

---

MID - TERM EVALUATION OF

UNDAF OUTCOME 1.2:

IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENT, NATURAL RESOURCES AND  
CLIMATE CHANGE FOR SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT AT NATIONAL AND DISTRICT  
LEVEL BY 2016 IN MALAWI

EVALUATION REPORT BY:

MARIA ONESTINI  
(INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR/TEAM LEADER)

DECEMBER 2015

---

Local Consultant: David Mkwambisi

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADB	African Development Bank
CC	Climate Change
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
ENR	Environment and Natural Resources
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MoAIWD	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development
MoFEPD	Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation
MoGCDSW	Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoLGRD	Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme

Abbreviations and Acronyms	2
Acknowledgements	5
Disclaimer	5
 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	 6
 2. INTRODUCTION: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	 13
 3. BACKGROUND: COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME DESCRIPTION	 17
 4. MAJOR FINDINGS	 24
Projects and Achievements within Outcome 1.2	24
Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability	27
Relevance	28
Effectiveness	29
Efficiency	31
Sustainability	32
GENDER	33
UNDAF AS A FRAMEWORK FOR OUTCOME 1.2 AND OUTCOME INDICATORS	36
Extent to which specific outputs and outcomes have been achieved or not achieved and whether or not specific outputs and outcome would be achieved by the end of 2016	38
Contribution and performance of UNDP	42
Mandates, Methods of Delivery and Coordination	44
BEST PRACTICES	46
 5. LESSONS LEARNT FROM BOTH POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES	 50
 6. CONSTRAINTS THAT IMPACTED COUNTRY PROGRAMME DELIVERY	 52
 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	 56
 10. ANNEXES	 64

*Table of Figures*

FIGURE 1: UNDAF CLUSTER 1	19
FIGURE 2: EXPECTED OUTPUTS FOR OUTCOME 1.2	20
FIGURE 3: UNDAF DIVISION OF LABOUR	22
FIGURE 4: OUTCOME 1.2 WITHIN MGDS II KEY PRIORITY AREAS	23
FIGURE 5: APPROXIMATE UNDAF EXPENDITURE FOR 2012 AND 2013 FOR OUTCOME 1.2 IN US DOLLARS	24
FIGURE 6: UNDAF BUDGET VS EXPENDITURE FOR OUTCOME 1.2 BY 2014	25
FIGURE 7: MALAWI ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE PROJECT FICHE	25
FIGURE 8: UN AGENCY EXPENDITURE BY OUTCOME 2014	26
FIGURE 10 INDICATORS FOR OUTPUTS WITHIN OUTCOME 1.2 AND THEIR ESTIMATED ACHIEVEMENT BY END OF 2016.	40
FIGURE 9: INDICATORS OUTCOME 1.2: TARGET ACHIEVEMENT - IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, NATURAL RESOURCES AND CLIMATE CHANGE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AT NATIONAL AND DISTRICT LEVEL BY 2016	41

### *ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS*

The international evaluation consultant would like to acknowledge and thank all who graciously shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews and consultations that took place as part of this process. In particular, the evaluator would like to thank Peter Kulemeka of UNDP for all of his support.

### *DISCLAIMER*

Be stated that the analysis and recommendations contained in this document only represent the analysis of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the United Nations Development Programme, nor of the UNCT.

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### *SUMMARY INTRODUCTION*

Environmental, climate change and disaster risk issues are intrinsically linked to Malawi's socio – economic development. Social welfare and economic development are dependent to a great degree on Malawi's natural resource base and vulnerable to climate change and risks impacts. Eighty percent of the Malawian population is directly dependent on agriculture for their incomes and for their livelihoods. This matter and population dynamics has resulted in advancing agricultural boundaries by clearing original vegetation cover for agriculture. This, in turn, has resulted in further natural resource and environmental issues such as soil and land degradation, and contributed to further socio – economic vulnerabilities such as GDP loss and harm to food security.

Climate change's negative impacts have further amplified the fragile relation between natural resources and society within Malawi. Given the increased intensity, unpredictable and frequent weather-related events associated to climate change, risks have increased. Recent (January 2015) floods have been devastating with resulting displacement of over 250000 people and 64000 hectares of land have been damaged due to flooding. Other natural disaster – based risks include landslides, heavy storms, and droughts.

The above are fundamentally linked to poverty issues that exacerbate Malawi's vulnerability. Food insecurity/nutritional issues, health problems, large poor rural populations, weak governance, population growth, and inequality are factors and issue that interact with natural resource management and risk management.

Malawi is the poorest nation in the world as measured by GDP per capita, which for the country is USD 226 in 2014. Evidently, poverty (as measured by different indicators) is high and extensive. Malawi's Human Development Index of 0.414 (as of 2013), places the country below the Sub-Saharan African average of 0.502. While other poverty measures indicate that 74 percent of the population lives below the poverty line.

Malawi is also one of the most densely populated countries in Africa with a population density estimated at 139 persons per km<sup>2</sup> and a growth rate of 2.8%. This implies that the nation is one of the fastest growing populations in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. Malawi is the least urbanized country in Africa. However, it has a 6% urbanization growth. This is one of the highest urbanization rates in the world.

As a Gini Coefficient of 41.5 demonstrates there are acute income inequalities. Inequalities are also expressed in other analysis. For instance, the gender inequality index for the country is 0.591 as measured by the Human Development Index, placing Malawi in the 131st place out of 187 countries assessed. This brief introductory information gives a general sense of the significance that Outcome 1.2 has and can have for Malawi.

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012 – 2016 for Malawi brings together participating UN Organizations within a single planning

document. The development of the UNDAF responds to the need to improve coherence within the UN system's programme of activities in Malawi and increase the resource availability to support development efforts in Malawi and allow enhanced access of Malawi to the specialized knowledge and expertise of both resident and non-resident agencies.

Within the framework, UN in Malawi, at the time of its inception, had decided to focus interventions in four thematic areas. Under these four key priorities there were seventeen UNDAF outcomes and 64 UNDAF outputs. Within these outcomes, is Outcome 1.2 (being evaluated here). UNDAF's Outcome 1.2 is aimed at working comprehensively on environment, natural resources and climate change issues within a sustainable development framework. It is noted that the aim is to improve these variables not only within a national context but also work at the district level.

In turn, UNDAF Outcome 1.2 consists of three Outputs, each output is instrumentalised by projects. Following are the three expected outputs:

- Output 1.2.1: Environment, natural resources and climate change mainstreamed in policies, development plans and budgets at national and district level.
- Output 1.2.2 Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environmental and natural resources degradation collected and made accessible to decision makers in Government, Private Sector and Civil Society.
- Output 1.2.3: Coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for CC and ENR established and used at national and district level.

In general, therefore, the Outcome aims to support the generation of policy and of regulatory frameworks dealing with natural resource management and climate change adaption, as well as to improve data and information on effective environment and natural resources, climate change and disaster risk management. The Lead Agency for Outcome 1.2 is UNDP. Although there are other agencies (resident and non – resident) that do also participate in the implementation of this outcome.

#### SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS OF THE MID TERM OUTCOME EVALUATION

Within expected Outcome 1.2 (*Improved Management of Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change for Sustainable Development at National and District Level by 2016 In Malawi*) several achievements and overall conclusions can be noted at the mid-term juncture. First of all, the achievements at this point closely relate to the issue of Outcome 1.2 *relevance* and significance to Malawi. Not only from the point of coincidence with expressed national priorities but also, and perhaps more importantly, due to country needs in the fields of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management.

The very key issues that the Outcome specifically deals with (climate change adaptation, natural resource and environmental management, as well as disaster risk

management) are imbedded specifically within UNDAF's Outcome 1.2. Other issues, such as agriculture and food security, energy, mining, health and sanitation, to a name a few priority areas for the country, are also matters that pertain, impact upon, or are related to natural resources, climate change and disasters. Country needs in the fields of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management are very significant in Malawi. Furthermore, this is where most of the opportunities related to this Outcome lie within future work, in the completion of UNDAF 2012 – 2016 as well as future UNDAFs. A great deal of opportunities is foreseeably present for basically two reasons: country needs and international environmental / climate change agenda. Most of the country needs for development lie in close association to natural resources due to direct reliance on them for livelihoods as well as the exacerbation of needs associated with the negative impact that climate change is having in Malawi.

Attained processes and outputs (whereby an examination takes place as to the extent to which an outcome has contributed to developmental change) regrettably, there is not a high degree of effectiveness evident as of yet from most of the outcome's interventions. That is, there is not a high degree of developmental changes associated to the outputs and processes that make – up the Outcome. Although, as mentioned, Malawi has a robust set of policies dealing with Outcome 1.2 issues, to a great degree owing to interventions, projects, and support by UNCT, and particularly due to UNDP-supported projects and programs in this area, there is also an enormous gap in the implementation of this policy framework. This evidently hinders effectiveness. Therefore, the effect pursued (i.e. Improved Management of Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change for Sustainable Development at National and District Level by 2016) is not occurring as effectively as could be expected due, primarily, to the gap in implementation of regulatory frameworks arrived at with UN support. The UN, and in particular UNDP as a lead agency within this Outcome, has sustained several processes related to policy frameworks to deal with environment and natural resources, climate change adaptation as well as disaster risk managements. Reviews of policies, development of planning frameworks regarding the abovementioned issues, development of plans (national and at district levels) were supported. The generation and information and knowledge management products and platforms were also supported.

Projects also have had tangible achievements of a more applied nature. For instance, sustainable land management practices implemented through a UNDP implemented and GEF funded project have led to better management of natural resources and improving livelihood in targeted areas. Furthermore, it has aided in diminishing effects of floods in areas which are vulnerable to climate change impacts. Other new processes and projects are evolving with noticeable opportunities to have impact, promote effects and generate coordination. The Joint Resilience Project led by FAO is a key opportunity to confront risk and promote socially – centred sustainable development in an integrated manner with a long – term resiliency horizon. It is also an opportunity to work collaboratively within the UNCT among different agencies, increasing effectiveness, efficiency while avoiding duplication. In general, the Outcome has concentrated on promoting products at the



policy level, nationally and to a certain degree at the districts level within this Outcome. However, the supported policy framework (such as policy reviews, policy analysis and promotion) still requires approval to some degree. Nevertheless, the largest issue presented with this approach is that there is a critical gap between the development of policy-level frameworks and their implementation. The implementation gap is critical in Malawi and poses governance issues. This gap is manifested also by national weak ownership of these products; lack of appropriate budgeting by national government to implement products originating out of UN supported projects and programmes, and the incapability of government to retain personnel that has been trained within these projects and programmes. This is crucial in understanding the weak institutional capacity of Malawi to form and implement adequate governance mechanisms for ENR, CC and DRM. It is, therefore, not sufficient for the UN just to support the tools that make up environmental governability but to work deeply on what the country could and should do to enhance environmental governance.

The downstream interventions that the UN has supported have resulted, in many cases, in important developments, improvements in livelihoods, reduced risk, and community – based adaptation to climate change. However, there are (as with many of these localized interventions) issues due to their rather limited influence. In order to enhance these successes and effects, special care and attention should be paid to upscaling, having a catalytic effect and improving impact by connecting the downstream best practices with upstream work. The considerable concentrated focus that UNDP as lead agency of Outcome 1.2 has on mainstreaming ENR, CC and DRM policies (mostly at the national level) has had a low impact on what the Outcome expects to achieve: i.e. improved management as a factor of improving human sustainable development in Malawi.

Moreover, the Outcome is more than the sum of its parts. Although it is understood that an UNDAF outcome is operationalized through a portfolio, the aggregated impact that the Outcome has in Malawi is more than a simple sum of individual projects. Global benefits identified, besides project-by-project benefits, include inter alia innovation. That is, the incorporation of innovative management practices that would not have occurred without UN intervention. Furthermore, the Government of Malawi, by working with the UN within this Outcome, is able to leverage funding for its work in the area.

It is demanding to assess the efficiency of an outcome when it has not been achieved as of yet given that this is a mid – term review. Nevertheless, there are certain patterns emerging that can be useful in analysing efficiency. The lack of joint programming, weak coordination, overlap and duplication, as well as the intricate bureaucratic organizational structures within the UN is having critical impacts on delivery efficiency and donor support. When efficiency is reduced, first of all, the integral capacity of UN technical staff is unused due to these issues. Also, this inherently affects how counterparts (governments, non-governmental organizations, local stakeholders) interact with the projects and how their engagement changes. Projects' momentum and focus of inefficient administrative practices delay project implementation. Also, and very

importantly at a time when resource mobilization is crucial, donor partners specify that the lack of coordination within the UNCT as well as high transaction costs are detrimental to their support. Therefore, it is seen here how efficiency issues can and do have a broader impact than within the implementation of projects.

*Sustainability*, or the probability of sustainability, at the outcome level is diverse according to what intervention, project or process is being analysed as well as directly related to effectiveness. If effectiveness is weak, therefore the perspective of sustainability is also weak. If interventions results remain at the product level, then sustainability is also doubtful given that effects are not perceived nor products appropriated. Therefore, the sustainability of achievements when they solely remain at the policy framework setting level (that is, in establishing norms and policies but not fully implementing them as is the case for many of the interventions within this Outcome) is arguable. Capacity development is one of the main processes that interventions seek and an emphasis at the outcome and effect levels. Capacity development is also a crucial factor for sustainability of effects and outcomes.

UNDAF itself as an instrument merits some exploration. UNDAF 2012 – 2016 for Malawi is a complex and intricate instrument. A pointer of this is the streamlining that took place only one year after it came into effect. The streamlining also took place within the Outcome, combining outputs and redefining the outcome itself. The UNDAF still remains exceedingly complex and with some issues related to indicators. Output indicators, for instance, are not intrinsically related to the Outcome, and it is not clear, therefore, how to construct the Outcome out of outputs that are not commensurate.

The concluding period of UNDAF 2012 – 2016 and the next UNDAF for Malawi face new prospects and it befits to begin incorporating them as soon as feasible and possible. For instance, post – 2015 development agenda including the recently approved Sustainable Development Goals will need to be incorporated, not only at the conceptual level but also at a more programmatic level. These developmental aims, with their targets and topics, can also provide a framework for indicators of development to be part of future UNDAFs. This includes, also, localizing targets and indicators of the post-2015 agenda, as well as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The principles of this agenda present opportunities to ensure that investment in sustainable development, climate adaptation planning and disaster risk management are mutually reinforcing. Therefore, there is room to building synergies between climate change adaptation processes, natural resource management and ensuring investment in sustainable development.

### *Summary Recommendations*

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE UNDAFS

- UNDAFs should be a streamlined, focused instrument if they are to effectively guide UNCTs work in Malawi relating to environment, natural resource management, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management.

- Future UNDAFs should be based on true enhanced engagement with national authorities in order for them to reflect accurately national priorities, and generate ownership of UNDAF's outcomes and outputs.
- Future UNDAFs should reflect thorough work on indicators, in order for output indicators to accurately and closely relate to outcome indicators, as well for indicators to be clearly targeted.
- Indicators within future UNDAFs should assimilate Sustainable Development Goals targets.
- UNDAF development, in particular in cross – cutting subjects such as ENR, CC and DRM, should involve all relevant agencies in a cohesive manner, and not in a piecemeal way.
- Future UNDAFs should streamline gender equality issues as they relate to outcomes and outputs dealing with risk management, climate change adaptation, and natural resource management.
- Future UNDAFs should include issues and matters are root causes for disasters, hinder climate change adaptation, or deter environment and natural resource management.
- UNDAFs should promote governmental integration also, not only inter – agency coordination, particularly in cross – cutting issues such as those Outcome 1.2 deals with.
- UNDAFs should address strategic core issues that have an impact of lack of sustained management of ENR, climate change impacts and/or risk management. New UNDAFs should be highly strategic, facing not only acute problems but recurrent issues and root causes of development failures in the country.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRENT PROCESS FOR UNDP

- UNDP should accelerate work in order to providing impulses for relevant products obtained through the implementation of Outcome 1.2 to be approved as binding policies *and* to be implemented in Malawi.
- UNDP's portfolio related to the current Outcome should enhance engagement with and support of non – state actors, including local communities, the private sector, non – governmental organizations and civil society.
- UNDP project development should be based on a thorough exhaustive knowledge of the areas where an intervention will take place, not only knowledge of social and economic components but also knowledge of natural resources and environment variables as well as what impacts climate change is having in the particular area where work will take place.

- UNDP's downstream and upstream work needs to be linked, with downstream nourishing upstream work with successes, and thus aiding in upscaling and enhancing catalytic effects of local level interventions and avoid continuous "piloting."
- Projects, programs and processes supported by UNDP should contain clear and feasible exit strategies in order to promote implementation of policy, encourage institutional capacity building and promote sustainability.
- Relevant areas within UNDP as lead agency of the Outcome at hand should also connect and collaborate.
- Given that UNDP puts a strong emphasis on developing and strengthening institutional capacities, capacity development for Malawi should be enhanced and be made more sustainable than it is now in order to achieve objectives that withstand over time, truly building long – term institutional capacity through proper approaches.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRENT PROCESS SYSTEM - WIDE

- All projects development should be based on a thorough exhaustive knowledge of the areas where an intervention will take place, not only knowledge of social and economic components but also knowledge of natural resources and environment variables *in situ* as well as what impacts climate change is having in the particular area where work will take place.
- Projects, programs and processes supported by the UN should contain clear and feasible exit strategies in order to promote implementation of policy, encourage institutional capacity building and promote sustainability.
- Capacity development is also a task that should be carried out internally within the UNCT.
- Although many issues regarding coordination, high transactions costs, overlaps and overlapping mandates, as well as atomization within the UNCT extend beyond Outcome 1.2 and even beyond UNCT in Malawi, there is ample room to work towards coordination within the present confines.

## 2. INTRODUCTION: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

### *EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE*

This evaluation has as its principal purpose to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of the United Nations Country Team's (UNCT) contribution to UNDAF Outcome 1.2. The purpose is to assess collective contributions as a country team as well as for individual participating UN agencies. The evaluation was framed to assess this contribution following standard criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. It focused on seeking information of these criteria in relation to current programming in the areas of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk management.

The purpose of this assessment was to assess the mentioned criteria in order to contribute to the strengthening of existing programmes and of further programming. Furthermore, this evaluation aimed to inform further UNDAF reviews planned for the immediate future. Other tangential purposes include support learning across the UN to improve effectiveness at the programmatic level, as well as increased accountability of UNCT actions, programmes and projects before a series of national and international stakeholders.

The evaluation had several specific objectives:

- Assess the contribution of UNDAF Outcome 1.2 to Malawi's national priorities and development results.
- Determine the extent to which the outcome and related outputs have been achieved or are being achieved and the likelihood of being achieved by the end of 2016 in general.
- Determine the extent of participating UN agencies' contributions to these outputs/outcome.
- Determine the impact, both positive and negative, from achievement of the outcome and its related outputs.
- Assess the existing frameworks and strategies adopted by the UNCT and UN agencies in providing support to Government including partnership and resource mobilization strategies, engagements, and whether they were well conceived for achieving the planned outcomes.
- Determine whether strategies employed by participating UN agencies are complimentary and synergistic or not.
- Examine and analyse factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome by the UNCT collectively and the participating UN agencies, individually, both in terms of the external environment and those

internal to the portfolio interventions including: weakness in design, management, human resource skills and resources.

- Assess how the participating UN agencies worked together jointly in the planning, implementation and reporting on the outcome.
- Document lessons learnt from the implementation of the interventions.
- Appraise and make recommendations on the sustainability of the outcome, including the institutionalization of interventions;
- Review the efforts to mainstream gender and other cross cutting issues;
- Assess relevance and utilization of monitoring and evaluation processes and lessons learned for follow-on support of the programme.

The evaluation's time-based scope is from January 2012 to 31 December 2014. The assessment is national, while it will take into account key district interventions and observe local to national interventions. This will include the following scope:

- Assess progress towards achieving outcome – level objectives and outcomes as specified in relevant documents.
- Assess early signs of successes or failures with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the outcome on-track to achieve its intended results.
- Review strategies in light of its sustainability risks.

### *Evaluation Methodology*

With the above overarching background and evaluation purpose, scope and objectives in mind a work plan and a methodological approach were outlined as follows. The evaluation followed methods and approach as stated in UN Manuals, documents, relevant tools, and other relevant guidance materials (such as, *The evaluation policy of UNDP; Standards for Evaluation in the UN System; and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*). The assessment was conducted according to the principles outlined in both Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and by the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.

In order to fulfil the evaluation's purposes and objectives, the assessment focused upon and addressed the following specific questions:

- Whether the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) including the Outcome and Output indicators were properly designed.
- Whether the level of financial resources made available by different UN Agencies was sufficient for successful implementation of the outcome vis-a-vis the planned resource envelope.
- What progress has been made so far towards the outcome and whether the outcome will be met by December, 2016;
- To what extent has each participating UN agency contributed to the achievement of the outcome?
- What are the main factors (positive and negative) that are affecting the achievement of the outcomes? How have these factors limited or facilitated progress towards the outcome?

That is, establish not only *what* has been achieved but also *how and why* outcome has been met or not.

It was carried out following a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with UNCT, Malawi's government counterparts, project and programme's teams, and key stakeholders from different sectors of civil society (such as non-governmental organizations). The assessment was comprehensive entailing a combination of methodologies that not only allowed for data gathering but also for triangulation and validation of findings. That is, in order to carry out this evaluation exercise, several data collection tools for analysing information were used in order to follow the principles of results-based evaluation and carry – out analysis based on standard UN evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability).

Regarding specific methodologies to guide this assessment as well as to gather evaluative information, the first tool development was an Evaluation Matrix that recorded, for each specific evaluation question within each criterion, information and data collected from different sources and with different methodology. The matrix was

also a keystone first instrument in generating the construction of a theory to understand how the interventions, processes, and products developed did generate (or not) the expected Outcome (See ANNEX 1: Evaluation Matrix) .

Further specific tools and methods were developed and used in the evaluation. The methods and tools to be used for data gathering were linked to the evaluation criteria and (in turn) to evaluation questions that are included within the scope of the evaluation (see Evaluation Matrix above). The methodologies and tools aimed at obtaining information for the evaluation using quantitative and qualitative tools and allowing for triangulation and validation of findings. These tools were:

- *Document analysis.* In depth analysis of relevant documentation was carried out examining documents, such as planning and programmatic documents (such as UNDAF planning documents, mid-term and final project evaluations, annual reports and past agency outcome-level evaluation reports, strategy documents as well as relevant national strategic plans and policies). See Annex 2: Consulted Documents.
- *Key informant interviews.* Interviews were implemented through a series of open and semi-open questions raised to stakeholders directly and indirectly involved with UNDAF Outcome 1.2. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as UN officers, government actors' strategic partners of civil society / NGOs / beneficiary groups, and local actors, among others. The interviews were carried in person evaluation mission. See Annex 3: Mission Agenda.
- *Questionnaire.* A questionnaire was developed and sent to organizations which were not available in Lilongwe during the mission. See Annex 3: Mission Agenda.

Maria Onestini was the international consultant/team leader who, following Terms of Reference guidance for this evaluation, “was responsible for the overall outcome evaluation implementation” as well as author of this report. See Annex 5: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form. David Mkwambisi was the local evaluation team member who attended a set of the interviews carried out during the mission and collated a preliminary list of background materials relating to the evaluation.



### 3. BACKGROUND: COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME DESCRIPTION

*UNDAF OUTCOME 1.2:*

*IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, NATURAL RESOURCES  
AND CLIMATE CHANGE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AT NATIONAL  
AND DISTRICT LEVEL BY 2016.*

Environmental, climate change and disaster risk issues are intrinsically linked to Malawi's socio – economic development. Social welfare and economic development are dependent to a great degree on Malawi's natural resource base and vulnerable to climate change and risks impacts. Eighty percent of the Malawian population is directly dependent on agriculture for their incomes and for their livelihoods. This matter and population dynamics has resulted in advancing agricultural boundaries by clearing original vegetation cover for agriculture. This, in turn, has resulted in further natural resource and environmental issues such as soil and land degradation, and contributed to further socio – economic vulnerabilities such as GDP loss and harm to food security.

Climate change's negative impacts have further amplified the fragile relation between natural resources and society within Malawi. Given the increased intensity, unpredictable and frequent weather-related events associated to climate change, risks have increased. Recent (January 2015) floods have been devastating with resulting displacement of over 250000 people and 64000 hectares of land have been damaged due to flooding. Other natural disaster – based risks include landslides, heavy storms, and droughts.

The above are fundamentally linked to poverty issues that exacerbate Malawi's vulnerability. Food insecurity/nutritional issues, health problems, large poor rural populations, weak governance, population growth, and inequality are factors and issue that interact with natural resource management and risk management.

Malawi is the poorest nation in the world as measured by GDP per capita, which for the country is USD 226 in 2014. Evidently, poverty (as measured by different indicators) is high and extensive. Malawi's Human Development Index of 0.414 (as of 2013), places the country below the Sub-Saharan African average of 0.502. While other poverty measures indicate that 74 percent of the population lives below the poverty line.

Malawi is also one of the most densely populated countries in Africa with a population density estimated at 139 persons per km<sup>2</sup> and a growth rate of 2.8%. This implies that the nation is one of the fastest growing populations in the Sub-Saharan Africa region. Malawi is the least urbanized country in Africa. However, it has a 6% urbanization growth. This is one of the highest urbanization rates in the world.

As a Gini Coefficient of 41.5 demonstrates there are acute income inequalities. Inequalities are also expressed in other analysis. For instance, the gender inequality index for the country is 0.591 as measured by the Human Development Index, placing Malawi in the 131st place out of 187 countries assessed.

This brief introductory information gives a general sense of the significance that Outcome 1.2 has and can have for Malawi.

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2012 – 2016 for Malawi brings together participating UN Organizations within a single planning document. The development of the UNDAF responds to the need to improve coherence within the UN system’s programme of activities in Malawi and increase the resource availability to support development efforts in Malawi and allow enhanced access of Malawi to the specialized knowledge and expertise of both resident and non-resident agencies.

Within the framework, UN in Malawi, at the time of its inception, had decided to focus interventions in four thematic areas. Under these four key priorities there were seventeen UNDAF outcomes and 64 UNDAF outputs. Within these outcomes, is Outcome 1.2 (being evaluated here).

UNDAF’s Outcome 1.2<sup>1</sup> is aimed at working comprehensively on environment, natural resources and climate change issues within a sustainable development framework. It is noted that the aim is to improve these variables not only within a national context but also work at the district level. It falls within UNDAF’s Cluster 1: Economic Growth and Food Security, as seen in the chart below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Outcome 1.2 was originally denominated Outcome 1.3 and it was defined as Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk by 2016. After a revision in 2013, that redefined the structure of UNDAF outcomes, and reduced them from 17 to 14, the new numbering was adopted and the new definition was agreed upon. The focus shifted, by this definition, from “targeted population” benefiting from effective management to a broader concept of improved management in general and the adding of sustainable development as a framework for expected outcome. It also removes the phrase “in selected districts”, reinforcing –therefore–the issue that the expected Outcome would be operationalized throughout the country. Given these changes, the evaluation focuses on the current outcome and refers to it as 1.2 through this evaluation process and report.

*Figure 1: UNDAF CLUSTER 1*

In turn, UNDAF Outcome 1.2 consists of three Outputs, each output is instrumentalised by projects. Following each output are expectations on how these results are to be met, according to the UNDAF Action Plan.

Figure 2: Expected Outputs for Outcome 1.2

Output 1.2.1: Environment, natural resources and climate change mainstreamed in policies, development plans and budgets at national and district level.

Policies on Disaster Risk Management, Climate Change and Forestry will be developed, and Sectoral policies reviewed to reflect Climate Change (CC), Environment, Natural Resources (ENR) and Disaster Risk Management (DRM) concerns (e.g. Agriculture Policy, Land Policy, and other relevant policies – to be determined). Strategies, national programmes and action plans on CC, ENR and DRM will be produced and the regulatory framework concerning CC, ENR and DRM reviewed and relevant Acts revised. A public expenditure review on CC, ENR and DRM should be undertaken, national and district budget guidelines for integration of concerns about these issues developed and disseminated, and where relevant Investment Plans drafted and implemented. Integration of CC, ENR and DRM in District Development Plans will be pursued and activities reflecting these plans undertaken at District level. All this should lead Malawi on its way to an encompassing Low Emission Climate Resilient Development Strategy.

Output 1.2.2 Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environmental and natural resources degradation collected and made accessible to decision makers in Government, Private Sector and Civil Society.

Data, information and knowledge on CC, ENR and DRM will be produced through research, inventories and reviews collected in databases and presented in websites, atlases, maps, publications, and other means following an agreed Communication Strategy. Different targeted end user information materials will be produced, e.g. for awareness and advocacy of general public, as well as to inform decision-makers, researchers, etc. Information and knowledge at local level will be disseminated, inter alia through District Information Centres and other local means. Research networks, which should include regional and global links, will be assisted, leading to setting up of national “Centres of Excellence” on CC, ENR and DRM. Research findings will be disseminated through national and regional symposia and publications in journals and other peer-reviewed articles, including State of Environment Reports and inventories.

Output 1.2.3: Coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for CC and ENR established and used at national and district level.

Functional Sector Working Groups on CC, ENR. Number of target Districts coordinating and implementing CC and ENR programmes. CC & ENR Sector funding mechanism in place

Streamlining of UNDAF after the revision has implied that one original output (Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk by 2016) has in fact been absorbed conceptually by Output 1.2.1 (Environment, natural resources and climate change mainstreamed in policies, development plans and budgets at national and district level).

Another original expected output has been shelved. This Output (Innovative renewable and energy saving technologies piloted in targeted locations in rural and peri-urban areas enabling the development of a national programme) also had a series of expected results. Among them, studies to assess the energy demand and supply, policies, strategies, investment plans and communication programmes on renewables and energy saving options, and upscaling of successful pilots in order to inform a national programme on renewable and energy saving.

In general, therefore, the Outcome aims to support the generation of policy and of regulatory frameworks dealing with natural resource management and climate change adaption, as well as to improve data and information on effective environment and natural resources, climate change and disaster risk management.

The Lead Agency for Outcome 1.2 is UNDP. Although there are other agencies (resident and non – resident) that do also participate in the implementation of this outcome. The chart below indicates which those are.

Figure 3: UNDAF Division of Labour

Outcome	FAO	UNICEF	UNDP	UNFPA	UN HABITAT	WFP	UNEP
1. Environment, 2. Natural Resources and Climate Change	IA	IA	LA	IA	IA	IA	IA

<b>LA</b>	<b>Lead Agency</b>
<b>IA</b>	<b>Implementing Agency</b>
<b>Name</b>	<b>Resident Agency</b>
<b>Name</b>	<b>Non-Resident Agency</b>

However, as is well indicated in UNDAF Action Plan, environment, natural resource management, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management are cross - cutting issues. As indicated in that document *“Improved climate change, environment, natural resources and disaster risk management has a dedicated UNDAF Outcome . . . but environmental principles are also mainstreamed in other programme areas and programme development was environmentally screened.”*

UNDAF correlates at different levels with the country’s development strategy. The overall aims of the development strategy are to fast-track economic growth, wealth creation and reduce poverty. The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (MGDS II) is built around six thematic areas:

- Sustainable Economic Growth;
- Social Development;
- Social Support and Disaster Risk Management;
- Infrastructure Development;
- Improved Governance; and
- Cross Cutting Issues.

From these subjects, the MGDS II identifies nine key priority areas which are: Agriculture and Food Security; Energy, Industrial Development, Mining and Tourism; Transport Infrastructure and Nsanje World Inland Port; Public Health, Sanitation, Malaria and HIV and AIDS management; Integrated Rural Development; Green Belt Irrigation and Water Development; Child Development, Youth Development and Empowerment; and Climate Change, Natural Resources and Environmental Management.

UN interventions at UNDAF outcome level, therefore, complement the efforts made by the Government of Malawi and other development partners to achieve goals and objectives as outlined in the MGDS. Targets identified at the UNDAF outcome level are aligned with the MGDS II.

The MGDS II deals, therefore, with a wide range of national issues, many of them pertinent to Outcome 1.2 and, to a lesser or to a greater degree, relevant with the cross – cutting issues which the Outcome deals with. It is not articulated fully and defines its goals broadly, not with concise indicators. It also is not through which means expected developmental outcomes will be achieved.

Therefore, it is a demanding document to analyse and work with vis-à-vis UNDAF's expected outcomes, in particular with an outcome that also deals with broad, cross – cutting issues, such as effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk can be.

With the revised UNDAF structure, the Outcome remains, within MGDS II, within Theme 1: Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security and Key Priority 1: National policies, local and national institutions effectively support equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security by 2016. The following chart graphs the Outcome within MGDS II theme and priority areas.

*Figure 4: Outcome 1.2 within MGDS II Key Priority Areas*

MDGs	MDG 1, MDG 7, MDG 8
<b>MGDS II Themes and Key Priority Areas (KPAs)</b>	<b>Sustainable Economic Growth Social Support and Disaster Risk Management KPAs: Agriculture and Food Security, Climate Change, Natural Resources and Environmental Management, Trade</b>
<b>UNDAF Themes</b>	<b>Theme 1: Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and Food Security</b>
<b>Key Priorities</b>	<b>Key Priority 1: National policies, local and national institutions effectively support equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security by 2016.</b>
<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Outcome 1.2: Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016.</b>

## 4. MAJOR FINDINGS

### PROJECTS AND ACHIEVEMENTS WITHIN OUTCOME 1.2

Although an Outcome is more than an agglutination of projects, expected outcomes are mainly instrumentalised through these. As seen in Figure 3: UNDAF Division of Labour, the UNCT's lead agency for Outcome 1.2 is UNDP, mainly through the implementation of projects. However other agencies (resident and non – resident) are also considered implementing agencies. These other implementing agencies are: FAO, UNICEF, UNFPA, UN HABITAT, WFP, and UNEP.

Within UNDAF 2012 – 2016, approximate UNDAF expenditure for Outcome 1.2 in 2012 and 2013 has been of nearly \$6,841,442 US Dollars.

*Figure 5: Approximate UNDAF expenditure for 2012 and 2013 for Outcome 1.2 in US Dollars*

Outcome	2012	2013	Total
Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change	<b>\$2,658,670</b>	<b>\$4,182,772.</b>	<b>\$6,841,442</b>

Several of these projects are funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). During the GEF-5 replenishment period (that runs from July 2010 – to June 2014), Malawi has been allocated 7,580,000 USD to formulate and execute projects. These have been for different focal areas: US\$4,390,000 in biodiversity, US\$2,000,000 in climate change, and US\$ 1,190,000 in land degradation. GEF partners (i.e. implementing agencies of GEF supported projects) in Malawi are UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, FAO, World Bank, African Development Bank, and IFAD.

The following figure indicates that expenditure for Outcome 1.2 is 35 percent of budget. This calculation is up to 2014.



*Figure 6: UNDAF Budget vs Expenditure for Outcome 1.2 by 2014*

Outcome	Budget	Expenditure	% Expenditure
1.2: Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change	<b>\$4,400,000</b>	<b>\$1,557,500</b>	<b>35%</b>

The Development Partners Coordinating Committee Group collected information for a Summary of Climate Change, Disaster Risk Management, Environment and Natural Resource Projects operating in Malawi as of June 2015 (Malawi Environment and Climate Change Project Fiche). Extracting UN interventions out of this fiche (since it includes other donors' projects outside of the UN also), most of the 13 UN projects accounted by this group are implemented by UNDP, as can be seen below. Eleven projects are implemented by UNDP, ten as a sole agency and one jointly with UNEP. Two of the thirteen are implemented by FAO.

*Figure 7: Malawi Environment and Climate Change Project Fiche*

<b>National Climate Change Programme (UNDP)</b>
<b>Implementing urgent Adaptation Priorities through strengthened decentralized and National Development plans (UNDP)</b>
<b>Climate Proofing Local Development gains in rural and urban areas of Machinga and Mangochi Districts (UNDP)</b>
<b>Climate Smart Agriculture: Capturing synergies between adaptation, mitigation and food security (FAO)</b>
<b>Supporting smallholder farmers in Southern Africa to better manage climate related risks to crop production and post-harvest handling (FAO)</b>
<b>Support to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation actions under the National Climate Change Programme (UNDP)</b>
<b>Disaster Risk Management support to Malawi (UNDP)</b>
<b>Strengthening climate information and early warning systems for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change (UNDP)</b>
<b>Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI) Malawi (UNEP-UNDP)</b>
<b>Environment and Natural Resources Management Programme (UNDP)</b>
<b>Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the Shire River Basin (UNDP)</b>
<b>Sustainable Energy Management (SEM) support to Malawi (UNDP)</b>
<b>Increasing access to clean and affordable decentralized energy services in selected vulnerable areas of Malawi (UNDP)</b>

Source: *Development Partners Coordinating Committee Group' Summary of Climate Change, Disaster Risk Management, Environment and Natural Resource Projects operating in Malawi as of June 2015.*

This information is somewhat proportionate with reported UN Agency Expenditure by Outcome 2014. This data indicates that 98 percent of UN expenditure for Outcome 1.2 in 2014 was carried out by UNDP while two percent was carried out by FAO. Other agencies do not report expenditures in this Outcome.

*Figure 8: UN Agency Expenditure by Outcome 2014*

Agency	Outcome	Amount
<b>UNDP</b>		
	1.2: Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change	1,527,500
<b>FAO</b>		
	1.2: Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change	30,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,557,500</b>

There are other interventions and projects that also fall within Outcome 1.2 yet have not been noted by the Development Partners Coordinating Committee Group within this exercise. These are, for example, the GEF / UNDP Small Grants Program (SGP) and UN Habitat's projects "Urban Household Sanitation Improvement Project, Lilongwe City", "Support to Living with Floods in Chikwawa District, Lower Shire Valley," "Support the Establishment of a Technical Centre for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation for Southern Africa (DIMSUR)" and "Regional multi-sectoral DRR assistance programme for Southern Africa (UN-Habitat Basic Infrastructure, Shelter and Urban Risk Assistance)". Within some specific projects at times agencies with specific capacities collaborate accordingly, as is the case of UNITAR collaboration in projects that incorporate climate change educational aspects.

At the output level the major finding regarding achievements can be seen in the development or revision of policy regulatory frameworks. These are frameworks dealing with natural resource management, environmental issues in general, as well as climate change adaptation and disaster risk management. For example, major policies (which are either at final stages of development and starting to follow approval processes or have been approved) that have been achieved are those dealing with climate change adaptation, fisheries and forestry –to include sustainable land management provisions--, disaster risk management, district based contingency plans for disaster prone districts (with some of these have been mainstreamed in District Development Plans and Social

Economic profiles), reviews of National Adaption Programmes Of Action (NAPA), development Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAS) as well as beginning to work upon the generation of a National Adaptation Plan (NAP). These are examples of policies and instruments that have been achieved or are in the process of being achieved within the current UNDAF's period.

Furthermore, for example, reviews are being carried out, such as the Public Expenditure Review on Environment and National Resources and plans have been launched (such as the Climate Change Investment Plan). Again at the product level, for example, a climate change – related webpage has been launched which distributes information on this subject.

A great deal of training and capacity building has taken place within Outcome 1.2. For example, training of technical personnel and farmers in sustainable land management practices; capacity building on environment, agriculture, education, water and health for disaster risk management for governmental staff; and through the incorporation of DRM in primary school curriculum.

Projects and programs have also carried out and produced studies, analysis and knowledge management products. Examples of these are a handbook and operational guidelines for DRM, economic valuation studies of natural resource use, guidelines on the integration of environment and natural resource management into local development plans and national budgets. Another example of training materials developed within the realm of the Outcome is the *Training/Reference manual on how to carry out Public Expenditure Review (PER) of environment and disaster risk management*.

Furthermore, other projects have driven the direct implementation of sustainable natural resource management practices (for example, practices in afforestation, best land management practices, conservation agriculture, river bank protection and catchment conservation). Examples of these are also the development of productive activities that include incentives for biodiversity management (such as, for example, adoption of profitable fish farming, bee keeping, charcoal producing practices).

The above are product – level achievements. In the following sections the achievements (or lack of achievements) will be analysed following evaluation criteria as well as achievements (or, again, lack of achievements) at the outcome level.

#### RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, AND SUSTAINABILITY

A standard set of criteria for analysis is used for outcome - level evaluations. These are *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability*. The definitions for these are presented below:

- *Relevance* - The extent to which the objectives of UNDAF are consistent with country needs and national priorities.

- *Effectiveness* – A measure of how well the outcome has contributed to developmental change and the extent to which the UN contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcome defined in the UNDAF.
- *Efficiency* - A measure of how well organized was the delivery of quality outputs and the extent to which outcome was achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).
- *Sustainability* - The extent to which the benefits from a development intervention are likely to continue, after it has been completed.

### *RELEVANCE*

Undoubtedly Outcome 1.2 is relevant and pertinent to Malawi. Not only from the point of coincidence with expressed national priorities but also, and perhaps more importantly, due to country needs in the fields of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management.

Regarding national priorities, although causality of whether a subject or issue is part of a national development plan because it is donor driven or not (particularly in a country with such high donor dependency as Malawi), is debatable, there is no argument that the issues part of Outcome 1.2 are integral parts of Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (MGDS II). The MGDS II formally identifies, for example, Disaster Risk Management as one of its six broad thematic areas. Furthermore, for instance, it also identifies Climate Change, Natural Resources and Environmental Management as one of its key priority areas.

Notwithstanding these priority and integral identifications of issues directly mirroring matters in Outcome 1.2 of UNDAF 2012 – 2016 (and much as it happens in the whole of the UNDAF) natural resources, environmental issues, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management are imbedded within the whole of the MGDS II. Matters such as agriculture and food security, energy, mining, health and sanitation, to a name a few priority areas, are also matters that pertain, impact upon, or are related to natural resources, climate change and disasters.

As very briefly explained in the introduction to this report, country needs in the fields of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management are very significant in Malawi. These are intrinsically linked not only Malawi's socio – economic development but also to the country's vulnerabilities that hinder economic growth and human development. Direct reliance on the natural resource base for livelihoods and high susceptibility to climate change and risks impacts create a dangerous cyclical combination of dependency – vulnerabilities. Population pressures and population growth are root causes for many of the problems manifested through entrenched poverty.

Although it is understood that the scope of this evaluation runs through 2014, the recent floods that occurred in January 2015 are poignantly emblematic of these issues and how relevant and pertinent is and can be Outcome 1.2. These floods that have devastated over 64 000 hectares of land, resulted in the displacement of over a quarter of a million people, and killed several hundred people are a paradigm of how vulnerable Malawi's society is to these disasters. Unfortunately, this extreme weather occurrence is not to be a once only event, and all outlooks indicate that these incidences are to continue in the near future. Therefore, Outcome 1.2 is highly relevant and pertinent in order to build resiliency and aid Malawi's society to adapt to the impacts and disasters that climate change is having and will continue to have in socially and environmentally highly vulnerable areas.

Certainly this is Outcome 1.2 greatest *strength* and where most *opportunities* are localizable within the UNCT work in Malawi. The *strength* derives from an excellent linkage that has been developed between poverty / development issues with environment / climate change issues (vulnerabilities, adaptation, natural resources as keystone to lifting Malawi's society out of poverty and achieving sustainable development) within the Outcome. That is, one of the greatest strengths of UNCT's work as it relates to Outcome 1.2 (and to cross – cutting issues of environment in general) is that for Malawi the UN has been able to conceptually and operationally link environment issues to development issues, dealing with land management, resilience, and climate change adaptation of the vulnerable sectors of society.

Furthermore, this is where most of the *opportunities* related to this Outcome lie within future work, in the completion of UNDAF 2012 – 2016 as well as future UNDAFs. A great deal of opportunities is foreseeably present for basically two reasons: country needs and international environmental / climate change agenda. First of all, as seen in introductory sections of these report and briefly in this section, most of the country needs for development lie in close association to natural resources due to direct reliance on them for livelihoods as well as the exacerbation of needs associated to negative impact that climate change is having in Malawi. Furthermore, the international environmental / climate change agenda <sup>2</sup> arena is currently presenting a whole assemblage of opportunities for projects and programs in these subjects that could open windows for financing and promotion of the Outcome's agenda.

### EFFECTIVENESS

When analysing effectiveness, an examination takes place as to the extent to which an outcome has contributed to developmental change and the extent to which the UN

---

<sup>2</sup> It is recalled that, for UNDP's Country Office in Malawi, the Environment and Energy Portfolio is the largest group of projects within the agency's portfolio with strong perspectives of maintaining the level of financing / expenditure or even increasing in the near future.

contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcome as defined in the UNDAF. Therefore, effectiveness goes to the core of an outcome evaluation since outcomes are concrete developmental changes, they are actual or intended changes in development conditions that an intervention(s) seeks to support. Although highly cognizant that this is a mid – term review (that is, that an UNDAF that runs from 2012 to 2016 is being assessed for its effectiveness at its mid-point of implementation), the analysis looks mainly at the possibility of effectiveness given current circumstances at this point in time.

Regrettably, there is not a high degree of effectiveness evident as of yet from most of the outcome’s interventions (those in progress as well as those in concluding stages). In particular, from those products, outputs, and processes which are placed at the upstream level, particularly those associated with policy frameworks associated with national government. If effectiveness is defined as changes in development, it is seen that privileging the engagement of national – level institutions for the drafting of policy frameworks dealing with natural resource management, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management has had to date little impact (or effect) on developmental changes. By all accounts, the interventions associated to Outcome 1.2 (in particular those derived from UNDP as lead agency since the organization’s mandate of upstream, policy work).

At the output level there have been suitable attainments associated to the support offered within the UNDAF framework. At the output level major findings regarding achievements can be seen in the development and / or revision of policy regulatory frameworks dealing with natural resource management, environmental issues in general, as well as climate change adaptation and disaster risk management.

For example, a recently approved Guide to Executive Decision-Making Processes Handbook outlining the processes and procedures to be followed in policy development in Malawi’s public service. With technical support from Poverty-Environment Initiative Malawi (PEI Malawi) the guide includes an annex providing guidance of how decision and policy makers’ better can integrate inclusive and sustainable environment and natural resources management in all stages of the public planning cycle. Again, however, thus far these have been inputs at the output level to review upcoming sector policies, including climate change, fisheries and forestry, from a sustainability perspective.

Malawi has a robust set of policies dealing with Outcome 1.2 issues, to a great degree owing to interventions, projects, and support by UNCT, and particularly due to UNDP-supported projects and programs in this area. Conversely, and regrettably, there is also an enormous gap in the implementation of this policy framework. As poignantly communicated by relevant stakeholders from diverse institutions Malawi is “policy rich” and “implementation poor” for the issues at hand.

Therefore, at the Outcome level there is a vast breach between outputs and sought effect. The effect pursued (i.e. Improved Management of Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change for Sustainable Development at National and District Level

by 2016) is not occurring as effectively as could be expected due, primarily, to the gap in implementation of regulatory frameworks arrived at with UN support.

### *EFFICIENCY*

When evaluating efficiency an assessment is carried out regarding how well organized was the delivery of quality outputs and the extent to which outcome was achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost. Resources are not only funds; resources are also expertise, time, and administrative costs. In sum, efficiency is a valuation of how cost-effectively are resources translated into outcomes.

The valuation of efficiency is varied. First of all, it is difficult to assess efficiency unreservedly because most of effects within Outcome 1.2 at this UNDAF's mid-point juncture are not at the result level but are, at best, at the product level. Therefore, it is demanding to assess the efficiency of an outcome when it has not been achieved as of yet. This of course being fully cognizant that this is a midterm evaluation and that the achievement of results is a work in progress.

Nevertheless, there are certain patterns emerging that can be useful in analysing efficiency. First of all, there is a very heavy administrative burden internally within the UN, which makes delivery inefficient. The weighty administrative structures imply high administrative costs. But this is not only an issue in and of itself, is also a detriment of delivery at the technical level. As technical staff accurately indicates, the considerable use of time (a resource) of technical staff for administrative purposes, for example, implies that their technical capacities are not suitably utilized and that they become merely administrators or conduits for funding with little or no input related to their technical capacities is exercised. Their technical capacity, therefore, is practically unused, misusing human resources that can be employed more efficiently and effectively in a thematic capacity.

The high administrative and transaction costs are also perceived and questioned by other key stakeholders and actors. Donor partners question this and at times express a frustration with bureaucracy, convoluted processes, disbursements procedures, and other matters that relate to efficiency. Although donors see the UN in Malawi as a valuable ally in delivering aid within the Outcome's topic, and appreciate the value added of each agency, there are questionings to its efficiency level or value-per-money. That is the bureaucratic and transaction costs are not questioned in and of themselves, they are questioned due to their negative impact on the delivery of results.

These issues are also examined not only within the UNCT and donor partners, they are also questioned from aid beneficiaries. From representatives of the Government of Malawi to non – State actors (non-governmental organizations, community organizations,



etc.) are raised a set of questionings to the matters of efficiency, transaction costs, lack of coordination.

This is arguably one of the Outcome's greatest *weaknesses*. Once more, this issue is not only having an impact on efficiency itself but also in effectiveness as well as donor partners' perception and/or support of future work.

The Lead Agency for this outcome (UNDP) also has had overlap and duplication with some other agencies or donors, therefore given this and the above, the strategies and execution of the outcome have not been fully cost efficient. Current attempts at charting projects and programs by all donors in the areas of climate change and natural resource management, suggest that there are efforts in place or beginning to develop in order to at least combine information with the aim of improving efficiency.

### SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability is a key matter in international cooperation. That is, the extent to which benefits from a development intervention are likely to continue after it has been completed is a strategic question to consider.

Sustainability, or the probability of sustainability, at outcome level for Outcome 1.2 is diverse according to what intervention(s) is being analysed as well as directly related to effectiveness. If effectiveness is weak, therefore the perspective of sustainability is also weak. If interventions results remain at the product level, then sustainability is also doubtful given that effects are not perceived. Therefore, the sustainability of achievements when they remain at the policy framework level (as is the case for many of the interventions within this Outcome) their sustainability is arguable.

Capacity development is one of the main processes that interventions seek and an emphasis at the outcome and effect levels. Capacity development is also a crucial factor for sustainability of effects and outcomes. With the emerging understanding that capacity development is the engine of human – centred sustainable development, it also an emphasis within the UN, including an emphasis of the Outcome's lead agency UNDP. Capacity development entails not only training but generating institutional capabilities to provoke change. That is, for an activity to meet the standard of capacity development (particularly as practiced and promoted by UNDP, lead agency in this case) it must bring about transformation that is generated and sustained over time from within a country.

Regarding training, many interventions and projects within the outcome generate training (of national government officials mainly but also of other sorts of stakeholders: local actors, farmers, people whose livelihoods depend directly upon natural resources, communities experiencing negative impacts due to climate change and associated disasters). With regard to training of national government officials, there is very little evidence that there is a transition from developing individual capacity to generating institutional capacity in the long-term. Regarding training within more local or applied interventions, there is evidence that when training is carried out to include proper



incentives (for example, the work of the SLM project with local farmers and producers where natural resource management training is coupled with incentives such as income generation for improved environmental management), then sustainability of outcomes is more definite.

## GENDER

Notwithstanding the conceptual understanding of gender differentials regarding natural resource management, environmental issues, climate change and disasters, very little of this awareness is incorporated within the scope of Outcome 1.2. The disparities in access to natural resources, nutritional sources, climate change coping and adaptation strategies and capacities between women and men, or between girls and boys in Malawi are conceptually acknowledged at some levels. However, in general, projects and programs that make up most of Outcome 1.2 are gender blind. That is the majority of these interventions fail to recognize that gender is an essential determinant of social outcomes impacting on projects and policies. In a country with strong gender inequality indices this is particularly problematic.

This occurs for interventions at most levels, from broad policy – oriented projects/programmes to those that do at some level incorporate field implementation of some sort. Although the discourse at times incorporates gender (or women) as an expression, for example, the projects and programs that make up Outcome 1.2 are mostly unmindful of gender concepts and the impact that gender inequality has on life experiences, the possibilities for development, and its consequences for girls and boys, men and women. As the preceding *Mid Term - Evaluation of Outcome 31 And Gender Mainstreaming Across All Outcomes United Nations Development Programme Malawi (2012-2016)* has indicated this is a pattern regarding the Outcome.

For example, albeit a thorough analysis of gender and climate change in Malawi has been commissioned with funding and facilitation by UNDP within the National Climate Change Programme (which in turn is also a UNDP-funded intervention and a pivotal programme within Outcome 1. 2) does not effectively integrate gender, neither at the design nor at the implementation phases. Neither gender indicators nor outputs have been generated. The analysis indicated above has had, therefore, no assimilation into the processes or outputs and interventions that the Programme has furthered thus far. Neither gender mainstreaming processes nor gender equality aspects have been incorporated *despite* a commissioned analysis that indicates the need to mitigate differential impacts of climate on women and integrate gender in planning efforts.

At a different level of intervention the SLM Project reveals the same gender blind patterns.<sup>3</sup> For example, project – level intended outcomes and outputs (such as policy

---

<sup>3</sup> The mentioned Outcome evaluation finds the same pattern of not incorporating gender issues in other projects, such as in the Sustainable Energy Management Project.

and institutional arrangements for basin – wide sustainable land management including the River Shire authorities, public – private partnerships, crop insurance, as well as the improvement of knowledge and skills to effectively implement sustainable land management practices) are all gender blind in their conceptualization. Some outputs have a few sex-differentiated data. And albeit they acknowledge that *“women play a central role in the provision, management and safeguarding of water”* these outputs fail to acknowledge discrepancy in access to resources that women face in a framework of land management issues, nor even the most basic issues of time use by women and girls for water collection, and therefore fail to recommend or implement actions to surpass these inequalities at the policy level.<sup>4</sup>

Although the project had enormous prospective to mainstream gender, given the that the specific subject matters are intimately related to gender (such as access to land, credit, and other natural resources) at the implementation level only a few instances have taken advantage of these issues to promote gender equality. Positively, some processes (informed by gender assessments) have created more income generating activities for women in the area of intervention. Given this a win – win situation was generated, i.e. increased income generation from sustainable land management practices incorporated by the project act as incentives to utilize sustainable use practices.

Other opportunities to make more sustainable use of natural resources and incorporate a gender perspective were unexplored. For example, a critical point of the project was the promotion of practices that reduce pressures over natural resources. Being aware that deforestation in Malawi is largely driven for household fuel use through wood burning and charcoal and that women are central to the demand of forestry resources for this, the SLM project did not work with women in an integrated way to pilot more energy efficiency practices than those currently used.

The triangle analysis of women – poverty – environment is also deficiently explored at the effect level in programmes and projects. For example, although the PEI Program has produced a report on this issue<sup>5</sup>, again as in the case related to the climate change programme mentioned above, gender/poverty/environment issues have not been assimilated nor mainstreamed into other programme outputs.

Furthermore, in the local implementation of projects there is a drive for increasing and enhancing women’s participation. However, several reports indicate that these

---

<sup>4</sup> *Policy Sector Review for Incorporating Sustainable Land Management in the Shire River Basin and Development of an Institutional Framework for Sustainable Land Management: Final Report.* June 2013.

<sup>5</sup> *Gender-Environment and Natural Resources Data and Indicator Rapid Assessment.* 2014-11-03.

initiatives are not fulfilled, in decision – making instances that guide projects and programmes.

In general, therefore, gender equality and mainstreaming is missing in most interventions that deal with environment, natural resources, and climate change adaptation. Within the projects and programs, in sum, there is no through attempt to reduce gender inequalities in the access to natural resources or productive resources as associated to the environment in order to contribute to sustainable livelihood. Nor is there a translation of awareness that women suffer different impacts from disasters (including climate change) and that disaster risk management and climate change adaptation programs and projects should be not only fully cognizant of this but act accordingly. Regarding gender, there is generally a “tick off” approach<sup>6</sup>. That is, there is a perfunctory inclusion of women in some projects, and the development of reports in others as if meeting with the issue at some level is sufficient. Nevertheless, this does not imply the mainstreaming of gender issues or the pursuit for gender equality within the Outcome.

---

<sup>6</sup> As also indicated in the gender outcome evaluation mentioned above.

## UNDAF AS A FRAMEWORK FOR OUTCOME 1.2 AND OUTCOME INDICATORS

It is clear that albeit the current analysis is for Outcome 1.2, this outcome operates within a context which is the UNDAF as whole. As stated before, as well indicated in UNDAF Action Plan, environment, natural resource management, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management are cross - cutting issues. As indicated there: *“Improved climate change, environment, natural resources and disaster risk management has a dedicated UNDAF Outcome . . . but environmental principles are also mainstreamed in other programme areas and programme development was environmentally screened.”* Therefore, although analysing the Outcome in a discrete set of interventions, the UNDAF is, and particularly with these issues, more than its parts.

However, UNDAF is a collective of Outcomes that overlap and intersect different agencies’ value – added, inter agency capacities as well as their distinct mandates. This particular outcome, as specified earlier, is particularly complex since it is cross cutting and since, therefore, the improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development is an area of work present in most of other outcomes and clusters. That notwithstanding, there is restricted correlation between the expected outcomes and outputs as well as limited correlation between the projects and programmes through which the outcome is operationalized. The review that took place in 2013 in some way streamlined outcome, outputs, and indicators. Yet, a great deal of streamlining can foreseeably take place in future UNDAF’s in order to more effectively and efficiently deliver sustainable results.

However, this streamlining was double edged. Although suitably restructuring took place resulting in a more rationalized Outcome 1.2, it also implied some changes that regrettably can conceivably cause impediments in the delivery of improved management of the environment in Malawi in a sustainable development context.

First of all, streamlining of UNDAF after the revision has implied that one original output within Outcome 1.2 was absorbed conceptually by another, which indeed helped in rationalization. However, an original output was dropped (Innovative renewable and energy saving technologies piloted in targeted locations in rural and peri-urban areas enabling the development of a national programme), although aiding in rationalization, removing this expected output has implied that there is very little emphasis remaining on energy which, in turn, is a crucial area as in Malawi as this matter relates to deforestation. Deforestation is one of the decisive issues as it relates to energy use, land degradation, food security, climate change adaptation and risk management in the country. Although it is understood that dropping this output responded to a withdrawal of donor support in this area; and a call for rationalization that took into account UNCT and agencies’ capacities, commitments, as well as past lack of effectiveness dealing with this subject matter, it has left a gap in programming for a very key area of development in Malawi.

This rationalization has also implied that some agencies abandoned their participation in Outcome 1.2. Again this has implied streamlining as well as focusing agency inputs and agency participation in areas where they truly hold comparative advantages. On the other hand, this has resulted in further compartmentalisation and hindered inter – agency collaboration.

The metrics for meeting or not meeting with expected outcomes and outputs within an UNDAF is through indicators. The ones presented for this Outcome present some questions. Although the three indicators for the Outcome (Yearly reduction of forest cover; Proportion of population using solid fuel; and, Average number of days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster) are, fittingly, outcome indicators they present some issues. First of all, they are not fully linked to the output indicators and vice versa. That is, Output indicators have a limited linkage with the Outcome. The limited linkage is conceptual as well as operational. For example, the indicators related to deforestation and use of solid fuel is linked in a rather limited way to the output indicators since the expected outputs tangentially touch these subjects. Furthermore, several output indicators are not reflected in the outcome indicators. This implies that if they are met or not it will not be reflected in the Outcome and therefore the visualisation of achieving the indicators at the effect/outcome level (if they occur) will not ensue.

Indicators also, at some level, hearten the gaps in implementation of policy frameworks in Malawi. That is, as indicated in other sectors of this report, Malawi has a robust set of policies dealing with environment, natural resource management and risk management that arise, to a great degree, due to the support by the UN. Contrariwise, and regrettably, there is also a vast gap in the implementation of this policy framework. Some of the indicators at the product level do accentuate this issue. For example, the indicator for “New policies, development plans and programmes reflecting ENR, CC and DRM concerns” is six of these policies approved. The indicator in no way is indicative of implementation, use or application of the policies. That is, is not a results-based indicator that, even if met, does not fully drive what Outcome 1.2 seeks (Improved *management* of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development) which is not just the adoption of a management framework but their successful use for improved management. A second level of indicators that could measure the implement efficacy of implemented policies, when this occurs, could capture effect as well as impact.

Attribution is also an issue to analyse. That is, how or to what extent can an outcome indicator be attributed to UN – work? When dealing with reforestation for instance, if it does occur how much of it can be attributed to the support of UN to Malawi and how much of it is attributed to other issues, including population dynamics, market forces, conflicting policies in the country, etc.

Furthermore, this and other issues regarding indicators are particularly complex when dealing with environmental and climate change matters. It should be taken into account that the issue of indicators for environmental and climate change matters is complex in

general given that outcomes many a times follow certain cycles (for instance, ecological or weather cycles) that are not commensurate to development assistance framework cycles. As an example, an afforestation project might not see impact or effect within a project cycle or an assistance framework cycle.

Although understandably the UNDAF is generated responding to expressed country development aims (as articulated in the MGDS II in this case) and to country needs, it also pertains to how it has been generated in order to analyse how and to what extent the Outcome is being met. First of all, although the UNDAF results in one matrix for delivering aid to the country, it still is a framework arrived at by separate agenda – setting. And, although it is a common document and as it would be expected a common positioning of the UNCT vis-à-vis development cooperation in Malawi, it is still far-off from being a common, intrinsically linked leading document for integrated planning, implementing and monitoring delivery. This is particularly important when dealing with cross cutting matters, in order to seek internal and external coherence, efficiency, commonality of approaches albeit maintaining agency specificity and mandates. Coherence, harmonization and simplification of administrative practices are also matters that need to be attended to for future UNDAFs.

EXTENT TO WHICH SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED OR NOT ACHIEVED AND WHETHER OR NOT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOME WOULD BE ACHIEVED BY THE END OF 2016

This section deals with the extent to which the outcome and outputs have been achieved or not achieved and whether or not specific outputs and the outcome will be achieved by the end of 2016. As all development assistance frameworks, the metrics for measuring attainment of outputs and outcomes are target indicators.

The following table indicates what are the baseline and target indicators for the Outputs that make up the Outcome. A final column indicates what is the estimated achievement status at the end of 2016 (that is, when UNDAF 2012-2016 concludes). However, there is no clear linkage between output indicators and outcome indicators. The outputs very tangentially relate to the outcome indicators and therefore it is not clear how the outputs generate the Outcome.

By this reporting, as seen in the table below, five out eight output – level indicators are likely to be met. <sup>7</sup>The three unlikely to be met are: new policies, development plans and programmes reflecting ENR, CC and DRM concerns (4 out of 6 likely); functional

---

<sup>7</sup> In green in the chart.

Sector Working Groups on CC, ENR (only 1 out of 2 likely); and, number of target Districts coordinating and implementing CC and ENR programmes (only 6 out of 15 likely).<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> These are in yellow in the chart.

Figure 9 Indicators for Outputs within Outcome 1.2 and their estimated achievement by end of 2016.

Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Estimated Status at end-2016
Output 1.2.1 : Environment, natural resources and climate change mainstreamed in policies, development plans and budgets at national and district level	Resources allocated to ENR, CC and DRM	2.3 Million USD	3.5 Million USD	3.5 Million USD
	New policies, development plans and programmes reflecting ENR, CC and DRM concerns	None	6 Approved	4
	Number of District Development Plans reflecting ENR, CC and DRM	3	15	12
Output 1.2.2 Data and knowledge on the impact of climate change, environmental and natural resources degradation collected and made accessible to decision makers in Government, Private Sector and Civil Society	Malawi CC, ENR websites developed, linked to databases and functional	0	2 websites with >1000 hits/month	2 websites
	Number of District climate change information centres	0	15 with updated information	12
Output 1.2.3: Coordination mechanisms and implementation arrangements for CC and ENR established and used at national and district level	Functional Sector Working Groups on CC, ENR	SWG on CC+ENR established	Fully operational SWGs, planning and reporting to MoEPD)	1
	Number of target Districts coordinating and implementing CC and ENR programmes	0	15	6
	CC & ENR Sector funding mechanism in place	No SWAP or functional funding mechanism	Working SWAp or Funding mechanism	1



Furthermore, the following table indicates what are the baseline and target indicators for Outcome 1. 2. The table expresses the target achievement of outcome indicators and it contains a final column which indicates what is the estimated status of achievement at the end of 2016 (that is, when UNDAF 2012-2016 concludes). In colour the two of the three targeted achievements that are not likely to be met are indicated in Figure 9.

*Figure 10: Indicators Outcome 1.2: Target Achievement - Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016<sup>9</sup>*

Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Estimated Status at end-2016
Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management	Yearly reduction of forest cover	-2.5% (2009)	0%	-1%
	Proportion of population using solid fuel	98.70%	92%	89%
	Average number of days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster	14 days (2011)	<5 days	7

By this reporting, the first indicator is not likely to be met (that is, estimated target yearly reduction of forest cover is not likely to be met). Neither is the third indicator likely to be met by these estimates since average number of days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster at the end of UNDAF is estimated to be seven days while the target was less than five days.

The second indicator, proportion of population using solid fuel, is assessed as likely to be met and exceeded (target 92% is expected to be achieved and exceeded with an estimated status of 89% at end of 2016). Yet as seen in the section on the indicators at the Outcome level (previous section) there are general questions to be conscious of also which is attribution of effect and the nature of environment/climate change indicators.

In overall terms and in summary, therefore, at the Output level, 63 percent of the expected outputs are likely to be met by the end of the present UNDAF period. Yet, it is pertinent to analyse within this set which outputs are likely to achieve and which are not according to their typology. The ones likely to be achieved by the end of the current UNDAF period deal with resource allocation; the development of plans dealing with climate change adaptation, disaster risk management and environment/natural resource issues at the district level; as well as the development of products that harness and

<sup>9</sup> Source: UNDAF MTE, June 2015.

distribute information. However, those outputs that specifically deal with the *implementation and operation* of improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level (that is, the very core of the expected Outcome) are outputs less likely to be achieved. For example, the implementation of new policies, development plans and programmes reflecting, or the functioning of sector working groups, nor target districts coordinating and implementing climate change, disaster risk management, and/or natural resource and environmental programmes is likely to be achieved to the full extent expressed and expected in the UNDAF by the end of 2016.

For the Outcome indicators, two of three indicators are not likely to be met. Neither estimated target yearly reduction of forest cover nor average number of days taken to start assistance after onset of a disaster. The proportion of population using solid fuel is assessed as likely to be met and exceeded by the end of 2016.

Therefore, as seen above, the extent to which specific outputs and outcome have been achieved or not achieved and whether or not specific outputs and outcome would be achieved by the end of 2016, varies according to the output within the outcome. In general terms, the outputs that are generally products (webpages, management instruments, guidance manuals, etc.) are more likely to be met by the end of the present UNDAF period. The more effect or results based expected outputs or outcome, such as the implementation of programmes and policy fully leading to improved management improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development is less likely to be achieved as it stands at this mid – point juncture of the UNDAF.

#### CONTRIBUTION AND PERFORMANCE OF UNDP

As indicated in order sections, performance of UNDP within Malawi in the area of can be analysed Vis – a – Vis the attainment of effect and impact as measured by the UNDAF indicators and other similar analysis. However, the Outcome is more than the sum of its parts. Although it is understood that an UNDAF outcome is operationalized through a portfolio of interventions, the aggregated effect or impact that the Outcome has in Malawi is more than a simple sum of individual projects. Specific contributions of UNDP at the outcome level can be summarized as follows.

- Financial support of national government activities in environment, climate change adaptation, and natural resource management. UNDP is the major financial contributor to the Government of Malawi in this area.
- Increased financial mobilization and leverage. The Government of Malawi, by working with UNDP in this area, is able to leverage funding for its work from other donors or to mobilize external funding.
- Innovation. As with most development countries, capacity and instruments to deal with natural resource management, environmental issues and climate change adaptation are lacking due to the fact (among other elements) that

these issues need or call for innovative instruments and inventive capacities. This is particularly the case in a country with weak institutional capacities such as Malawi. UNDP plays a strong role in incorporating innovation (such as in the adoption and upscaling / replication of indigenous innovation or technologies, importing technologies adopted to local conditions) within these fields in the country.

- Strategic role of UNDP due to its mandate for government engagement. UNDP's actual and potential contribution to improving natural resource, environmental and climate change adaptation management can be partially linked to its strategic role that stems from its global mandate to engage with national institutions. Natural resource management, climate change adaptation and risk management actually and potentially greatly generates through the engagement of national government institutions.
- Strategic role of UNDP at the national /macro-level. Within UNDP and with relevant other actors there is a generally accepted prevalent concept that successful achievements at the Outcome – level would be achieved by mainstreaming and implementing policies. Understanding that this requires a certain degree of purposeful capacity at the national – level institutions dealing with environmental governance should be in place. UNDP's contribution generates from the fact that its mandate places the Agency in a strategic role to leverage national – level governance in the area of climate change adaptation and risk management, environmental affairs and natural resource management in Malawi.
- Strategic role of UNDP at the subnational/local/ to micro-level. Albeit UNDP's role (and therefore input) is still minor at this level in Malawi, there are some incipient contributions that can be used as lessons learned or to provide an impulse for multi – level improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change. The direct involvement of UNDP at the micro / downstream level has meant that UNDP supported and contributed to very concrete improvement of environmental conditions, climate change adaptation and other impacts, including resiliency by local communities.

UNDP's contribution and performance can be also analysed (as indicated in other sections of this report) through standard evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability). *Relevance* is the most important factor in UNDP's contribution and performance in Malawi. The inherent relations poverty, natural resource management, climate change and state fragility is integrally complex in Malawi. UNDP's contribution and performance is greatly supported by the institutional judgement that natural resource management and climate change adaptation are deeply interconnected with development, resource use, livelihoods and economies. *Effectiveness* is less clear as a variable of UNDP's contribution and performance. UNDP's performance is effective at the product level when dealing with national institutional work. UNDP's (at this level) contributes to the generation of policy in Malawi. At the

Outcome level less efficiency is evident for national institutional policy work. That is, the products are not thoroughly efficient in delivering the expected outcome of tangible and specific improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development. At the more local levels, when UNDP's projects interact and engage with local communities and direct beneficiaries, the contribution is more efficient given that there are (as exemplified in other sections of this report) several concrete and tangible improvements in natural resource management and use, as well as in incipient evidence of climate change adaptation, within the local – scale areas where UNDP sustains projects and project sites. Regarding *efficiency*, UNDP's performance can be classified as adequate yet with issues regarding transaction costs as well as with weighty management and administrative tasks that frame contributions and performance, both at the output and at the outcome levels. Finally, UNDP's contribution and performance as to *sustainability* is fragile at some levels and stronger at others. The projects and products which make-up the Outcome, mainly policy instruments, do have a weak sustainability given that these tend to lack in institutionalization and maintainable implementation. Other interventions (within projects and at the product level) which are implemented at a more local or small scale level reflect a greater degree of sustainability in the short and medium term.

#### MANDATES, METHODS OF DELIVERY AND COORDINATION

Although outcome evaluations are asked to assess agency – selected method of delivery, the reality of implementation and of development aid conveyance indicates that this is a much broader issue. That is, there is not a selected method of delivery, not even within each agency. As is also clear in the case of UNCT's delivery in Malawi.

Agencies not only plan and act according to their value – added, capacities, and mandates; they also plan and act according to their chosen *methods* of delivery. And while each agency strategically determines at what level and what method they will use for engagement within Malawi, there are variances even within each agency. For example, UN Habitat engages with local and city authorities for delivery, yet they also work with non – governmental organizations and civil society groups at the community level.

UNDP, as a lead agency, is definitely engaging in diverse methods of delivery and engagement within its work in Malawi. UNDP has a comprehensive mandate including a unique and specific overarching mandate on democratic governance and supporting countries in their individual development challenges. This is consolidated in the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2014-2017, which states that UNDP will promote sustainable human development through three strategic areas of work: Sustainable Development Pathways; Inclusive and Effective Democratic Governance and Resilience-building.

Within this mandate, the lead agency for the Outcome in Malawi, as does UNDP in general, privileges its relation and engagement with the Government of Malawi. Nevertheless, although this is the agency's principal approach for delivery it also has other

additional strategies. Albeit not as major as engagement with national government, UNDP works with district – level governments as well as engages with communities, non-governmental organizations and civil society groups. The latter particularly through the implementation of pilot projects and the Small Grants Programme.

The principal method of delivery for UNDP as lead agency as it relates to Outcome 1.2 is engaging with the Government of Malawi especially for the development of policy frameworks for environmental and natural resource management, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management. This has its positive and its negative components. First of all, this method of engagement and strategy aims at UNDP's upstream focus on improved coordination, mainstreaming and knowledge management at the national level to ensure a low emission and climate-resilient development. Strengthening the policy environment as an emphasis aims at a top – down approach and seeks governance effectiveness in these subjects.

Nonetheless, although the upstream approach that UNDP mostly takes as a lead agency in this Outcome, and in general, has detracting factors in the case of Malawi. The great weaknesses in government to implement policy frameworks together (and to a great degree related to this weakness) with the limited capacity of absorption that Malawi has infers that frameworks and institutional capacity being developed through the UNDP's projects and programmes have limited effectiveness.

Therefore, this approach and this upstream government engaging strategy are double edged in some ways. Donor partners collaborate with UNDP partly due to this engagement with national authorities as to take advantage of UNDP's unique position to leverage national changes in the pursuit of development. This matter, and especially critical in the case of Malawi, is double edged because first of all this strategy has had little results beyond products generated within the policy framework. The implementation gap is critical in this case.<sup>10</sup> Second, transparency and accountability issues<sup>11</sup> have also hindered donor relations for UNDP due to privileging work with national level government structures.

The strategy to engage with local level institutions, non-governmental organisations, and directly with communities and stakeholders (and to a very small degree with the private sector) has been a method of delivery that has had more perceptible effects and results. UNDP engages in this sort of delivery strategy, however, to a very limited scale and to a limited degree. And, although results are more tangible when this delivery strategy is used, there are issues also with this sort of engagement. First of all, issues with

---

<sup>10</sup> This has been explored in sections related to efficiency and effectiveness and will also be explored in further sections of this report dealing with constraints that impacted country programme delivery.

<sup>11</sup> Such as the matter of Cashgate which will be touched upon further on in this report.

the limitation that this strategy has regarding the lack of upscaling and catalysing effects, as also issues with delinking of downstream interventions with upstream projects and programmes in Malawi. Small scale results do not generally aggregate into nationally significant results.

Coordination between agencies has been lacking in general within the Outcome. Perhaps due to cross – cutting factor that is environment, climate change and disaster risk management, but also due to the compartmentalized way that the UNCT works. Not least, furthermore, is the fact that UN agencies tend to compete with each other regarding funds and donor support. Except for some joint programming (PEI or the Strengthening Community Resilience to Climate Change in Blantyre, Zomba, Neno and Phalombe Districts that has only just began a few months before this evaluation) there is very little joint programming to analyse how the UNCT worked effectively with other international and national development partners to improve the management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk. Yet by all accounts and previous analysis (at the UNDAF level, but also at the country programming and at the project level) there is very little joint implementation or joint programming taking place.

#### BEST PRACTICES

Several best practices have been identified within Outcome 1.2 that can be used to reinforce improved work in the period that remains for the UNDAF and certainly for future UNDAF and future work of the UNCT. Some are best practices in the sense of the effect or impact that they are generating, some for the outlook that they take, and some due to exchanges and joint planning.

##### ❖ *Best practices: Private Public Sector Partnership for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project in the Shire River Basin*

The outlook utilized within this GEF funded – UNDP implemented project is an identified best practice given that Sustainable Land Management (SLM) as an integrated method of dealing with environmental and sustainable development issues. That is the approach itself is a best practice given that SLM is a knowledge-based procedure that helps integrate land, water, biodiversity, and environmental management including input and output externalities) to meet rising demands (natural resources, food, etc.) while sustaining ecosystem services and livelihoods. The SLM project itself, for example, embarked upon approaches to enable land users to maximize the economic and social benefits from land while enhancing the ecological support functions of the land and its natural resources in vulnerable areas of Malawi. It focused on increasing productivity of the Shire River Basin while adapting to the socio-economic needs of communities' dependent on natural resources. The project sought to improve communities' livelihoods, while simultaneously strengthening their resilience to environmental (variability) shocks, including climate change.

The use of SLM practices within the project with the implementation of incentives such economic benefits associated to biodiversity management and sustainable practices have produced outcomes and results. Avoiding soil degradation through SLM practices has implied that soil degradation has decreased and food production has increased. Furthermore, practices implemented with the community and with non-governmental organizations have entailed better management of the forest and the river. This has lead not only to improve forest cover, but also to better management of water run offs through buffer zone along the Shire River, protection of riverbanks, management of micro watersheds, better management of bush fires. The stimulus of productive activities within the project have generated concrete incentives for the communities to visualize benefits of SLM and to continue to use these practices outside of the project life span, as well as to generate replication of the project in neighbouring areas. The promotion of plantations and fish ponds development and stocking, as well as the promotion of beekeeping and honey production are activities that generate income and that are directly associated to the integrated practices promoted by SLM.

During the 2015 floods that Malawi suffered, several of the benefits of this project were poignantly clear. For example, effects directly associated with SLM practices put in place, including afforestation, river bank protection, sustainable forest management, incentives for maintaining forest cover, etc., have resulted in reducing the impact of water run off during the rains of 2015. Therefore, in the area of intervention less homesteads and their livelihoods were washed away than in areas where no SLM intervention took place during this period. The benefits were varied, not only having a positive impact on flood prone areas. For example, the project spearheaded a “No Bushfire Campaign” which yielded tangible benefits just after one rainy season and benefits have continued to accrue and multiply with each season passing with no bushfires in the area. The vegetation cover, therefore, remains standing throughout the dry season manages to reduce the raindrop impact and that amount of rainwater runoff at the beginning of the rain season and by so doing increase the amount of water percolating /seeping into the soil. The recuperated areas that did not suffer bushfires also were in a better situation to give course to another of the SLM project’s effect dealing with honey production.

Out of this highlighted good practice some pertinent lessons can be learned, among them the need to highlight project’s win – win effects, the need to upscale interventions that have positive impacts, and the imperious need for the downstream to inform and nourish the upstream in order that this sort of interventions’ local impact does not remain only confined to pilots but it can be translated into comprehensive management of natural resources.

❖ *Best practices: The Development Partners Coordinating Committee Group*

The Development Partners Working Group has been created at the instance of UNDP. It has been established to exchange information on major donors’ activities and support in climate change, disaster risk management, and environment and natural resources in



Malawi. As such, this group has been able not only to discuss internally what projects are supported by major donors in the country but also to exchange information but also to map areas of intervention in Malawi, and to chart suggested areas for project coordination. This information is to be used to ensure information and knowledge sharing, improve coordination among and between the different interventions and the different donors (including the UNCT agencies), as well as to search for synergies between the projects and donors.

This mechanism for information sharing has potentiality for upscaling towards “speaking as one voice” as donors. Not only vis – a – vis the environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk management cooperation community in Malawi but also vis-à-vis the Malawi governmental structures at the national and at the district level. The areas of government that deal with these subjects are, understandably to some degree, atomized in the country. The areas of government that deal with these subjects are many, and at times uncoordinated among themselves.

Therefore, working with them through an integrated working group as the Development Partners Working Group can, potentially, aid also in generating integrated planning and integrated management. The Working Group can also aim at the coordination of actions by donors, including the UNCT, using other successful coordinating groups already implemented in Malawi as models. This would also aid in generating inter agency coordination and synergies within the UN.

❖ *Best practices: Strengthening Community Resilience to Climate Change in Blantyre, Zomba, Neno and Phalombe Districts*

Albeit this is an extremely recent project (beginning in June 2015), it appears to be a best practice thus far for its approach as well as for its inter – institutional planning and coordination thus far.

This project, led by FAO, was considered in order to support vulnerable communities to strengthen their resilience to climate variability and change through sound safety nets and productive investments using a holistic approach through climate change adaptation. This approach attempts to address multiple threats to livelihoods based on the premise that in order to improve resilience of vulnerable communities (under conditions of increasing climate change amid environmental degradation coupled with a rapidly growing population pressure) a transformative community empowerment outreach process is required.

Therefore, a good practice identified is approach, in a sense that the project acknowledges the multivariate issue of climate change adaptation and that there is a need to work on vulnerabilities and adapting using a resiliency approach. That is, that the areas (such as Phalombe) where there are enduring and recurring disasters and difficulties in development, exacerbated by negative climate change impacts, it is not sufficient just to work on the emergency. Therefore, the approach maintained by the project is to not deal with these patterns exclusively as emergency issues but to deal with



them in a broad resilience approach that can assure that communities withstand threats and rebound quickly after a disaster.

The other positive aspect is the joint co-applicants' implementation and coordination approach where agencies that have applied jointly for EU support are also working together and, thus, compel to some degree government counterparts to work jointly. The Joint Management arrangement will be carried out through a Programme Advisory Committee made up of FAO, UNDP, UNICEF and WFP. The relevant line ministries to be involved are MoFEPD, MoAIWD, MoLGRD, MoNREM, MoTI, MoGCDSW and MoH.

## 5. LESSONS LEARNT FROM BOTH POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES

- The successful results within Outcome 1.2 thus far and results within its associated outputs level are directly related to the constructive joining of ENR, CC and DRM issues to human development.
- Coordination, synergies, information sharing between and among agencies begins at the design level.
- Unnecessary complexities of UNDAF force constant revisions; such as the one occurred in 2013, only a year after UNDAF 2012-2016 was adopted.
- Root causes and inequalities (such as gender inequality) must be explicitly included as part of the issues that outputs, products and outcomes will confront.
- Projects, outputs, programmes should not only assess needs but also capacities, especially institutional and absorption capacity of Malawi national and district level institutions.
- Budgetary inclusion pertaining to the outcome (that is, pertaining to ENR, CC, and DRM) are key to provide a drive for implementation, effectiveness and sustainability of the Outcome.
- In Malawi institutional lasting capacity is not directly nor automatically derived from training of government personnel or from individual capacity building, all aspects (public service quality, resources available, context) of capacity should be taken into account when designing or driving capacity building within the Outcome.
- Direct interventions or work at the local level should be carried out with precise local knowledge and linkage with the area of intervention by implementing agencies.
- Successes and major findings from projects and programmes should be properly visualized in order to positively demonstrate effect when it occurs.
- The downstream should proactively feed the upstream, in order to encourage replication, upscaling catalytic effects and avoid excessive 'piloting'.
- Programmes and projects must, from the very beginning of their design processes, include an exit strategy in order to foment and underline sustainability and bridge the implementation gap pervasive in Malawi.

- High transaction costs and convoluted systems of administration not only have a negative impact on efficiency, but also have negative bearings on effectiveness and on donor partners support of UN work.
- Complex issues need integrated approaches to be successful and to confront development issues in an integrated manner. Therefore, integrated approaches (such as sustainable land management or resiliency) are substantially more relevant to sustainable development issues in Malawi.

## 6. CONSTRAINTS THAT IMPACTED COUNTRY PROGRAMME DELIVERY

Although there are general positive patterns of delivery at certain levels and positive impact from achievement of Outcome 1.2 and its related outputs such as knowledge and information generation, acknowledgment of environmental / climate change / disaster risk management issues in the country, training as well as pilots and local level interventions with demonstrative results there are also a series of constraints. These constraints have impacted on country programme delivery and their analysis can give rise to recommendations for future programming.

### ❖ *Level of country needs*

The absolute level of country needs, although they offer a continuous amount of opportunities to work on sustainable development in Malawi, is also an all embracing constraint. Development aid and cooperation by the UNCT within the framework of a nation with so many widespread needs in even basic issues such as nutrition, food security access to water sources, gender inequality, health, disasters, and so on, indicate that delivery is constrained given that it must attend to so many necessities at the same time.

### ❖ *Weak national absorption capacity*

As pointed out in a series of assessments and analysis, Malawi as a State is weak with profound governance issues. This matter is thoroughly validated within this analysis, and particularly as it relates to governance dealing with environment/climate change adaptation/risk management. Therefore, within this context, the national capacity of the Government of Malawi to absorb and implement the regulatory framework that is promoted through Outcome 1.2 is rather frail.

### ❖ *Fragmented governance*

Malawi has a fragmented governance structure which hinders delivery and sustained impact. This is particularly demanding when dealing with cross cutting issues, such as the ones the Outcome deals with, and issues which must be acted upon at different levels of governance (from national, to district, to local levels).

### ❖ *Donor dependency*

The country as a whole is extremely donor dependent, in particular in areas such as the environment, climate change or attending to disasters. Therefore, this places constraints in that delivery of products and effects are not sustained in time and in processes. Forty – percent of Malawi's budget has habitually been subsidized by donors. This gives an idea of the deep donor dependency is a threat to delivery in the sense that it hinders sustainability of products and processes achieved.

❖ *Failure to leverage sufficient budgetary support to implement regulatory frameworks*

Public expenditure and budgetary reviews reveal that although national development aims (as indicated in the MDGS II) maintain that the subjects related to Outcome 1.2 are key priority areas for the country, Malawi has not adequately allocated budgets commensurate with the importance of environmental issues within the country. The areas within national government that deal with environmental affairs, climate change issues, and disaster risk management are extremely underfunded. Some of them even indicating that nearly all of their funding originates from UN projects and programmes, mainly from the lead agency. This matter goes as far as governmental stakeholders expressing that norms, plans, etc., are not implemented because the UN did not include implementation in their budget. That is, that frameworks are not implemented given that government perceives that budgetary burden belongs to the agency that supports generation of regulatory framework components. This implies that the instruments developed through UN support are not perceived as a national responsibility nor do they have true national ownership. Studies within the Outcome reinforce this matter. They indicate that, for example, between 2006 and 2012 the environment and natural resources sector within national government only accounted for 3.15% of the national budget. The disaster risk management sector within national government accounted for less than 1% of national budget. These analyses further specified that less than 1% of the entire funding allocated to ENR and DRM trickles down to district level.

❖ *Weak creation of institutional capacity*

Malawi has issues in transition from individual capacity to creating solid institutional capacity in the long-term. Many, if not most, projects and programmes implemented within Outcome 1.2 entail training in order to strengthen capacity. Nevertheless, the Government of Malawi finds it difficult to retain trained individuals and thus support institutional capacity. Trained individuals transfer outside of government structures once their capacity is increased, mostly due to the low remuneration of public service employment and the limited capabilities to deliver enhanced services within the public sector.

❖ *Lack of local knowledge by implementing agencies*

Several projects and programmes are not implemented with precise local knowledge or linkage with the area of intervention by implementing agencies. This constraints implementation and, in some cases, even if implementation occurs at some level, the lack of on – the – ground knowledge entails that implemented processes are not effective nor sustainable.

❖ *Lack of exit strategies in programmes and projects*

Projects and programmes lack many times exit strategies. This implies that although delivery takes place at some level (for instance, a normative framework is reviewed, or a

plan developed) little or no attention is paid to what occurs after the delivery/intervention ends and therefore no sustainability occurs. This hinders delivery in the sense that whatever achievement is realized at the product level, little is achieved at the outcome / effect level.

❖ *Weak attention to root causes*

Although it is understood that every implemented project, programme, nor the whole Outcome “can do everything”, there is –in general– weak attention to root causes of environmental degradation, of lack of adequate access to natural resources, and of climate change related risks within the Outcome and within most interventions. Albeit the cyclic nature of the subject (that is that human endeavours have an impact on the environment and that in turn environmental variables have an impact upon human development) root causes are not acknowledged as such. Population growth and population pressure have enormous impact on natural resource degradation in the country, which in turn have a massive impact on social wellbeing. Deforestation is a root cause of vulnerabilities to floods and other risks. These just to name a few of the root causes that hinder delivery of improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district levels in Malawi.

❖ *Cashgate accountability transparency issues*

The so – called Cashgate<sup>12</sup> scandal has not only hindered delivery but has also hindered current and potential donor support to government – related development projects. Therefore, resource mobilization is constrained, in particular for those agencies that engage with national government for delivering development aid (such as UNDP as lead agency of the outcome being evaluated here). The Cashgate scandal has brought to light matters that were underlying regarding government lack of transparency and lack of accountability in the implementation of development projects, not only the issue of taking of funds by individuals in and of itself, but also how this has had repercussions in efficiency and how it has undermined delivery.

❖ *Lack of coordination and frail synergies within the UNCT*

In general, except for very few instances, there has been weak coordination and frail synergies within the UNCT. This has implied high transaction costs and decreased efficiency in the implementation and delivery of projects, programmes, and processes

---

<sup>12</sup> “Cashgate” is a financial scandal in Malawi that has put in the limelight not only misuse of donor funds but also a whole series of transparency and corruption issues by government officials. The scandal (which unfolded in 2013 – 2014) has entailed millions of US dollars missing from the national budget (much of it cooperation funds from international donors) and accusations and prosecution of politicians, cabinet members, and members of the civil service. This has also entailed deep audits of donor funding and withdrawal of donor support of government projects.

relating to Outcome 1.2. Albeit there are some new mechanisms that are being outlined to share information between and among agencies, and also some joint planned projects begin to develop, there is still ample room to increase coordination, reduce transaction costs and increase synergies between agencies.

---

## 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### CONCLUSIONS

Within expected Outcome 1.2 (*Improved Management of Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change for Sustainable Development at National and District Level by 2016 In Malawi*) several achievements and overall conclusions can be noted at the mid-term juncture.

First of all, the achievements at this point closely relate to the issue of Outcome 1.2 *relevance* and significance to Malawi. Not only from the point of coincidence with expressed national priorities but also, and perhaps more importantly, due to country needs in the fields of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management.

The very key issues that the Outcome specifically deals with (climate change adaptation, natural resource and environmental management, as well as disaster risk management) are imbedded specifically within UNDAF's Outcome 1.2. Other issues, such as agriculture and food security, energy, mining, health and sanitation, to a name a few priority areas for the country, are also matters that pertain, impact upon, or are related to natural resources, climate change and disasters. Country needs in the fields of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management are very significant in Malawi. These are intrinsically linked not only Malawi's socio – economic development but also to the country's vulnerabilities that hinder economic growth and human development. Therefore, Outcome 1.2 is highly relevant and pertinent in order to build resiliency and aid Malawi's society to adapt to the impacts and disasters that climate change and natural resource degradation are having and will likely continue to have in socially and environmentally highly vulnerable areas. Relevance is Outcome 1.2 greatest strength and where most opportunities are localizable within the UNCT work in Malawi. The strength derives from an excellent linkage that has been developed between poverty / development issues with environment / climate change issues (vulnerabilities, adaptation, natural resources as keystone to lifting Malawi's society out of poverty and achieving sustainable development) within the Outcome. That is, one of the greatest strengths of UNCT's work as it relates to Outcome 1.2 (and to cross – cutting issues of environment in general) is that, for Malawi, the UN has been able to conceptually and operationally link environment issues to development issues to make this Outcome relevant for the country.

Furthermore, this is where most of the opportunities related to this Outcome lie within future work, in the completion of UNDAF 2012 – 2016 as well as future UNDAFs. A great deal of opportunities is foreseeably present for basically two reasons: country needs and international environmental / climate change agenda. Most of the country needs for development lie in close association to natural resources due to direct reliance



on them for livelihoods as well as the exacerbation of needs associated with the negative impact that climate change is having in Malawi. Furthermore, the international environmental / climate change agenda arena is currently presenting a whole assemblage of opportunities for projects and programs in these subjects that could open windows for financing and promotion of the Outcome's agenda. Therefore, the criterion is rated *R (Relevant)*.

With regard to the criteria of effectiveness attained processes and outputs (whereby an examination takes place as to the extent to which an outcome has contributed to developmental change) regrettably, there is not a high degree of effectiveness evident as of yet from most of the outcome's interventions. That is, there is not a high degree of developmental changes associated to the outputs and processes that make – up the Outcome. Although, as mentioned, Malawi has a robust set of policies dealing with Outcome 1.2 issues, to a great degree owing to interventions, projects, and support by UNCT, and particularly due to UNDP-supported projects and programs in this area, there is also an enormous gap in the implementation of this policy framework. This evidently hinders effectiveness. Therefore, the effect pursued (i.e. Improved Management of Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change for Sustainable Development at National and District Level by 2016) is not occurring as effectively as could be expected due, primarily, to the gap in implementation of regulatory frameworks arrived at with UN support.

The UN, and in particular UNDP as a lead agency within this Outcome, has sustained several processes related to policy frameworks to deal with environment and natural resources, climate change adaptation as well as disaster risk managements. Reviews of policies, development of planning frameworks regarding the abovementioned issues, development of plans (national and at district levels) were supported. The generation and information and knowledge management products and platforms were also supported.

Projects also have had tangible achievements of a more applied nature. For instance, sustainable land management practices implemented through a UNDP implemented and GEF funded project have led to better management of natural resources and improving livelihood in targeted areas. Furthermore, it has aided in diminishing effects of floods in areas which are vulnerable to climate change impacts.

Other new processes and projects are evolving with noticeable opportunities to have impact, promote effects and generate coordination. The Joint Resilience Project led by FAO is a key opportunity to confront risk and promote socially – centred sustainable development in an integrated manner with a long – term resiliency horizon. It is also an opportunity to work collaboratively within the UNCT among different agencies, increasing effectiveness, efficiency while avoiding duplication. The Development Partners Coordinating Committee Group has worked on surveying natural resource, environment, climate change and disaster risk management projects and programmes being implemented in Malawi by major donors and UN agencies. This tallying has also identified

duplication, areas of intervention and potential for cooperation. This mechanism has the potentiality to plan and coordinate work in this area within Malawi.

In general, the Outcome has concentrated on promoting products at the policy level, nationally and to a certain degree at the districts level within this Outcome. However, the supported policy framework (such as policy reviews, policy analysis and promotion) still requires approval to some degree. Nevertheless, the largest issue presented with this approach is that there is a critical gap between the development of policy-level frameworks and their implementation. The implementation gap is critical in Malawi and poses governance issues.

This gap is manifested also by national weak ownership of these products; lack of appropriate budgeting by national government to implement products originating out of UN supported projects and programmes, and the incapability of government to retain personnel that has been trained within these projects and programmes. This is crucial in understanding the weak institutional capacity of Malawi to form and implement adequate governance mechanisms for ENR, CC and DRM. It is, therefore, not sufficient for the UN just to support the tools that make up environmental governability but to work deeply on what the country could and should do to enhance environmental governance.

The downstream interventions that the UN has supported have resulted, in many cases, in important developments, improvements in livelihoods, reduced risk, and community – based adaptation to climate change. However, there are (as with many of these localized interventions) issues due to their rather limited influence. In order to enhance these successes and effects, special care and attention should be paid to upscaling, having a catalytic effect and improving impact by connecting the downstream best practices with upstream work. The considerable concentrated focus that UNDP as lead agency of Outcome 1.2 has on mainstreaming ENR, CC and DRM policies (mostly at the national level) has had a low impact on what the Outcome expects to achieve: i.e. improved management as a factor of improving human sustainable development in Malawi. In general therefore the rating for *effectiveness* is Moderately Satisfactory (MS).<sup>13</sup>

Moreover, the Outcome is more than the sum of its parts. Although it is understood that an UNDAF outcome is operationalized through a portfolio, the aggregated impact that the Outcome has in Malawi is more than a simple sum of individual projects. Global benefits identified, besides project-by-project benefits, include inter alia innovation. That is, the incorporation of innovative management practices that would not have occurred without UN intervention. Furthermore, the Government of Malawi, by working with the UN within this Outcome, is able to leverage funding for its work in the area.

The valuation of *efficiency* is varied. First of all, it is difficult to assess efficiency unreservedly because most of effects within Outcome 1.2 at this UNDAF's mid-point

---

<sup>13</sup> See Annexes for rating scales.

juncture are not at the result level but are, at best, at the product level. Therefore, it is demanding to assess the efficiency of an outcome when it has not been achieved as of yet given that this is a mid – term review. Nevertheless, there are certain patterns emerging that can be useful in analysing efficiency.

The lack of joint programming, weak coordination, overlap and duplication, as well as the intricate bureaucratic organizational structures within the UN is having critical impacts on delivery efficiency and donor support. When efficiency is reduced, first of all, the integral capacity of UN technical staff is unused due to these issues. Also, this inherently affects how counterparts (governments, non-governmental organizations, local stakeholders) interact with the projects and how their engagement changes. Projects' momentum and focus of inefficient administrative practices delay project implementation. Also, and very importantly at a time when resource mobilization is crucial, donor partners specify that the lack of coordination within the UNCT as well as high transaction costs are detrimental to their support. Therefore, it is seen here how efficiency issues can and do have a broader impact than within the implementation of projects. Therefore the criteria rating for *efficiency* is Moderately Satisfactory (MS).<sup>14</sup>

*Sustainability*, or the probability of sustainability, at the outcome level is diverse according to what intervention, project or process is being analysed as well as directly related to effectiveness. If effectiveness is weak, therefore the perspective of sustainability is also weak. If interventions results remain at the product level, then sustainability is also doubtful given that effects are not perceived nor products appropriated. Therefore, the sustainability of achievements when they remain at the policy framework level (as is the case for many of the interventions within this Outcome) their sustainability is arguable. Capacity development is one of the main processes that interventions seek and an emphasis at the outcome and effect levels. Capacity development is also a crucial factor for sustainability of effects and outcomes. Capacity development entails not only training but generating institutional capabilities to provoke change. That is for an activity to meet the standard of capacity development (particularly as practiced and promoted by UNDP, lead agency in this case) it must bring about transformation that is generated and sustained over time from within a country. With regard to training of national government officials (which at times is perceived within the Outcome as the main mean through which capacity if built) there is very little evidence that there is a transition from developing individual capacity to generating institutional capacity in the long-term. Regarding training within more local or applied interventions, there is evidence that when training is carried out to include proper incentives then sustainability of outcomes is more definite. In summary, therefore, sustainability is rated as Moderately Likely (ML).<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> See Annexes for rating scales.

<sup>15</sup> See Annexes for sustainability rating scale.

UNDAF itself as an instrument merits some exploration. UNDAF 2012 – 2016 for Malawi is a complex and intricate instrument. A pointer of this is the streamlining that took place only one year after it came into effect. The streamlining also took place within the Outcome, combining outputs and redefining the outcome itself. The UNDAF still remains exceedingly complex and with some issues related to indicators. Output indicators, for instance, are not intrinsically related to the Outcome, and it is not clear, therefore, how to construct the Outcome out of outputs that are not commensurate.

The concluding period of UNDAF 2012 – 2016 and the next UNDAF for Malawi face new prospects and it befits to begin incorporating them as soon as feasible and possible. For instance, post – 2015 development agenda including the recently approved Sustainable Development Goals will need to be incorporated, not only at the conceptual level but also at a more programmatic level. These developmental aims, with their targets and topics, can also provide a framework for indicators of development to be part of future UNDAFs. This includes, also, localizing targets and indicators of the post-2015 agenda.

Another forward looking matter that will most certainly impact UN work and future UNDAFs for Malawi is the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The principles of this agenda present opportunities to ensure that investment in sustainable development, climate adaptation planning and disaster risk management are mutually reinforcing. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda identifies increased international attention to environmental challenges as well as the need to ensure that results and outcomes of development finance are resilient to climate change impacts. Therefore, there is room to building synergies between climate change adaptation processes, natural resource management and ensuring investment in sustainable development.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### *Recommendations for the development of future UNDAFs*

- UNDAFs should be a streamlined, focused instrument if they are to effectively guide UNCTs work in Malawi relating to environment, natural resource management, climate change adaptation and disaster risk management.
- Future UNDAFs should be based on true enhanced engagement with national authorities in order for them to reflect accurately national priorities, and generate ownership of UNDAF's outcomes and outputs.
- Future UNDAFs should reflect thorough work on indicators, in order for output indicators to accurately and closely relate to outcome indicators, as well for indicators to be clearly targeted.
- Indicators within future UNDAFs should assimilate Sustainable Development Goals targets.
- UNDAF development, in particular in cross – cutting subjects such as ENR, CC and DRM, should involve all relevant agencies in a cohesive manner, and not in a piecemeal way.
- Future UNDAFs should streamline gender equality issues as they relate to outcomes and outputs dealing with risk management, climate change adaptation, and natural resource management.
- Future UNDAFs should include issues and matters are root causes for disasters, hinder climate change adaptation, or deter environment and natural resource management. For instance, issues such as population pressure upon natural resources, deforestation and energy use, another root issues, should be included in future UNDAFs and properly addressed.
- UNDAFs should promote governmental integration also, not only inter – agency coordination, particularly in cross – cutting issues such as those Outcome 1.2 deals with. Dealing with integrated government structures would aid not only effectiveness but also in working collectively and in enhancing the performance of weak government structures. This would also entail work on policy harmonization and consistency between areas of government, and avoid the undermining of policies in one area by another.
- UNDAFs should address strategic core issues that have an impact of lack of sustained management of ENR, climate change impacts and/or risk management. New UNDAFs should be highly strategic, facing not only acute problems but recurrent issues and root causes of development failures in the country.

*Recommendations for current process for UNDP*

- UNDP should accelerate work in order to providing impulses for relevant products obtained through the implementation of Outcome 1.2 to be approved as binding policies *and* to be implemented in Malawi. This entails also being attentive to (and strengthening where it is fit) weak national policy absorption capacity, weak national governance, as well as frail budgeting structures that hinder implementation of policies and hampers improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district levels. That is, it is imperative that policy frameworks be implemented in a planned and coherent manner within the remaining period of this UNDAF.
- UNDP's portfolio related to the current Outcome should enhance engagement with and support of non – state actors, including local communities, the private sector, non – governmental organizations and civil society. Furthermore, it should also enhance engagement with and support of relevant district – level institutions. Projects that already contemplate local interventions and specific sites where the projects/programmes will take place should boost these aspects providing increase support and/or being attentive to implementation.
- UNDP project development should be based on a thorough exhaustive knowledge of the areas where an intervention will take place, not only knowledge of social and economic components but also knowledge of natural resources and environment variables as well as what impacts climate change is having in the particular area where work will take place.
- UNDP's downstream and upstream work needs to linked, with downstream nourishing upstream work with successes, and thus aiding in upscaling and enhancing catalytic effects of local level interventions and avoid continuous “piloting.”
- Projects, programs and processes supported by UNDP should contain clear and feasible exit strategies in order to promote implementation of policy, encourage institutional capacity building and promote sustainability. Those UNDP processes, programs and projects that are part of current Outcome 1.2 that do not have such a strategy should quickly determine one and begin implementing.
- Relevant areas within UNDP as lead agency of the Outcome at hand should also connect and collaborate. Very importantly, Democratic Governance area of UNDP should connect with Environment and Energy area in order to exchange knowledge, best practices and lessons learned regarding governability in Malawi and promoting implementation of ENR, DD, and DRM in the country. The same should occur regarding connections of Capacity Development and Environment and Energy units within UNDP in order to

exchange knowledge, best practices and lessons learned regarding capacity building and capacity strengthening in ENR, DD and DRM in the country.

- Given that UNDP puts a strong emphasis on developing and strengthening institutional capacities, capacity development for Malawi should be enhanced and be made more sustainable than it is now in order to achieve objectives that withstand over time, truly building long – term institutional capacity through proper approaches. Here as in other areas of work, engagement should not be exclusively with national government, but should entail a broader spectrum of institutions (even with stakeholders which UNDP does not traditionally engage with): district and local level institutions, local stakeholder organizations, private sector, and other relevant organizations beyond national government.

*Recommendations for current process System - Wide*

- All projects development should be based on a thorough exhaustive knowledge of the areas where an intervention will take place, not only knowledge of social and economic components but also knowledge of natural resources and environment variables *in situ* as well as what impacts climate change is having in the particular area where work will take place.
- Projects, programs and processes supported by the UN should contain clear and feasible exit strategies in order to promote implementation of policy, encourage institutional capacity building and promote sustainability.
- Capacity development is also a task that should be carried out internally within the UNCT. For instance, providing capacity to strengthen gender mainstreaming in programmes, projects and process supported by the UNCT for staff; and providing capacity in results – based programming, just to cite a few areas of desirable capacity building, with other subjects incorporated as needs arise.
- Although many issues regarding coordination, high transactions costs, overlaps and overlapping mandates, as well as atomization within the UNCT extend beyond Outcome 1.2 and even beyond UNCT in Malawi, there is ample room to work towards coordination within the present confines. Coordination between and among agencies in projects and programs implemented as well as fostering and enhancing coordinating committees already present can lead to improved and efficient practices and synergies, using successful instances of coordination and joint programming in Malawi as models. These forums can have keen effects, beginning with discussions and information exchange to fostering joint work. It can also signal donor partners that coordination leading to more efficiency and effectiveness are goals.

---

## 10. ANNEXES

---



## ANNEX 1: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Data and Information Sources / Methodological Instruments
Relevance	<p>To what extent is the UNCT's collectively and each UN agency engaging in promoting natural resources conservation and improved management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk together with reflection of strategic considerations, including UNCT's role in the development context of Malawi and its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners?</p> <p>To what extent has the UNCT's collectively, and each participating UN agency selected method of delivery been appropriated to the development context?</p> <p>Has the UNCT been influential in national debates in promoting natural resources conservation and improved management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk issues, and has it influenced national policies on legal reforms and human rights protection?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UN Document Review (agency – specific outcome evaluations, programmatic documents)</li> <li>Malawi's official documents (government strategic plans)</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<p>What evidence is there that the UNCT collectively and as individual UN agencies have contributed towards improved national government capacities, including institutional strengthening?</p> <p>Has the support at the national level been effective in helping improve management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk management at the local level in Malawi? Do these local results aggregate into nationally significant results?</p> <p>Have the UNCT and individual UN agencies worked effectively with other international and national development partners to improve the management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk?</p> <p>How effective has the UNCT collectively and individual participating UN agencies been, in partnering with civil society and the private sector to promote management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk in Malawi?</p> <p>Has the UNCT collectively, and participating individual UN agencies utilised innovative techniques and best practices in its programming?</p> <p>Did the UN coordination reduce transaction costs and increase the efficiency of implementation of the programmes relating to the outcome? To what extent did the programme create actual synergies among agencies and involve concerted efforts to optimise results and avoid duplication?</p> <p>Is the UNCT collectively, and other participating UN agencies perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk in Malawi?</p> <p>What contributing factors and impediments or enhance UNCT's collective, and individual participating UN agencies' performance in this area?</p>	<p>Document review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNCT reports, agency outcome evaluations</li> <li>National Government policy documents</li> <li>Local level documents</li> <li>UN Partner's reports and documents</li> <li>Interviews (UN, governments, development partners, civil society partners)</li> </ul>
Efficiency	Have participating UN agency strategies and execution of the outcome been efficient and cost effective?	Interviews

	<p>Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources?</p> <p>Are the monitoring and evaluation systems that UNCT collectively and individual participating UN agencies have in place helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ UNCT</li> <li>○ Government</li> <li>○ Development partners</li> <li>○ Outcome evaluations at the Agency level</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>What is the likelihood that the interventions are sustainable?</p> <p>What mechanisms have been set in place by UNCT and participating UN agencies of Malawi to sustain improvements made through these interventions?</p> <p>How should this portfolio be enhanced to support central authorities, local communities and civil society in improving service delivery over the long term?</p> <p>What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships and strategies in order to promote long-term sustainability?</p> <p>What could be done to strengthen sustainability of outcomes?</p> <p>Is the UNCT and individual agency resource mobilization strategy in management of the climate change, environment and disasters risk appropriate and likely to be effective in achieving this outcome?</p> <p>Are UNCT's management structures and working methods appropriate and likely to be effective in achieving this outcome?</p> <p>To what extent did the UNDAF contribute to developing an enabling environment (including capacities of rights holders and duty bearers) and institutional changes to advance Human Rights and Gender Equality issues?</p> <p>The key question will be whether stakeholders foresee an ongoing increase in poverty, food insecurity or natural resource degradation related problems or rather a decline or return to the previous situation if active intervention stalls. This will include the assessment of the extent of localization of Interventions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Document review (outcome agency level assessments, UNDAF reviews,</li> <li>▪ Interviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ UNCT</li> <li>○ Government</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

*ANNEX 2: Consulted Documents*

Development Partner Statement for High Level Forum 2015: Effective Financing and Partnerships for Development	UN	2015
Draft Outcome Statement for the 8 <sup>th</sup> July High Level Forum on Development Effectiveness	UN	
Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Programme Support to Malawi 2012-2016 – Programme Support Document (PSD)	UNDP and GoM	2012
Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Eastern and Southern Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change –Malawi	UNDP	
The evaluation policy of UNDP	UNDP and UNFPA	2010
Government statement on effective financing and partnership for development in Malawi	GoM	2015
Joint Strategy meeting report	UNDP and GoM	2014
Draft country programme document for Malawi 2012-2016	UNDP and UNFPA	
Malawi MDG End-line survey 2014 key findings	MICS	2014
Malawi ROAR 2014	UNDP	2014
Final Country Programme Document (CPD)for Malawi	UNDP and UNFPA	2011
Malawi Country Programme Document (CPD) 2012-2016	UNICEF-Malawi	2011
Private public sector partnership on capacity building for sustainable land management (SLM) in the Shire River Basin Project- Final report	GOM	2014
Mid-term evaluation of outcome 3.1 and gender mainstreaming across all outcomes (2012-2016)	UNDP	2015
Sector working groups planning and management (SPM) guidelines	GoM	
United Nations in Malawi UNDAF Coordination Structure	UN	
UNCT- Work plan- 2015	UNDP	2015
UNDAF Coordination Matrix	United Nations	2014
UNDAF Annual Progress Report	UNDP	2014
UNDAF at a Glance- revised	UNDP	

UNDAF Division of Labour- revised	UNDP	
UNDAF Progress report (2012-2013)	UNDP	2013
Gender and climate change study in Malawi final report	GoM and UNDP	2014
UNDP outcome level evaluation: A companion guide to the handbook on planning, monitoring & evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators	UNDP	2011
UNEG Norms for evaluation in the UN system	UNEG	2005
Malawi PDNA Draft Report	GOM	2015
UNEG Standards for evaluation in the UN system	UNEG	2005
Malawi humanitarian situation report No 17 (8 April, 2015)	UNICEF	2015
Malawi humanitarian situation report No 18 (15 April, 2015)	UNICEF	2015
Malawi humanitarian situation report No 11 (25 February 2015)	UNICEF	2015
Malawi humanitarian situation report No 14 (18 March 2015)	UNICEF	2015
2014 Climate Change Project Annual report first draft	UNDP	2015
MGDS II result handbook	GOM	2012
MGDS II final document	GOM	2012
UNDAF Expanded Annual Review and Planning UNCT/PMT/M&E Review Meeting	UNICEF	2013
United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Action Plan (2012 – 2016)	UNDP	2012
United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Evaluation Report on Gender and Human Rights (2012 – 2016)	UNDP	2015
Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the UNDAF Outcome 1.2/1.3	UNDP	2015
Environment and Natural Resources Malawi (2013-2016)	GOM and UNDP	2013
Private Public Sector Partnership on Capacity Building for SLM in the Shire River Basin (Project Document)	GOM and UNDP	2010
Malawi Humanitarian Situation Report No 4 (23 January 2015)	UNICEF	2015
Malawi Humanitarian Situation Report No 5 ( 26 January 2015)	UNICEF	2015
Malawi Humanitarian Situation Report No 3 (21 January 2015)	UNICEF	2015
Malawi Humanitarian Situation Report No 6 (28 January 2015)	UNICEF	2015

Malawi Humanitarian Situation Report No (18 January 2015)	UNICEF	2015
UN-Malawi Newsletter-June 2015	UNCT	2015
UPR-Working –Group Report	UNDP	
Draft Outcome Statement	UNDP	
DRM Project Document	UNDP	2012
Early Warning Systems Project Document	UNDP	
Evaluation Policy	UNDP	2014
Final Evaluation Report CCP-AAP	UNDP	
Final Project Document SLM in the SRB Malawi	UNDP	2011
Final Report Outcome 4.2 Mid Term Evaluation	UNDP	2015
Government Statement on effective financing-HLF	GOM	2015
Guidance Midterm Review -SP	UNDP	2014
JSM 2014 Draft Report	UNDP	2014
Malawi CPD 2012-2016 Final	UN	2011
Malawi 2015 Floods Post Disaster Needs Assessment Report	UNICEF	2015
Mid Term Review of SLM	UNDP	2014
Mid-Term Evaluation Report of CPD Gender Outcome	UNDP	2015
Reference Group Meeting Minutes (August 19, 2015)	UNDP	2015
Signed ENR PSD 2013-2016	UN	
SWG Guidelines	UN	
UNCT Work Plan 2015 Draft Plan		2015
UNDP Strategic Plan	UNDP	2014
UNDAF Evaluation Final	UNCT	2015
UNDAF EARP 2013	UN	
UNDAF EARP-UNCT-PMT M and E Review Summary of Discussions	UN	

*ANNEX 3: Mission Agenda*

## UNDAF OUTCOME 1.2 MID-TERM EVALUATION

## MISSION PROGRAMME

17 August, 2015 to 2 September, 2015

Date and Time	Person(s)	Location / Institution
<b>Monday, 17 August, 2015</b>		
09:00 – 09:30	Ms. Susan Mkandawire, Procurement Associate, UNDP	UNDP
09:45– 10:45	Mr. Peter Kulemeka, UNDP M&E Specialist	UNDP
14:00 – 15:30	UNDP Sustainable Growth and Resilience team: Ms. Sithembiso Hlatshwako Mr. Sothini Nyirenda Ms. Etta Mmangisa Ms. Sarah Mclvor Ms. Tapona Manjolo	UNDP conference room B
<b>Tuesday, 18 August, 2015</b>		
09:00 – 09:45	Mr. Ben Botolo, Secretary for Natural Resource, Energy and Mining. Confirmed	Capital Hill
10:00 – 10:30	Security briefing, UNDSS	Lingadzi House
10:45 – 11:30	Ms. Tapona Manjolo, Programme Analyst, DRM.	UNDP
14:00 – 15:00	Mr. Bernard Sande, Commissioner for Disaster Management Affairs.	Capital Hill
15:30 – 16:30	Ms. Mia Seppo, UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative. TBC Ms. Carol Flore-Smrecznik, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative Mr. Peter Kulemeka, UNDP Ms. Sithembiso Hlatshwako; UNDP	UNDP
<b>Wednesday, 19 August, 2015</b>		
08:00 – 08:45	Mr. Sothini Nyirenda Ms. Sarah Mclvor Climate Change, Programme Analysts, UNDP.	UNDP

<b>15:30-16:30</b>	<b>Mr. Yanira Ntupanyama, Principal Secretary, Environment and Climate Change.</b>	<b>Millennium Challenge Account, City Centre</b>
<b>14:00– 16:00</b>	<b>Reference Group Meeting.  Ms. Sithembiso Hlatshwako, UNDP Mr. Sipho Billiat, Department of Economic Planning and Development Mr. Golden Nyasulu, Department of Energy Affairs Ms. Tapona Manjolo, UNDP Mr. Chimwemwe Yonasi, Environmental Affairs Department Mr. Peter Kulemeka, UNDP</b>	<b>UNDP Conference Room</b>
<b>Thurs, 20 August, 2015</b>		
<b>08:30 – 09:30</b>	<b>Mr. Dokani Ngwira, Secretariat for Irrigation and Water Development. Mr. Steve Mwamza, Department of Water Supply Services Mr. Price Moleta, Department of Water Resources</b>	<b>Tikwere House, City Centre</b>
<b>09:45 – 10:45</b>	<b>Mr. Michael Makonombera, Project Coordinator, Environment and Natural Resources Management.</b>	<b>Taurus House, City Centre</b>
<b>11:00 – 12:00</b>	<b>Mr. Amon Kabuli, Project Manager, Sustainable Land Management.</b>	<b>EAD, Lingadzi House</b>
<b>Friday, 21 August, 2015</b>		
<b>9:00-10:00</b>	<b>Ms. Jane Swira, Project Manager, National Climate Change</b>	<b>EAD, Lingadzi House</b>
<b>10:15 – 11:15</b>	<b>Mr. Alex Damaliphetsa, GEF- Small Grants Manager, UNDP</b>	<b>Zowe House</b>



MID - TERM EVALUATION OF UNDAF OUTCOME 1.2: MALAWI

11:20 – 12:15	Mr. John Chome, UN Habitat, Programme Manager, UNDP.	Zowe House
<b>Monday, 24 August, 2015</b>		
08:30 – 09:30	Mr. James Mbata, Technical Adviser, UNDP/UNEP.	EP&D, Capital Hill
10:00 – 10:45	Mr. Joseph Kalowekamo, Sustainable Energy Management	Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining, Capital Hill
15:00 – 15:45	World Bank	Lilongwe
16:00 – 16. 45	Ms. Jenny Brown, EU Delegation. Confirmed.	Lilongwe
<b>Tuesday, 25 August, 2015</b>		
09:00 – 09:45	Mr. Senard Mwale, DFID	British High Commission, Lilongwe
15:00 – 15:45	Mr. George Phiri FAO Mr. James Okof, FAO	FAO
<b>Wednesday, 26 August, 2015</b>		
08:30 -0 09:15	Ms. Roisin Deburca, UNICEF Deputy Representative	UNICEF House
<b>Thursday, 27 August</b>		
09:00-09.45	Mr. Kingtone Chiona, Irish Embassy Ms. Phina Rocha, Irish Embassy	Irish Embassy, Arwa House, City Centre
10.00 – 11.00	Ms. Shamiso Najira Environmental Affairs Department	Environmental Affairs Department, GoM
<b>Monday, 31 August</b>		
15:00 – 16:00	Mr. Mietek Maj, Resident Representative WFP Ms. Coco Ushiyama Mr. Duncan Ndhlovu	WFP
<b>Wednesday, 2 September</b>		
	Debriefing with UNDP Resident Representative	UNDP
	First Findings Meetings	UNDP
	Ms. Etta Mmangisa	UNDP

Organizations/stakeholders contacted via online questionnaire:

- Coordination Unit for R Environment (CURE) / Christopher Mwambene
- Development from People to People (DAPP) / Gift Vasc ; Charlotte Danckert
- Wildlife and Environment Society of Malawi (WESM) / D. Mapweresa
- Cooperative Partnership for Relief and Development (COPRED) / Jimmy Katuma

*ANNEX 4: Criteria Rating Scale*

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

*Sustainability Rating Scale*

Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

*Annex 5: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form***Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct  
for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** Maria Onestini

**Name of Consultancy Organization:** UNDP:

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed

Buenos Aires, Argentina August 5 2015