. On average, bee keeping and charcoal and weaving provided better sources of income generation than the others for both male headed and female headed household. Female headed households earned more income from only four of the income generating activities; **Charcoal**, Remittances, **Firewood** and Weaving.[[38]](#footnote-38)

The evaluator notes that the gender assessment finding ‘Female headed households earned more income from only four of the IGAs; **Charcoal**, Remittances, **Firewood** and Weaving, led the project to support bee keeping and fish farming as alternative livelihoods for communities engaged in charcoal production with high income gains realized by farmers from honey production.

As a result of the gender assessment the project has created more income generating activities for women in the impact area. This includes bee keeping and fish farming as strategy to encourage women to participate in Sustainable Land Management activities. Over 50% of the beneficiaries in these bee keeping groups are women who have already started getting the benefits of beekeeping by selling honey at profitable prices. One farmer group with over 75% women participation has just realised Over MK50, 000.00 (US$150) as a result of selling the honey. Similar results have been achieved with communities participating in fish farming and crop diversification through provision of sweet potato.

The evaluator notes that the project should have also addressed an intervention for alternative source of energy to discourage women from selling charcoal and firewood and yet it is also the women who demand these commodities.

Outcome 28: The national response to HIV is evidence- informed, coordinated, sustainably resources, efficient and based on a supportive legal and policy environment by 2016.

Outcome 28 corresponds to UNDAF Outcome 3.2, ‘critical enablers for the implementation of the national response enhanced by 2016’.

There was no project made available to the evaluator for assessment of this outcome. There is insufficient information to make good findings. However, during interviews, it emerged that UNDP participated and contributed to the development and review of several important government policy documents including the National HIV and AIDS Strategic Plan (2012-2016); the Male Circumcision Policy; and the new M&E Plan (2011-2016); a country assessment of the integration of HIV and Gender in Environmental Impact Assessments; and the Men who have Sex with Men (MSM) size estimation study. These products informed the formulation of a joint programme between UNAIDS, ILO, UNODC, FAO and UNDP in 2012.[[39]](#footnote-39)However, funding for the joint programme has not been forthcoming.

The evaluator was made aware that some of the policies and laws originally were not positive in addressing gender issues, for example a gender assessment done by UNAIDS and Southern AIDS Trust (SAT) found that “Women and girls are highly vulnerable in HIV context, but they are not counted as a vulnerable group in strategic documents like the National HIV and AIDS Strategic Plan (2011-2016) and National HIV and AIDS Policy (2013). Noting the weaknesses, the UNDP in partnership with other UN agencies, have been strategic in ensuring revision of such policies and strategies to make them gender sensitive. The NSP was revised and updated and women and girls are identified as a vulnerable group in the National Strategic Plan 2015- 2020 and the National Prevention Strategy 2015 – 2020 and defines a minimum combination prevention package for women, young women, and adolescent girls as a priority group.

Outcome 29: National institutions foster democratic governance and human rights to promote transparency, accountability, participation and access to justice for all especially women and children by 2016.

**Finding: Outcome 29 made great progress and was systematic to mainstream gender in its results but improvements are required to consistently use gender analysis/assessments and disaggregate the benefits and show groups of men, women, girls and boys befitting and for which changes is making a difference. Even though the projects contribute to outcome 29 which in turn contributes to UNDAF outcome 4.1, these project level successes are not vertically captured in UNDAF outcome annual reports to inform gender mainstreaming results at UNDAF level.**

Outcome 29 contributes to UNDAF Outcome 4.1, ‘National institutions foster democratic governance for all, especially children, women persons with disabilities and the youth by 2016.’

The evaluation assessed the following projects:

1. Policy and Institutional Framework for Integrated Rural Development project implemented through the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development.
2. Democracy consolidation programme phase IV.
3. Malawi electoral Cycle support project.
4. Social cohesion project implemented by Office of President and Cabinet.
5. Malawi Human Rights Support Project.
6. **Policy and Institutional Framework for Integrated Rural Development (IRD) project**

The project has been effective and systematic in mainstreaming gender. The objective is gender sensitive. The objective of the project was to produce a policy and Institutional framework for IRD that is fully engendered for planning, coordination, implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

One of the outputs of the project is: a gender responsive IRD strategy developed and gender assessment report approved and disseminated. Output indicator is: a gender responsive IRD in place. A gender assessment of the IRD sector was undertaken (2014) which provided evidence based information to assist the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development in finalizing the Integrated Rural Development Strategy (IRDS).[[40]](#footnote-40) Based on the assessment, gender has been effectively mainstreamed in the IRD framework with the following core focus areas: Gender is a core pillar of the framework; increased meaningful participation of all gender groups in IRD activities; reduced gender based violence at all levels; enhanced gender mainstreaming across all sectors.[[41]](#footnote-41)

1. **Democracy Consolidation Programme Phase IV**

The democratic governance area of UNDP work provides an opportunity to advance women’s legal rights and empowerment, strengthen their access to justice, and ensure gender responsive and equitable service delivery, and promote their equal participation in decision making.

The project has made great progress to mainstream gender in its results but improvements are required to consistently disaggregate the benefits and show groups of men, women, girls and boys befitting and for which changes is making a difference. The project has potential to mainstream gender and be a driver of change for women and men demanding service delivery at community level and to strengthen UNDPs interventions that change people lives but in a number of cases the benefits are not informed by gender analysis and benefits accruing not disaggregated. It is also noted that even though the project contributes to outcome 29 which in turn contributes to UNDAF outcome 4.1, these project level successes are not vertically captured to inform gender mainstreaming at UNDAF level. The Annual UNDAF outcome 4.1 reports do not report on the achievements at UNDP CP level.

Out of four outputs, three outputs expressed intension to reach out to ‘especially for women, youth, children and disabled’, for example, output one states: At least 70% group villages in 28 districts effectively demanding progressive accessibility and acceptability of basic social services and good governance especially women, youth, children and people with disabilities.

The project has successfully tracked success stories of change that occurred at outcome level. For example, UNDP intervention is empowering communities to demand for better services. Through training by Community Rights Committee (CRC) on fair trade, labour rights and consumer protection, community sensitization campaigns on labour rights and the need to fight against exploitation of workers have been intensified with positive changes emerging.

After some farmers acquired knowledge and skills in fair trade through the sensitization campaigns that were carried out by Chizuwi CRC, the farmers formed clubs as one way towards bargaining for better prices for their crop instead of going through vendors. The farmers mobilized themselves into clubs which enabled them gain more skills on rice production from duty bearers such as Malawi Lake Basin and the office of the Director of Agriculture Development at the district. The farmers’ break-through came about after they entered into an agreement with Land O’ Lakes which gave them rice seeds and promised to buy their rice at K350 per kg as opposed to K200 or less per kg offered by vendors. Following this agreement, farmers have managed to benefit from their rice. The proceeds have enable some to buy ox-carts, goats and roof houses with iron-sheets. The initiative has benefitted a total of 148 farmers (57 men 64 women, 22 youth and 5 disabled).

Through UNDP interventions, communities are demanding for change that benefits boys and girls, for example, communities in Kauka CRC denounced harmful cultural practices critically reflected upon effects of early marriages and child labour. The community members challenged traditional leaders to stop harmful cultural practices so as to create conducive environment for boys and girls to enjoy their right to education. Following this, the Chiefs Council of TA Mwahenga formulated bi-laws to curb harmful social and cultural practices that predispose girls to early or forced marriages. The bi-laws defined specific penalties for parents/ guardians forcing boys and girls into early marriages as well as child labour. Furthermore, the community set up committees to enforce and monitor implementation of the laws. The CRC was tasked to support the established committees in monitoring and reporting those involved in such malpractices. Since establishment of the bi-laws, 7 perpetrators have already been fined and others reported to relevant legal institutions for redress. The enforcement of the bi-laws and ongoing community sensitization campaigns on the importance of sending children to school are helping to curb early marriages and child labour in the area.

In some results the project could improve in capturing disaggregated benefits in terms of who is befitting and how services demanded benefit different groups. This emerged during interviews and documents review. for example, the project provide free paralegal services to victims of human rights violations in the 19 targeted districts. A total of 2,222 cases were registered by the district paralegal offices out of which 1,159 were resolved through mediation and counselling, 743 were referred to appropriate case handling institutions and 320 were pending resolution at the close of the reporting period. It would be gender responsive to identify benefits accruing to different groups rather than lumping them together - how many of these were women, children, disabled and men. Another, example is “1,208 out of 2,048 CRCs (59%) in 16 districts and 51 out of 61 RLCs (84%) sensitized and mobilized communities to stand up for the protection of the rights of children and other vulnerable groups especially women, children, people with disabilities and those infected and affected by HIV/AIDS.

In some aspects, the ‘gender results’ reported are not backed with gender data and changes occurring in lives of men and women, “as per its design, gender mainstreaming continued to guide implementation across all programme activities. Further, all activities continued to proffer special consideration to the needs and challenges besetting vulnerable groups, namely; women, the elderly, people with disabilities and those infected and affected by HIV/Aids, youth and children. Based on the bulk of the challenges and the adopted implementation guiding principles, most of the issues being addressed have something to do with addressing the gender and other imbalances.’[[42]](#footnote-42) This general statements shows lack of capturing gender disaggregated results.

In addition, there is no data showing proportion of women and men benefiting from the interventions. For example, ‘most of the beneficiaries of the free paralegal services were women who were able to access justice, a service that is generally not easily accessible for most women, especially for those based in rural areas.’ It is indicated in Annual report that presentation of project information was done with gender disaggregated data to demonstrate the extent of gender mainstreaming. The entire annual reports fails to show the disaggregated results.

Some attempts at results shows that in terms of addressing gender imbalances, the project made deliberate efforts to promote participation of vulnerable groups, slightly over 50 % of Community Rights Committee (CRCs) and around 70% of the Radio Listening Clubs (RLC) membership is now made up of women, with many taking up leadership positions.[[43]](#footnote-43) Women were major players in wealth creation schemes which saw more women start and benefit from savings clubs in their communities through which they accessed capital and used it to get into small scale business ventures.

1. **Malawi Electoral Cycle Support Project**

The project was to achieve four outputs as follows:

* Electoral policy and regulatory environment is harmonized and stabilized.
* Technical and institutional capacity of MEC strengthened.
* Organization and management of elections enhanced.
* Effective and efficient management, partnership formation and monitoring and evaluation of the Project

For the 2014 tripartite elections, UNDP provided financial and technical support to Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC) to build capacity, strengthen information technology, procure sensitive materials and manage the Basket Fund.

Although all the outputs were gender blind, UNDP supported the Center for Multi-Party Democracy, political empowerment of women, and conflict prevention through Public Affairs Committee (PAC). Processes ensured that gender and conflict sensitive issues were integrated into the development of Codes of Conduct that were issued for the accreditation of Civil Society Organisations as Civic and Voter Education (CVE) providers, Media, Political Parties, Election Observers and Traditional Authorities. Through the Project, UN Women was engaged through the Technical Committee and at operational levels to ensure that instruments were subject to gender-sensitive reviews.

The Project assisted the MEC with planning and contingency operations during the pre-election and election process, as well as in the subsequent by-elections. Several recommendations were adopted by the MEC in the process. For example, a 25% discount for the nomination fees of parliamentary and councillor female candidates, the early announcement of the fees (to allow women to overcome structural barriers in raising funds to support their nomination). In addition, a stand-alone project was formulated to support women’s participation in elections. The outcomes are discussed under outcome 31/UNDAF outcome 4.3.

1. **Social Cohesion project implemented by Office of President and Cabinet.**

The project implemented by the office of the President and Cabinet made attempts to mainstream gender. Out of the three project outputs, one was gender responsive: output 2: civic capacities for conflict prevention extended and applied through development of conflict and gender sensitive reporting by media and through the enhancement of capabilities of women’s networks for conflict resolution and for advocacy for peace.[[44]](#footnote-44)

UNDP through the project build a solid gender-inclusive team of ‘insider mediators’ to tackle national disputes and play a preventive diplomacy role before, during and after the electoral process.[[45]](#footnote-45) Fourteen Public Affairs Committee (PAC) leaders (10 Men and 4 Women) were exposed to a simulation and mediation training with an aim of developing election-related scenarios and building capacities in mediation and dialogue facilitation.

Through provision of technical experts by UN Women to team up with Senior Peace Advisor of UNDP, 29 women were trained in basic peacebuilding and conflict transformation skills. Capacity of ‘women in faith’ network was built to be able to promote peace building groups in their own religions and communities. The training led to the formation of 3 regional teams of Women in Faith Peace networks. In their regional teams, the women engaged in sensitization exercises, sharing the knowledge and skills they had acquired with other women in their communities. The networks also monitored violence during the elections period. Another achievement from the formation of the networks was the inclusion of 2 women in the 6 member-core national mediation team, representing 33.3%. This was very encouraging to other women as previously women’s participation in peace initiatives was very minimal, and they were not represented at the national level.

1. **Malawi Human Rights Support Project**

The project was implemented through five outputs. Gender has been mainstreamed in the project. The project through MHRC formulated a gender responsive output 1: a gender responsive national human rights action plan developed in a participatory manner and implemented (AWP2013). Subsequently, UNDP supported finalization of the study report on the situation of gender and human rights in Malawi whose recommendations will feed into the development of National Action Plan for Human Rights in Malawi to ensure that it is gender responsive. The report recommends favourable environment for women in leadership positions in committees, in politics, and in public institutions including parliament. On cultural practices, the report recommends that community leaders with the support of the government and NGOs must reinvigorate their efforts to sensitize community members to abandon all cultural practices that infringe on the rights of girls and women.

Although the other four outputs were not formulated in a gender responsive manner, there are emerging disaggregated gender results such as: Training in Human Rights / Governance, Gender mainstreaming and Human rights based approach Programming; produced state reports on Universal Peoples Rights and SADC Protocol on Gender and Development Report. Twelve open air sensitization meetings on human rights were conducted. The initiative reached out to a total of 5,112 people including 1,643 men, 1,549 women and 1,920 youths. The meetings equipped members of community groups with relevant skills and knowledge in human rights.[[46]](#footnote-46) The Commission investigated and resolved fifteen cases in the areas of child rights, gender and women rights, civil and political rights, economic, social and cultural rights and disability and elderly rights. In some cases recommendations were made for relevant authority to take action. The Commission conducted six sensitization meetings in Ntchisi district to mark the Sixteen Days of Activism against Gender Based Violence where the discussions with the duty bearers on their roles relating to fight against gender based violence were also done. The duty bearers included District Executive Committee members that comprised all heads of departments at district level.[[47]](#footnote-47)

Outcome 30: Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016.

**Finding: Although Outcome 30 has potential to contribute to gender sensitive representation through skilled personnel, it has not been effective in monitoring the change process towards tangible results. Development of guidelines should not be an end in itself. Monitoring of its use should be factored into project. Training in leadership should be monitored to track results of placements related to training.**

CP Outcome 30 contributes to UNDAF outcome 4.2. The evaluation assessed two projects for gender mainstreaming, namely:

1. Public Service Capacity Development Project (PSCDP);
2. Capacity Development in the Health Sector
3. **Public Service Capacity Development Project implemented through the Office of the President and Cabinet**

The project is implemented by the office of the President and Cabinet. It seeks to strengthen the capacity of the public service to better deliver services. The project had one gender responsive output out of six.[[48]](#footnote-48) Output 3 was ‘gender sensitive recruitment guidelines developed and adopted. The output was achieved - gender-sensitive recruitment guidelines were developed and adopted. The evaluator was not able to establish the higher level of change on how the guidelines have been used. However, interviewees indicated that the guidelines will go a long way in Government’s efforts to balance recruitment as well as promotion of men and women within the public service. The output was not followed through in 2014. None the less, the project should monitor how the guidelines have helped with recruitment.

Even though the other outputs were not gender responsive, some results emerged. Through this project UNDP’s main area of work towards gender equality and women empowerment was to ensure that women are taking up leadership positions within the public service. This was achieved by the CO’s deliberate efforts to involve more women in leadership and management trainings. For example, a total of 212 participants attended the ethics, integrity and professionalism training courses in 2014. Of these, 150 were men (71%) and 62 were women (29%).[[49]](#footnote-49) Interviewees indicated that although most participants indicated that they now have a common understanding of issues surrounding leadership and management in the public sector, the project has little influence in seeing to it that the trained women are accelerated into leadership positions within the public service. Institutional/organizational changes might take long. The evaluation finds change at this level key in establishing UNDP’s contribution to the outcome and hence should be fostered through project activities by monitoring changes in status of men and women occurring after training.

1. **Capacity Development in Health Project implemented by Ministry of Health**

The project contributes to UNDAF outcome 4.2, ‘Public Institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016.’

The overall goal of the project is to strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Health to deliver quality health services in Malawi through recruiting specialist UNV doctors and general practitioners to be deployed in central and district hospitals. This will be achieved through the following outputs:

* **Output 1:** UNV doctors have increased coverage of the expanded Essential Health Package interventions in Central, District and CHAM hospitals by 2016**.**
* **Output 2**: The College of Medicine, Kamuzu Central and Queen Elizabeth Central Hospitals are able to deliver specialist training to strengthen the performance of the Health System in anesthesia, physiotherapy and surgery by 2016.
* **Output 3:** Three central hospitals establish specialized units for physiotherapy, cardiology and oncology disease conditions by 2016

At UNDAF level, the outcome, outputs and related indicators were all gender blind. This is replicated at project level with gender blind outputs. Gender mainstreaming was not systematically adopted hence the weakness in reporting results as an afterthought and perceived to have happened, for example, the project indicates that ‘the Project had seven specialist doctors recruited in the area of obstetrics and gynaecology as well as paediatric. This shows the commitment to deal with maternal issues in hospitals among others. In addition, considering that the majority of population accessing ART services are women, it can also be concluded that the strategies to mainstream gender was successful. There is no gender analysis of the proportion of those accessing ATR services.

Since the project involved recruitment of doctors, progress will be determined by number of male and female doctors recruited. It would be worthwhile to know how many of the UNV doctors were female and the proportion of those that have accessed health services by gender. The long run solution is to help Malawi train and retain its own doctors. It is noted in the Annual report that 300 more general practitioner doctors and 56 physiotherapists will also have been produced by 2016. This is a field where women are generally less represented but the project should capture progress on number of female and male doctors being trained. The project should look into encouraging qualified females to apply for training in various fields. The evaluator is aware of the low level of females in education at secondary and tertiary level that could hamper progress. However, the female IUNVs can play the role of motivation and mentorship of young girls to take up science courses and enrol for medical courses.

**Outcome 31: National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016 (same as UNDAF outcome 4.3.)**

This section examines the effectiveness of UNDP’s specific outcome 31 and contribution to outcome 4.3.

Four gender sensitive outputs were identified to contribute to a gender sensitive outcome ‘National *institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016’.* As follows:

**Output 4.3.1:** Gender Mainstreamed in Seven Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAps).

**Output 4.3.2:** Ministry of Gender and selected sectors have the capacity to plan, coordinate, monitor and evaluate the National Gender Programme.

**Output 4.3.3**: Women have the capacity and benefit from an enabling environment to claim and exercise their rights to participate in decision making in public and private sectors.

**Output 4.3.4** Gender related laws revised and a functional implementation framework in place to address Gender Based Violence (GBV).

The evaluation assessed performance of UNDP through each of the outputs.

1. **UNDP’s contribution through Output 4.3.1:** Gender Mainstreamed in Seven Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAps).

**Finding 8: UNDP has not been effective in mainstreaming gender in SWAps.**

The UNDP has made some modest contribution in providing support for gender mainstreaming in sector plans. In delivering results for outcome 4.3, it was critical for each organization to be strategic in the specific sectors identified by individual mandates and coordinate where there is an overlap. UNDP is active in the Democratic governance SWAp, Trade and Industry SWAp, Rural and Integrated Development and development of the Gender, Youth and Sports Joint Sector Strategic Plan (JSSP), 2013-2017.

There is no evidence that gender has been effectively mainstreamed in the UNDP led Democratic governance SWAp and Trade and Industry SWAp (TIPSWAp). A draft Joint Sector plan for TIPSWAp has been prepared in 2014 with no gender analysis or priority actions. The democratic governance SWAp is yet to take off. The evaluation finds weakness in gender mainstreaming in the Democratic Governance overarching policy framework. There is good situation analysis of gender issues in the Democratic Governance Sector Strategy 2013-2017.[[50]](#footnote-50) However, UNDP did not achieve gender mainstreaming in proposed six results and indicators. Out of 32 indicators only one is close to be gender sensitive “relevant electoral laws engendered” the rest refers to people, citizens, Malawians.

SWAps are seen to be more effective and operational mainly in the sectors where aid largely flows, such as **health and education, transport and agriculture**, not in gender national machineries or social welfare. This can mean that some Ministries, institutions or departments are facing funding difficulties, as donor financing strategies change. This was the finding particularly for Democratic Governance SWAp which has not taken off.

1. **UNDP’s contribution through Output 4.3.2:** Ministry of Gender and selected sectors have the capacity to plan, coordinate, monitor and evaluate the National Gender Programme.

**Finding 9: UNDP contributed substantively to advocacy for formulation of gender equality policies and legislation**

While many actors were engaged in advocacy and lobbying for laws to be enacted, the UNDP also played critical role in support of capacity of the MoGCDSW that led to the GoM enactment of the Gender Equality Act (Act Number 3 of 2013) following the Presidential Assent of 9 April, 2013.

The focus of the UNDP in collaboration with other UN to advocate for enactment of laws and policies is important as programmes related to women should be fully guided by relevant policy and strategic frameworks that are tightly descriptive of strategic actions for addressing deep rooted norms, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. Legislation will only be effective when implemented. UNDP should support the implementation of laws and policies to benefit gender equality. Even where gender-equal laws have been put into place, entrenched inequalities, discriminatory social norms, harmful customary practices, as well as dominant patterns of economic development, can undermine their implementation and positive impact.

**Capacity building towards change of attitude was notable in addressing cultural impediments that affect delivery of UNDAF:** UNDP in partnership with UNFPA, UNICEF, UNAIDs and UN Women approach of working with traditional leaders was strategic in addressing harmful cultural practices, re-admission policy, integration of gender into the village actions and advocating for the age of marriage to be 21 year. While it is prudent to fast track implementation of the Chiefs Declaration on Women, Girls and HIV and AIDS, care need to be taken to ensure appropriate messages that do not contradict the Gender Equality Act and also to monitor and ensure women and girls are not being put to greater risk.

**Finding 10: Change in institutional capacity strengthening of the MoGCDSW was strategic for improved coordination, policy making and leadership for gender equality. However, UNDP contributed to small change in the capacity of the Ministry.**

**Strengthening capacity**: The UNDP and UNFPA managed to build technical and coordination capacity in the Ministry through both international gender experts and national technical experts - Gender Expert on Political Empowerment of Women (Focal Point for political empowerment of women project); Gender Expert on Economic Empowerment of Women (Focal point for UNFPA – supported GEWE Project) and national experts for M&E and Finance. However, these are only short time measures. Long term commitment to staffing will have to come from the Government reducing the vacancy rate in the Ministry which at the moment stands at 50%. Frequent turnover of staff hampered effective skills transfer by the international gender advisors who have since left the Ministry. Any technical support by UNDP ought to be accompanied with skills transfer and mentorship plan by the skilled personnel seconded to the Ministry.

UNDP support did influence the ongoing process of capacity development through technical assistance, skills training, advocacy, development of strategies but cannot control how effectively the Ministry used the contribution to become better in coordination and in monitoring - for example, the UNDP and the UN contributed to producing the gender Youth and Sports JSSP with intention to strengthen coordination but cannot control the process of capacity development that will lead to this coordination, which needs to have an effective SWG – leadership problem affects the ability to achieve desired capacity development results.

The organizational capacity of the Gender Department remains weak. Coordination of gender mainstreaming; working across sectors; raising awareness; mainstreaming of policies; allocating responsibilities; demanding accountability; reporting on commitments; limited human resources and capacities within the Ministry as well as management practices and processes. The Joint Sector Strategy contained little reference to any of these approaches.

1. **UNDP’s contribution through Output 4.3.3**: Women have the capacity and benefit from an enabling environment to claim and exercise their rights to participate in decision making in public and private sectors.

**Finding 11: The UNDP and UN Women made substantive contributions towards increased women’s capacity to participate in politics and occupy decision making positions. However, the results achieved were not only below the minimum 50:50 advocated for but unfortunately regressive when compared to past elections. This was due to some factors both within and beyond the control of the UN.**

Despite great effort to increase number of women in parliament, the results achieved were not only below the minimum 50:50 representation but unfortunately regressive when compared to past performance due to factors both within and beyond UNDP and UN Women control.[[51]](#footnote-51) UNDP and UN Women support was for enhancing awareness and capacity of women to run as candidates and influencing political parties to promote women’s participation. 11 out of the 12 major political parties signed a communiqué on strategies to promote women’s political participation in the Tripartite Elections of May 2014 and enhance gender in political parties manifesto. In addition to this, 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.[[52]](#footnote-52)

Furthermore, UNDP in collaboration with UN Women supported advocacy of political parties and media houses to put in place strategies for supporting female electoral candidates. UNDP has also supported the development of training manuals for Members of Parliament including local councils based on findings from a UNDP-supported capacity needs assessment of female Parliamentarians which showed that the capacity gaps among female Parliamentarians is similar to that of male Parliamentarians.

It is nevertheless important to mention that this evaluation does not reduce gender representation to numerical ratios and configurations, but also refers to the leadership and intellectual quality of that representation. In this aspect UN Women post-election support to strengthen capacity of female parliamentarians where the overall objective was to increase parliament accountability around gender equality and empowerment of women is a positive move.

Some of the constraints that emerged during this evaluation are: Institutional, legal frameworks, economic challenges as well as very strong patriarchal cultural values work against women’s political participation and gender equality; working more with female potential candidates and parliamentarians and limited leveraging of support of male influential actors like traditional leaders/champions to support women’s agenda; lack of UN Women and UNDP and other donor’s multi-year engagement in women’s political participation and lack of multi-dimensional approach to diverse factors that can contribute to success. UNDP and other partners have supported women’s participation in elections as a one off event during election time; gaps in legislative aspects of women’s participation have not been addressed – the country lacks special electoral quota system to increase women’s representation in parliament to at least 50 percent.[[53]](#footnote-53) The engagement with political parties to influence gender mainstreaming within their policies and structures was minimal. UNDP and UN women as leaders in women’s political participation need to go beyond numbers to enhance the capacity of elected parliamentarians in the legislative process. Key informants indicated that the legislative and analytical skills/capacity of the female MPs is being addressed but it is not adequate. Furthermore, very limited funds were provided by donors on women political empowerment for elections – only Royal Norwegian Embassy funded the NGO-Gender Coordination Network for the 50:50 campaign. UNDP and UN Women supported the work on elections just with core funds. No funds were raised by other donors The UNDP/UN Women election cycle support project did not include civic and voter education.

## **3.3 Efficiency**

**Finding 12: Efficiency of gender mainstreaming is mixed. Allocation of resources through gender marker is not commensurate with anecdotal results achieved for GEWE. Gender mainstreaming as a strategy, and gender equality as an outcome, cannot be achieved by over-reliance on one gender focal point. UNDP appeared to have overlap and duplication with some UN agencies.**

Efficiency is a measure of how economic resources/inputs are converted into results. It is difficult to assess the efficiency of gender-related initiatives, inter alia*,* because of the limited information available in the reports covered by the evaluation. Nevertheless, there are some indications as to whether project investments supported the gender initiatives and whether the resources allocated were sufficient to meet the stated gender output targets and objectives.

**Programming efficienc**y: The evaluation notes that gender mainstreaming as a strategy, and gender equality as an outcome, cannot be achieved by over-reliance on one gender focal point. The gender mainstreaming approach can only be successful when the majority of programme and operation staff understand that gender issues are inherent in activities, programme, procurement, staffing and development processes. Gender mainstreaming will be successful when the mainstream accepts responsibility for gender equality outcomes and continues to be committed to operate in a gender responsive manner. To ensure that staff members have the necessary tools and skills to increase their overall efficiency in gender mainstreaming in programmes and thereby contribute to the CP’s stated GEWE goals, gender training for programme and operations staff is essential.

UNDP appeared to have overlap and duplication with some UN agencies, for example in providing support to the Ministry of Local Government where three gender assessments with action plans have been produced in over a period of 6 years. Another case of duplication is with the Ministry of Gender which was supported by UNDP to produce a White Paper (2011) that informed capacity strengthening of the Ministry but in 2014 another donor supported yet another “Framework strengthening the capacity of the MoGCDSW’ with similar action plans.

**Capacity building for the Ministry of Gender.**  UNDP adopted the conventional option of funding *technical assistance* in the shape of an expert that is seconded to the Ministry of Gender. There were good and not so good experiences with this option. The seconded expert is commonly loaded with any relevant work, and effectively replaces staff rather than capacitating existing staff in the Ministry. The international staff departed and left no skills transfer.

**Financial Resources and disbursement**: UNDP has not mobilised bilateral donor resources to specifically advance GEWE. Funds have been mainly through its core resources. However, UNDP has made great progress to commit core resources for GEWE resultsthrough the **Gender marker** which is an accountability tool that allows UNDP to track its financial allocations and expenditures contributing to GEWE. Each outcome allocated resources for gender equality as depicted in analysis of expenditures through the gender marker. Some of the outcomes were donor funded, hence it can be implied that GEWE benefitted from donor funds such as the private sector programme. However, the evaluation finds allocation of resources through gender marker not commensurate with anecdotal results achieved for GEWE. A notable challenge with the gender marker is that it represents intentions at the project design stage and does not reflect the actual implementation of a project nor its achievements, unless that project is GEN3. Financial tracking through a marker on gender expenditures in interventions is critical in establishing actual results of the marker.[[54]](#footnote-54)

In terms of value for money, key informants and reports available show that results have mostly been delivered through workshops. This required payment to participants in form of cash incentives (daily subsistence allowance) to participants which has now been harmonized to full board approach. The approach demotivated participants and greatly diminished participation at workshops. This amounts to lack of owning the development process. A new approach that emphasizes ownership of the development process needs to be worked out.

## **3.4 Sustainability**

**Finding 13: Sustainability involves assessing the likelihood that results of UNDP interventions will continue to be enjoyed by men and women in the long term and that gender issue mainstreamed therein will be sustained. Gender mainstreaming cuts across many sectors. It is therefore difficult to make an aggregated opinion of sustainability while at the same time being objective. However, some of the short-term results that UNDP has contributed to may be sustained over time, but UNDP has not planned for or systematically addressed sustainability in its work.**

Sustainability refers to the likelihood that achievements relevant to GEWE will be sustained after the funding period, including ownership by beneficiaries, the extent to which their strategic needs have been met through the project and the extent to which capacity has been built to sustain the impact of the project. Key informants interviewed saw sustainability as a long term plan and not possible in the short term where institutions are still being built and institutional capacity is widely lacking.

Some of the approaches used by UNDP have potential for sustainability. At the level of results, there is evidence that citizens are taking own initiative and demanding their rights which can be sustained even when funding ceases. The approach of mainstreaming gender in national frameworks and strategies strengthens possibility of sustainability. The empowerment of women farmers through private sector initiative is likely to be sustained through viable co-operative societies.

The evaluation notes that over the period, 2012 to 2014, there has been progress for an enabling environment for possible real change for GEWE in the country. There is seriousness on the part of GoM to advance GEWE such as reporting on international GEWE obligations (CEDAW; follow up of Beijing+20; MDG3; SADC protocol on GEWE). There is willingness to implement gender mainstreaming in programmes across sectors. There is the establishment of Institutions to coordinate and monitor GEWE- MoGCDSW.

Most of the gender equality interventions and results are aligned to national priorities and strategies of the Government, therefore, it can be reasonably assumed that they should be sustained in the long term. Many of the UNDP projects include support in the development of specific sector policies and strategies, which will be implemented for the long term, assuming that the Government does not change its policies and capacity to implement is in place.

# **4.0 Conclusions**

**Conclusion 1:** **Strategic positioning** -The CO has committed itself to the promotion of gender mainstreaming by implementing a corporate gender equality strategy (GES) but not in a systematic manner due to absence of a CO Gender Strategy or Gender Action Plan. It has not fully translated GES locally to create internal mechanisms that support gender mainstreaming. Mechanisms are in place in form of gender focal point at the level of Assistant Resident Representative but this is not robust enough to ensure compliance and meaningful integration of gender perspective into cluster areas and programmes. Commitments by all programme staff in necessary to ensure compliance. Capacity and skills for gender mainstreaming remains inadequate.

**Conclusion 2: Relevance** - UNDP’s initiatives on GEWE have been relevant to the broad objectives and priorities outlined in national and regional commitments. The agency’s work has, for the most part, responded to identified needs at the country and local levels, and has been relevant to UNDP’s corporate goal of advancing gender equality. The UNDP engaged in strategic partnerships with relevant stakeholders based on their mandates and, to contribute to changes on gender equality. The evaluator established that UNDP did not have a specific gender equality partnership plan as part of its overall gender equality strategy. However, the nature of strategic partnerships that UNDP has engaged with varies and was useful in driving results

**Conclusion 3:** **Integration of gender-** Evaluation findings suggest that CO sought to mainstream gender in its CP through a stand-alone outcome which was very strategic to address special interventions for creating fundamental structural changes in institutions, policies and legislation. However, CO’s efforts are not uniform in strength across the other outcomes. Projects and programmes contributing to various outcomes depict un-even level with a majority projects ad hoc and after thought in mainstreaming gender. Hence, gender equality has not been fully integrated into UNDP CO programmatic priorities. The review finds that gender mainstreaming in projects and programmes is weak because many projects and programmes have gender none-responsive outcomes and outputs and AWP hardly feature gender aspects in activities’ planning and implementation. Even where projects and programmes have been informed by gender assessment/analysis the information has not been translated into gender responsive programming.

**Conclusion 4: Monitoring and Reporting**. UNDP projects are unable to demonstrate their contribution to promoting gender equality mainly due to inability to effectively link up studies and assessments to improvements in project implementation, lack of substantive gender considerations in the project design and implementation, lack of sex-disaggregated and gender-specific information in monitoring and reporting. It was difficult to find systematic monitoring of gender mainstreaming results, except at the level of Annual Reports for a few projects and programmes and missing in others mainly because there were no specific activities, outputs related to gender and performance indicators in the AWP. UNDP CO will have difficulty in reporting on gender as long as it does not cover gender-specific issues or systematically use sex-disaggregated data or gender assessments and analysis to inform its programming.

**Conclusion 5: Partnerships.** UNDP has consistently worked with government and the UN partners to deliver as one for gender equality. However in some cases it was faced with duplication of efforts. The results of the collaborative efforts with UN agencies are mainly positive in gender mainstreaming in SWAps and participation of women in political participation. UNDP engagement with the private sector is emerging as a potential area for strengthening women’s economic empowerment. UNDP‘s partnerships with the media and CSOs is absent. UNDP engagement with partners is mixed in strength and there is room for improvements. Partnership for leveraging resources, synergy and opportunities for integrated delivery and greater impact such as with UNCT to for a UNCT gender equality strategy and a strong UNGTWG; with bilateral donors for resource mobilization Inter-intra- project partnerships for sharing of information about the projects so as to avoid duplication of efforts but also share best practices and lessons learnt. Partnership for setting the normative standards and policy frameworks such as continued support to MoGCDSW. Partnerships for knowledge generation, communications and research such as with academia as potential to offer more services such as think tanks, undertake analysis and evaluations for GEWE. Partnerships for skills and capacity building- those that UNDP aims to influence directly such as potential to partner with mainstream, social and alternative media organizations, including as a vehicle to engage younger men and women in advancing gender equality. UNDP partnerships with NGOs/CSOs/Women’s organizations to advance GEWE is weak. There is hardly any contractual partnership.

**Conclusion 6: Strengthening Capacity of the Ministry of gende**r, UNDP support did influence the ongoing process of capacity development through technical assistance, skills training, advocacy, development of strategies but cannot control how effectively the Ministry used the contribution to become better in coordination and in monitoring, hence the Ministry remains weak due to among others, leadership and decision making challenges. Despite great effort to increase number of women in parliament, the results achieved were not only below the minimum 50:50 representation but unfortunately regressive when compared to past performance due to a number of factors including entrenched cultural practices.

**Conclusion 7**: **Resource allocation**- Although actual expenditures on gender mainstreaming are not available, the ad hoc level of integration of gender in projects and programmes shows a mis-match compared to the level of resources allocated through the gender marker for the period 2012-2014. With the allocations, CO should have performed much better in terms of concrete outputs.

**Conclusion 8:** While piece meal elements of sustainability exists in the projects, the issue of exit strategy must be discussed within the context of UNDP partnerships which is largely with the Government for delivery of its programmes and donor withholding funds from the Government. The fragility of the context and need for long term interventions to realize development results where institutions are still being built and institutional capacity is widely inadequate is a challenge for sustainability.

# **5.0 Lessons Learned**

Although lessons can be learned from all the findings in the report, a few lessons are highlighted in this section.

**Internal Institutional Mechanisms**

The UNDP needs to strongly communicate its comparative advantage on GEWE not just listing of its mandate but a realistic assessment of expertise and value added relative to the country context so that partners and other UN are clear on UNDP ‘brand name on GEWE.’

**Partnerships**

The notion of national ownership should not be seen only from the perspective of the partnership with Government. The UNDP CO should also broaden strategic partnerships with other national stakeholders, including civil society in order to ensure sustainability of programme processes and results.

**Systematic approach to gender mainstreaming**

When the outcome, outputs and indicators are gender sensitive, there is a strong likelihood that gender transformative results will be achieved. All other factors such as capacity building, enabling environment and resources are also to be taken into account. This was the case for outcome 29 and outcome 31.

Although there are cases where outcomes and outputs were not formulated in a gender responsive manner, disaggregated gender results did emerge implying that even when the design of projects is weak from a gender lens, there is a possibility to turn things around at the implementation and reporting level.

This was the case with some project: Private Sector, Malawi Human Rights Support Project. Malawi Electoral Cycle Support Project, Private Public Sector Partnership for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project in the Shire River Basin. However, gender mainstreaming should not be an afterthought but must be addressed at formulation stages and all other stages of programming cycle and carefully monitored for systematic results.

**Financial allocation vs results**

Allocation of resources through the gender marker is not always commensurate with gender sensitive results. Tracking of expenditures need to be ensured to have a true picture of results achieved. Programme staff should be provided with guidelines that help them assess results of mainstreaming beyond just allocation of expenditures by gender marker. Allocation of expenditures is not commensurate with results achieved. The guideline will show progress towards, partially mainstreamed; fully mainstreamed- indicating that women and men experience equal conditions for realizing their full human potential, have the opportunity to participate, contribute to, and benefit equally from the project.

**Linkages of CP outcomes to UNDAF outcomes.**

All CP outcomes were linked to contribute to UNDAF Outcomes. The lesson learned is that poor performance or good performance at agency level determines its effective contribution to UN achievement at UNDAF outcomes level. The evaluation of gender mainstreaming in outcomes at UNDAF level, confirms this.

# **6.0 Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1: Strengthen the internal institutional set-up for gender mainstreaming**.

The following actions need to be taken:

1. Develop a CO Gender Mainstreaming strategy or Action Plan with strategic steps to replace the current ad hoc approach of mainstreaming gender.
2. Internally within UNDP CO, mainstreaming approach needs to be “everybody’s business”, including the senior management and operational staff.
3. Constitute an intra gender team of focal points from each cluster and operations, under the leadership of the DRR Programme or DRR Operations that promotes knowledge of gender mainstreaming and gender support to their respective programmes and tracks results. The Terms of Reference for the team to be developed and participating staff members be rewarded appropriately in the performance management development tool.
4. Each cluster/programme needs to assume the full responsibility for integrating relevant gender issues into their work effectively using their own resources. Thus they would need to build in the cost of on-going technical assistance related to gender into their programmes.
5. Strengthen linkages across projects and programmes for cohesive gender results and cross programme learning.
6. Comparative strength- In addition to mainstreaming across all outcomes, projects and programmes, UNDP CO needs to focus on niche areas within the broad gen­der agenda. This is necessary to enable UNDP communicate its comparative advantage to the country in a consistent and systematic manner. This could be women’s economic empowerment, or women’s participation in leadership and decision making or gender and Governance including institutional capacity strengthening for GEWE. The relative spread of UNDP initiatives is positive to respond to diverse priority areas by the country but it makes it difficult to identify UNDP’s comparative niche for GEWE. A niche area would allow the UNDP to optimize available resources and thus create a greater impact in the longer run.
7. UNDP CO should adopt and implement the recommendations from the Gender Seal Self-Assessment Report in order for it to improve its performance in gender mainstreaming in its programming and operations.

**Recommendation 2:** The UNDP approach of stand-alone outcome and integration in all other outcomes was a right choice as greater results emerged through stand-alone outcome. However, UNDP should consider a multi-track approach to gender mainstreaming that allows for targeted interventions on specific priority areas. While at UNDAF level the UN agencies have taken the multi-track approach of gender mainstreaming, UNDP as guided by its corporate GES seems to focus only on integrating gender in outcomes and programmes and not so much on specific targeted approach which adds value to comprehensive gender mainstreaming. UNDP CO should consider both approaches. Within integration of specific targeted gender/women/girls/men’s priorities, the CO and partners should make specific gender interventions a strategic option rather than a default choice based on analysis of inequalities and barrier and the need to bridge the gap and identify upfront which areas will require special targeted intervention. The choice needs clear options appraisal; analysis of the state of gender programming nationally; capacity analysis; and the consideration of other potential modalities.[[55]](#footnote-55)

**Recommendation 3: The UNDP CO should plan for regular capacity building for staff on gender mainstreaming, analysis and capturing gender results.**

CO should strengthen gender mainstreaming capacity of programme staff to enable the CO and programme staff to develop a consistent and systematic approach to gender mainstreaming in the programmes and projects. Invest in capacity building for programme staff and counterparts for gender mainstreaming. Interviews with some staff members reveal the gap in ‘**how to’ of gender mainstreaming**, therefore, training should move to the level of “how to” such as gender mainstreaming in climate change, gender mainstreaming in private sector, gender mainstreaming in employment and others to be identified and linked to the planned outcomes. UNDP has to enhance its staff training on the gender equality aspects of the substantive areas of the organization’s work, shifting from generic gender analysis training to targeted training in specialized technical areas. Focus on shifting from ensuring that gender is only in documents, including project documents to understanding how gender relations affect the implementation of development programmes. Train staff on results based management from gender perspective to enhance programme planning and monitoring and reporting.

UNDP CO should provide quick gender analysis or diagnosis at the design of outcome areas to inform gender sensitive outcomes, outputs and relevant indicators so that meaningful mainstreaming takes place “where the river is flowing’. Instead of developing new tools, the UNDP CO should make good use of its existing tools as well as other agency tools, for example, UNEP tools on gender and environmental managemnt. In addition all UN staff should complete the online course (see link at [www.unicef.org/](http://www.unicef.org/) or <https://trainingcentre.unwomen.org/course/index.php?categoryid=1>. The course is relevant in understanding UN partnerships and coherence for delivering as one.

**Recommendation 4: UNDP should allocate sufficient funding for capacity building and staff training on gender mainstreaming so that concrete results are achieved**. In line with corporate GES, It is recommended that at least 10 per cent of the learning budgets of the CO be earmarked for gender related learning activities.

**Recommendation 5:** Develop a partnership strategy for GEWE or integrate this in the overall Office partnership Strategy. Strengthen partnerships with diverse actors based on UNDPs comparative strength and partners strengths and mandate, for example, partnerships with donors to leverage resources for GEWE, partnerships with the UNCT for delivering as one but in particular, UNDP should work with UNCT to develop a UNCT gender equality strategy and to ensure a strong UN-GTWG; partnerships with CSOs beyond just contractual partners. UNDP should deepen its partnership with mainstream; social and alternative media organizations, including as a vehicle to engage younger men and women in advancing gender equality.

**Recommendation 6: UNDP should strengthen gender mainstreaming in programmes/projects by: improving gender responsiveness in project design and implementation**. The incorporation of a gender perspective does not necessarily mean that gender specific measures should be incorporated into the design where they are not relevant. It simply means that projects and programmes should be designed with a gender lens using gender analysis.

The following actions need to be taken:

1. Take action and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment are addressed comprehensively throughout UNDP’s project life cycle through a set of well-defined-thematic checklists and guidelines and sex disaggregated data where possible and building programme staff member‘s capacity to undertake gender analysis
2. Take action and ensure that programme documents incorporate gender-responsive outcome indicators and at least one output and output indicators. Focus on shifting more effectively from a focus on women, as beneficiaries or target populations, to approaches that promote gender equality.
3. Take action and ensure that programme Appraisal process includes mandatory gender screening and benchmarking against programming guidelines. Institute a check off system for integrating gender before sign-off of programme/project documents. The intra focal team to develop an outline of the different steps and actions required to mainstream gender at the programme level and what the expected outcomes of this process are.
4. Track expenditures for funds allocated under the gender marker to ensure it is commensurate with gender results achieved.
5. Take action to ensure that relevant tools for gender mainstreaming are available for use by staff. This can be requested through staff participation in UNDP knowledge networks such as the gendernet.
6. Ensure regular monitoring of and reporting on progress of gender mainstreaming using sex-disaggregated data or capturing of stories of change. This will include building on training from Results based management to identify key gender specific indicators for each programme or project in relation to the gender-related results identified.
7. Develop a partnership strategy for GEWE or integrate this in the overall Office partnership Strategy. Strengthen partnerships with diverse actors based on their strengths and mandate, for example, partnerships with CSOs beyond just contractual partners, UNDP should deepen its partnership with mainstream; social and alternative media organizations, including as a vehicle to engage younger men and women in advancing gender equality.

**Recommendation 7**: For the short term results to be sustained over time, UNDP will need to plan for and systematically address sustainability in its work.

## **Annex 1: Terms of Reference**

For Joint Gender Mid-term Evaluation of UNDAF 2012-2016

***UNDP Contribution Evaluation Component***

1. **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

1.1 **Gender Challenges and UN Response**

Four MDGs that are unlikely to be met are deeply related to gender issues (MDG 1, MDG 2, MDG 3 and MDG 5). The Gender Index indicates that women’s economic and political power in the country is weak, with disparities relative to men being particularly noticeable in agricultural household enterprises; in paid employment, and in senior positions across all sectors of life (2012-2014 Undaf, p.xxx).The 2013/2014 global Human Development Report (HDR) further confirms the state of Gender in Malawi reflecting that the high Malawi records high Gender Inequality Index (GII) that has a negative impact on the already gained development achievements.

Progress on gender equality and women’s empowerment has been adversely affected by inadequate and weak gender structures and systems in the country to drive gender equality at policy level. The capacity of the Ministry of Gender, Children Disability and Social Welfare to support a coordinated national response has been weak leading to uncoordinated, ineffective and fragmented projects and programmes. In fact the national gender machinery under the leadership of the MoCDSW, has remained weak. Gender mainstreaming has also been weak despite gender being a cross-cutting issue in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II and the UNDAF II.

In order to effectively support efforts towards gender mainstreaming, the 2012-2016 United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) identified gender equality as a cross cutting issues to ensure it is mainstreamed and institutionalization within all the clusters and outcome areas given its relevance at national level.

At the same time it positioned it as a key result are and specifically prioritized assistance to institutionalization and capacity development of the National Gender Machinery through the Gender and Youth SWG, to strengthen the gender machinery and to promote the advancement and socio-economic empowerment of women and gender equality through advocacy, resource mobilization, policy influence and coordination of implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the national gender agenda.

The intended UNDAF gender outcome is ***National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016, Outcome 4.3.*** The Outcome is one of the 14 UNDAF Outcomes of the 2012-2016 UNDAF.

The UNDAF outputs for this outcome are the following:

**Output 4.3.1:** Gender mainstreamed in 7 SWAps;

**Output 4.3.2:** Ministry of Gender and selected sectors have the capacity to plan, coordinate, monitor and evaluate the National Gender Programme;

**Output 4.3.3:** 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;

**Output 4.3.4** Gender related laws revised and a functional implementation framework in place to address GBV.

In the context of Delivering As One UNDP adopted the UNDAF Outcome 4.3 as of its five outcomes for its Country Programme (2012-2016), MWI\_Outcome31. Only UNDP proceeded in this manner as all other UN Agencies maintained different outcomes but with efforts to contribute achievement of UNDAF Outcome 4.3.

In preparation for the new UNDP Country Programme 2017-2021 the UN is carrying out an evaluation of current CPD outcomes.

The UN is therefore searching for a consultant to undertake a specific gender evaluation its contribution to the CPD MWI\_Outcome31 which is also UNDAF Outcome 4.3.

1. **PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

 **The purpose of the evaluation is to**:

* Assess the contribution made by and , UNDP, to strengthen national gender machinery, and women empowerment as envisaged under outcome 4.3 of the UNDAF;
* Assess the extent of gender mainstreaming in the UNDP Country Programme;
* Inform the 2017-2021 Country Programming process;
* Document lessons learnt in mainstreaming gender at the programme level.

**Specific objectives of the evaluation are**:

1. Determine the extent to which the planned outcome 4.3 and related outputs have been achieved or are being achieved and the likelihood of being achieved by the end of 2016.
2. Assess the contribution of UNDP to the achievement of outcome 4.3 so far.
3. Assess the extent to which gender has been mainstreamed in the UNDP country programme and related projects
4. Assess the adequacy or inadequacy of UNDP partnership strategy for the achievement of the outcome and gender mainstreaming across the CPD;
5. Examine and analyse factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome and gender mainstreaming by , by UNDP both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including: weakness in design, management, human resource skills and resources;
6. Explore strategic values and comparative advantage of the UNDP in contributing to the outcome and advancement of the gender agenda in Malawi
7. Document lessons learnt from the implementation of the interventions.
8. Make recommendations for the UNDP for improving the achievement of its gender equality and women socio-economic empowerment and sustainability;; partnership arrangements, mainstreaming of gender across the CPD and resource mobilization strategies.

**Evaluation scope:**

* The evaluation will cover the period from January 2012 to December, 2014. Geographically, the evaluation is national in nature although there are also district interventions, which the consultant may visit whenever it will be necessary. The exercise will include a review of the UNDAF annual work plans and annual reports, UNDP level project/programme documents, work plans and related progress and evaluation reports.
1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS**:

In order to fulfill the purpose and specific objectives stated above, the evaluation shall address the following five specific questions:

1. What progress has been made towards achieving Outcome 4.3 and its outputs
2. Whether the level of financial resources made available by UNDP was sufficient for successful implementation of outcome 4.3 vis-a-vis the planned resource envelope with regards to gender equality.
3. What progress has been made so far towards the integration of gender equality in the UNDP CPD, programmes and whether the gender aspects cross the CPD will be met by December, 2016
4. To what extent has UNDP contributed to the achievement of Outcome 4.3 and outputs?
5. What are the main factors (positive and negative) that contributed to the achievement of the outcomes? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome and integration of gender within those?
6. Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
7. What factors contributed to effectiveness and ineffectiveness?

**Evaluation Criteria:** The evaluation of performance of the UNCT and the participating UN agencies individually in the outcome and outputs will be made using the standard criteria: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact and sustainability. Below are detailed questions related to each criterion to be addressed by the evaluator.

Relevance and design:

* To what extent is UNDP engaged in promoting the national gender machinery?
* To what extent has UNDP selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context?
* To what extent has UNDP mainstreamed gender across the components and outcomes of the CPD and outputs?
* Is gender equality taken on board as a real cross cutting issues across all outcome areas?

Effectiveness

* What evidence is there that UNDP’s, support has contributed towards advancement of gender equality and the status of women and the strengthening of the national gender machinery through Outcome 4.3?
* To what extent has progress been made towards achieving the outputs and key results under Outcome 4.3?
* Has UNDP worked effectively with other international (yet to be determined) and national delivery partners to improve gender equality and the socio-economic empowerment of women?
* How effective has UNDP been in partnership with civil society and the private sector to promote gender equality and women empowerment in Malawi?
* Has UNDP utilised innovative techniques and best practices in its programming on gender issues?
* Is UNDP perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for gender equality and women empowerment in Malawi?
* What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP performance in this area?

Efficiency

* Have UNDP strategies and execution of the outcome been efficient and cost effective?
* Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources?
* Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNDP has in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively?

Sustainability

* What is the likelihood that the interventions are sustainable?
* What mechanisms have been put in place by UNDP, to sustain improvements made through these interventions?
* What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships and strategies in order to promote long term sustainability?
* What could be done to strengthen sustainability?
* Are there resource mobilization strategies at UNDP for outcome 4.3?
* What specific efforts were made on resource mobilization by UNDP for mainstreaming gender equality under Outcome 4.3 ensuring its implementation and accountability?
1. **DELIVERABLES**
* **Inception report** by 17 March, 2015. The report will include a detailed approach and methodology, schedule, a draft data collection protocols and an evaluation matrix. Annex 5 gives a template of the evaluation matrix. The work plan should also include an outline of the evaluation report. The report will have two main parts: one on assessment of gender mainstreaming across the UNDAF outcomes and the other on Outcome 4.3 collective and individual contributions for the UNDP/4 UN agencies.
* **Key emerging issues paper** – by 23 April a presentation of preliminary findings to key stakeholders orally and in writing will be made after the data collection exercise with three weeks after presentation of the inception report. The purpose of this session is to provide opportunity for initial validation and elaboration of the evaluator’s observations and analysis.
* **Draft evaluation reports** – 1) The Evaluator will present a Draft Report by 27 May covering inputs for the UNDAF Evaluation Report; and 2) by 10 June a draft report including a separate section on UNDP Evaluation elements.
* **Final Evaluation Report**. The evaluators will present a Final Report 5 days after receiving feedback and comments from Reference Group and UN Gender TWG. The review shall include a separate UNDP section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Annex 2: List of People Met |
|  | Institution | People Met |
| 1 | GOVERNMENT |  |
|  | Office of the President & Cabinet - Social Cohesion Project | Mr. Wezi Kayira, Principal Secretary, Good GovernanceMr. Ernest Kantchentche, Clerk to the cabinetMr. Samson Ngutwa Deputy Clerk to the Cabinet |
|  | Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development (ASWAp) | Mr. Nelson Mataka, ASWAp coordinatorMs. Frieda Kayuni, Deputy Director (AGRESS)Mr. 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 EducationMs Joyce Milner, Girl’s educationMr. Job Mwamlima, Budget Officer |
|  | Ministry of Finance Economic Planning & Development (DEAP project) | Mr. Yona Kamphale, Principal Secretary for Economic Planning and DevelopmentMr. Jimmy Kawaye Program Manager, DEAP Mr. Sipho Billiat, Principal EconomistMs. Magdalena Kouneva, Development Effectiveness and Accountability AdvisorMr. Levi Chirwa, Assistant Director, Budget DivisionMs. Tithokore Samuel, Budget Division |
|  | Ministry of Gender Children Disability and Social Welfare | Dr. Mary Shawa - Principal SecretaryMr. Peter Msefula - Director for Gender Mr. Massimo Sichinga - SWG Secretariat for Gender Youth and Sports  |
|  | Ministry of Health (HSWAp) | Dr. Charles Mwansambo, Chief of Health ServicesMs. Fannie Kachale, Director of Reproductive Health  |
|  | Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs | Mr. Thombozi |
|  | Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development | Mr. Darwin Benson Pangani, Chief Local Government Officer |
|  | Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development | Mr. Walusungu Kayire, Chief Economist |
|  | Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure | Ms. Doreen Kamwenda - Gender Focal Point |
|  | Ministry Trade and Industry (TIPSWAp) | Mr. Joy Hara, TIPSWAp coordinator |
|  | Women Parliamentary Caucus | Hon, Jessie Kabwila - Chairperson of Women Parliamentary Caucus  |
|  | Malawi Law Commission | Mr. William Msiska – Chief Law Reform Officer |
|  | National AIDs Commission | Mr. Mahara Longwe, Partnership & Liason OfficerEllious Beneth Chasukwa, Acting Head of policy Support and DevelopmentJames Njobvuyalema, HIV Policy Officer |
| 2. | UNITED NATIONS |  |
|  | Resident Coordinators Office | Mia Seppo, UN Resident Coordinator/ UNDP Resident Representative and Cluster Convener (Cluster 4) |
|  | UNDP | Ms. Carol Flore, Carol Flore-Smereczniak, Deputy Resident Representative (Programme)  |
|  | Private Sector Programme | Cinzia Tecce, Private Sector Development Specialist |
|  | Monitoring and Evaluation  | Mr. Peter Kulemeka, Peter Kulemeka, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist |
|  | Democratic Governance Cluster | Ennettie Mbuka, Programme Analyst - GovernanceTerenceCharles,Judith,David Kayuni, Programme Analyst – Human Rights |
|  |  | Etta Mmangisa, Programme Analyst & Environment  |
|  |  | Clemence Alfazema, Programme Analyst, Governance Terence Malamulo, Programme Analyst – DG SWAp |
|  | Capacity Development Cluster | Mr. Ernest Misomali, Capacity Development Cluster Mr. Kenge Nkosi, Capacity Development Cluster |
|  |  | Ms. Agnes Chimbiri, Inclusive Growth Cluster  |
|  | Peace | Rebecca Adda,-Dontoh, Peace AdvisorPatrick Kamwendo, Senior Economist |
|  | UNFPA | Ms. Violet Kakyoma, UNFPA Representative (Outcome 4.3 participant, GTWG)Rogaia Abdelrahim, Deputy RepresentativeDorothy Nyasulu, Assistant Representative  |
|  | UNICEF | Ms. Clara Chindime, Gender Focal Point/Girls Education, |
|  | UN Women | Alice Harding Shackelford, UN Women Representative, UN GTWG and UNCG chairEmma Gausi, M&E OfficerGiulia Pelosi, Advocacy Lily Mwandira, Programme AssistantPamela Mkwamba, National Programme Officer  |
| 3 | DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS |  |
|  | DFID | Philip Smith |
|  | JICA | Godfrey Kapalamula |
|  | AFDB  | Peter Mwanakatwe |
|  | European Union (EU) | Tom Schrieber- Program Manager (Governance) |
|  | Embassy of Ireland | Aidan Fitzpatrick |
| 4 | CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION/NGOS |  |
|  | Action Aid | Blessings Botha Chikondi Chavbuta Julie JumaDalitso KuphangaKen Matekenya |
|  | Adolescent Girls' Literacy Project (AGLP) | Hazel Manda |
|  | Blantyre Synod Health & Development Commission  | Lindirate Gareta |
|  | Church and Society Programme of the Livingstonia Synod | Limbani Gondwe  |
|  | 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 |
|  | Girls Empowerment Network – MALAWI (GENET) | Faith Phiri |
|  | Hygiene Village Project | Yvonne Beauty Kasekera |
|  | Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI)  | Wezi Moyo |
|  | Malawi Law Society (MLS)  | Khumbo Bonzoe Soko |
|  | Malawi Health Equity Network (MHEN) | Martha Kwataine/RoseMary |
|  | Malawi Human Rights Resource Centre | Emma Kaliya |
|  | Malawi Human Rights Commission | Mr. Michael Kakatera – Director of Gender at MHRC offices |
|  | Nkhadze Alive Youth Org | Charles Sineta |
|  | NGO Gender Coordination Network | Mrs. Kaliya, Chairperson |
|  | 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 |
|  | Women’s Legal Resources Center (WORLEC) | Maggie Banda/Gift/Loma  |
| 5 | ACADEMIA |  |
|  | Directorate of Gender Affairs, Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources | Orpah Kabambe - Directorate of Gender AffairsJessica Kampanje-Phiri |
|  |  |  |
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## **Annex 4: Interview Protocol**

|  |
| --- |
| ASSESSMENT OF GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT RESULTS |
| This form will be used to document key observations and conclusions from each semi-structured interview with Outcome 4.3/UNDP Outcome 31 stakeholders  |
| Institution | Department/unit | Name of Interviewees/Position |
| Date:  | Time:  | Location:  |
| Relevant UNDAF Outcome 4.3/UNDP Outcome31 |  |
| Relevant output/Project |  |

Introductions

Objectives of the evaluation

Ethical issues: confidentiality and cultural sensitivity

1. RELEVANCE

* 1. Do you have examples of how any change in political, economic, cultural environment in the last 4 years supported or hindered advancement of gender equality and women’s empowerment in Malawi?
	2. How are gender equality issues given increased or decreased importance within the country and within the UNCT in the past and any change at the moment?
	3. Was the intervention you relate to informed by underlying causes and barriers to gender equality?

**2. EFFECTIVENESS**

2.1. What have been the key results achieved in each of the outputs. What specific contribution was provided by each of the UN agencies (e.g. UNFPA, UN Women, UNICEF, UN FAO, UNDP and UNAIDS?

*Examples areas: Changes in policies, legislation; SWAPs, capacities, systems at organization level; - New knowledge, practices, strategies; advocacy/communication for GEWE, political parties responsiveness to GEWE, women holding senior positions in the Civil Service (data), women Parliamentarians; strategies to increase women representation in decision making positions; individual capacity, financial resources to the Ministry by donor 2012, 2013, 2014, gender statistics).*

2.2. How did the sectors you work with mainstream gender? What capacities were built? What expertise was available or lacking for effective mainstreaming? What is the evidence of mainstreaming? (Health, Education, Agriculture sectors, Gender and Youth, Governance, Industry and Trade and Integrated Rural Development, Democratic governance SWAps).

2.3. What are the main factors (positive and negative) that contributed to success or hindered success?

2.4. What are the strategic areas where rapid results is difficult to be achieved through gender mainstreaming and would require targeted approach?

2.5. Does the intervention results contribute to changing attitudes and behaviors towards gender equality and reducing the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination?

2.6. Did the intervention contribute to the empowerment of women to claim their rights, examples?

1. **EFFICIENCY**

3.1. Was the level of financial resources made available by different UN Agencies sufficient for successful gender mainstreaming in the sectors/institution/programme? What were the other sources of financing gender mainstreaming in your outcome/programme?

3.2. Did the seven SWAps have clear budget lines for gender mainstreaming?

3.3. Was the use of intervention resources for gender mainstreaming in line with the corresponding results achieved? (e.g. too much on workshops and salaries compared to changes in life conditions

3.5. What Monitoring mechanism have been put in place to track and document gender mainstreaming results in your institution?

3.6. Were roles, responsibilities and accountability for gender mainstreaming in your institution/agency/outcome clearly clarified? How many gender experts/focal points are in your institution?

3.7. What were the weakness and strengths in design, management, human resource skills and resources for gender mainstreaming within the UNDAF/or your programme?

1. SUSTAINABILITY

4.1. How can the gains in GEWE be sustained? What are the supporting and impeding factors?

4.2. Is there an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on GEWE in the country?

1. ASSESSMENT OF UNCT STRATEGIC POSITIONING FOR GEWE
	1. Do you feel that UN Agencies are working together in support of gender mainstreaming? In what aspects? (E.g. Planning, M&E, advocacy?
	2. How useful and appropriate were the UNCT’s selected tools, methods, approaches for gender mainstreaming?
	3. Are there alternative tools, approaches, strategies UNCT could have used to be more effective in gender mainstreaming?
	4. What is UNDP’s/other UN agency comparative strengths for GEWE? Are there other areas where UNDP or other UN agency can do better?

5.7. Has UNCT provided adequate technical capacity for gender mainstreaming? How did change occur beyond training? Which tools, systems, practices have been improved?

1. **Lessons Learned:** What are the lessons learnt from the implementation of the interventions?

**7.1 Recommendations:** What can be done better going forward? What are the opportunities to be exploited?

|  |
| --- |
| Annex 5: Gender Mainstreaming by Gender Marker Rating 2012 and 2014 |
|  | Gender Marker Rating | Outcome 26: Total Number of projects | Outcome 26: Total Expenditures ($) | Outcome 27: Total Number of projects | Outcome 27: Total Expenditures ($) | Outcome : 28: Total Number of projects | Outcome 28: Total Expenditures ($) | Outcome 29: Total Number of projects | Outcome 29: Total Expenditures ($) | Outcome 30: Total Number of projects | Outcome 30: Total Expenditures ($) | Outcome 31: Total Number of projects | Outcome 31: Total Expenditures ($) |
| 2012 | GEN 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 61,390 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| GEN 1 | 1 | 99,371 | 6 | 1,176,445 | 2 | 615,205 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 642,853 | 0 | 0 |
| GEN 2 | 2 | 417,983 | 3 | 2,274,347 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3,230,366 | 4 | 3,959,372 | 0 | 0 |
| GEN 3 | 1 | 56,701 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 880,018 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 538,662 |
| 2014 | GEN 0 | 4 | 1,049,738  | 1 | 69,843   | 0 | 0 | 3 | 199,948   | 6 | 3,390,563   | 0 | 0 |
| GEN 1 | 3 | 426,319   | 17 | 2,868,174  | 2 | 463,382   | 10 | 10,531,556 | 6 | 1,331,988   | 0 | 0 |
| GEN 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 799,871   | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2,773,16   | 5 | 422,058   | 0 | 0 |
|  | GEN 3 | 1 | 5 (how possible?) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 617,027   | 0 | 0 | 6 | 688,247   |
| **Source: Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), 2012 & 2014** |  |  |  |  |

1. See Final Report, Evaluation of Outcome 4.3 and Gender Mainstreaming in UNDAF, June 2015, by Grace Okonji [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See Final Report, Evaluation of Outcome 4.3 and Gender Mainstreaming in UNDAF, June 2015, by Grace Okonji [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Section 24 of the constitution [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (2012-2016) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Government of Malawi and UNDP White Paper, Strengthening National Gender Machinery in Malawi (2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Gender Equality Act, 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The gender equality and women’s empowerment is aligned several articles in the international and regional treaties to advance women’s rights that Malawi has signed and ratified. These include the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against women (CEDAW), the SADC Gender Protocol, the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa (Maputo Protocol), and Beijing Platform for Action [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. GoM and UN, 2013, MDG acceleration framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. UNICEF, Generation 2030 Report, Africa, August, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Malawi MDG End Line Survey, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Marriage Divorce and Family Act (2015?) and Gender Equality Act (2013) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. GoM, Integrated Household Survey 3 (IHS3: 2012) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Government of Malawi, ‘the impact of Social Cultural Practices on Gender, GBV, HIV and AIDS’ 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. (UNFPA, Marrying too Young: End Child Marriage, 2012). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Cited in page 79, Malawi, Gender and HIV assessment, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. UNDP, Elections project, Annual Report, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. GoM, Beijing +20 review report [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Republic of Malawi, Revised, Gender Policy, February, 2008, page 20 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Malawi Demographic and Health Survey Report (2010) [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See Final Report, Evaluation of Outcome 4.3 and Gender Mainstreaming in UNDAF, June 2015, by Grace Okonji [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Corporate gender equality strategy, 2014-2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. See Evaluation of Malawi UNDAF, by Richard Olver, May 2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. UNDP, Corporate Gender Equality Strategy (2014-2017) [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. See Final Report, Evaluation of Outcome 4.3 and Gender Mainstreaming in UNDAF, June 2015, by Grace Okonji [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Scores range on a scale between GEN0 (not expected to contribute ‘noticeably’ to gender equality outcomes) and GEN3 (gender equality as a principal objective of the output) [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. There is no information on how many projects ended prior to 2014 so there might be double counting [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. UN System Wide Action Plan for implementation of Gender Equality, 2012 [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Adopted from 1997/2 resolution of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. The same Criteria has been applied for evaluation of gender mainstreaming in UNDAF evaluation – See Final Report, Evaluation of Outcome 4.3 and Gender Mainstreaming in UNDAF, June 2015, by Grace Okonji [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. UNDP ‘Private Sector Development Programme, Annual Report, 2014 and ROAR 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Meaning, unaware of gender concepts and the impact that they have on life experiences and outcomes for girls and boys, men and women. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. see Draft Trade, Industry & PSD Sector Wide Approach Joint Sector Plan, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. UNDP, Annual Report, 2015 Private Sector Development Programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. ROAR, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. ROAR, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. UNDP, Gender and climate change study, January 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. See Sustainable Energy Management Project Annual Work Plan, 2012, 2013, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Annual Report, 2014, Private Public Sector Partnership for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project in the Shire River Basin [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. ROAR, 2012 [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Ministry of Local Government and UNDP, report by Edith Mussukuya, ‘Gender Assessment of Rural Development Sector In Malawi’ [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. See “Integrated Rural Development Strategy, Final Report, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development 2012’ [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
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