

**TERMS OF RERENCE FOR THE END OF TERM EVALUATION OF UNDP MALAWI COUNTRY PROGRAMME 2012-2016**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 **Background**

* 1. **Country Programme Components and Outcomes**

The UNDP Executive Board approved the Malawi Country Programme (CP) in September, 2011. The programme had three outcomes but four components as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CP Components** | **CP/United Nations Development Framework (UNDAF) Outcomes** |
| Sustainable Economic and Inclusive Growth | **CP/UNDAF OUTCOME 1:** National policies, local and national institutions effectively support equitable and sustainable economic growth and food security by 2016. **Related Strategic Plan focus areas:** *Energy & Environment; Crisis Prevention and Recovery* |
| Disaster Risk Management, Climate Change, Environment and Sustainable Development  |
| MDGs Achievement; Gender and HIV | **CP / UNDAF OUTCOMES 1 and 3:** Government policies, local and national institutions effectively support transparency, accountability, participatory democracy and human rights. National response to HIV/AIDS scaled up to achieve universal access to prevention, treatment, care and support**. Related Strategic Plan focus areas:** Poverty Reduction and Millennium Development Goals Achievement |
| Governance and Public Sector Management Reform | **CP / UNDAF OUTCOME 4**: National institutions effectively support transparency, accountability, participatory democracy and human rights. **Related Strategic Plan focus areas:** *Fostering Democratic Governance* |

The 2012-2016 Country Programme Document (CPD) was developed in parallel to the 2012-2016 United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and in effect the UNDP CPD was completed before the UNDAF document. Following an undertaking by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), UNDP adopted the UNDAF outcomes as its CP outcomes. However, since the CPD was finalized before the UNDAF, it meant that the UNDP CP based its outcome on an earlier version of the UNDAF. These differed from the final UNDAF outcomes.

From 4 outcomes, the final UNDAF document had 17 outcomes. What was conceived as outcomes in the initial stages became UNDAF thematic areas. In keeping with the agreement that agencies adopt relevant UNDAF outcomes, it now meant that UNDP would take on board 6 UNDAF outcomes to match the scope of its CP. The six UNDAF outcomes which became UNDP’s outcomes are as follows:

1. **Outcome 1.2:** Women, youth, people with disability and households benefit from decent employment, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016. This outcome was changed to Outcome 1.3: Productive poor benefit from decent work, income generation and pro-poor private sector growth by 2016. This was an outcome of a rationalization process conducted in 2013 which resulted in three instead of four outcomes in the thematic area of sustainable economic growth.
2. **Outcome 1.3:**  Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk by 2016. Following the rationalisation process noted earlier, this outcome was subsequently revised to become Outcome 1.2 Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016.
3. **Outcome 3.4**: The national response to HIV is evidence-informed, coordinated, sustainably resourced, efficient and based upon a supportive legal and policy environment by 2016. This outcome was later changed to: Outcome 3.2: Critical enablers for the implementation of the national response enhanced and utilized by 2016.
4. **Outcome 4.1:** National institutions foster democratic governance and human rights to promote transparency, accountability, participation and access to justice for all, especially women and children by 2016**.**
5. **Outcome 4.2:**  Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016.
6. **Outcome 4.3:**  National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016.
	1. **UNDAF Action Plan**

The UNCT resolved to develop an UNDAF Action Plan (AP) instead of individual agency Country Programme Action Plans (CPAPs). The UNDAF AP presented outputs which were expected to contribute towards each outcome. Each output listed key result areas (actions) which were required to achieve it. Each of the UN agencies determined the outcomes, outputs and key actions where they would contribute thereby making the UNDAF AP an important tool for joint programming.

Further to the UNDAF AP, UNDP opted to develop programme/project support documents (PSDs) to facilitate planning and implementation of activities towards achievement of outcomes. PSDs also facilitate multi-year budgeting and annual output target setting and tracking. Multi-year programming is particularly important where donor-support is involved and where release of funds is meant to be on annual basis. Over 25 projects have developed/implemented during the period of the evaluation. Most of the documents were approved in 2013. Although 2012 annual works plan took into account the 2012-2016 UNDAF Action Plan provisions, the scale of implementation was relatively low.

**1.3 Malawi United Nations Development Assistance Framework and UNDAF Outcome Evaluations**

The Malawi UNDAF (2012-2016) was evaluated in May, 2015. In addition, four outcomes of the UNDAF/CPD outcomes, namely: **Outcome 1.2**, *Improved management of environment, natural resources and climate change for sustainable development at national and district level by 2016*; **Outcome 4.2,**  *Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016* and **Outcome 4.3,**  *National institutions advance gender equality and status of women by 2016 have been evaluated between May and September, 2015* and UNDAF **outcome 4.1**, viz: *National institutions foster democratic governance and human rights to promote transparency, accountability, participation and access to justice for all, especially women and children by 2016* have been evaluated between May and December, 2015. These evaluations were initiated by UNDP in response to an audit query to ensure that its CP outcomes are evaluated during the course of the cycle. Hence, although there were essentially UNDAF outcome evaluations, each of them has included a specific assessment of UNDP’s contribution and performance.

In 2014, UNDP embarked on a process to align its work to its new Strategic Plan (2014-2017). The Vision of the Strategic Planis to achieve the simultaneous eradication of poverty and significant reduction of inequalities and exclusion. Among other areas, the scope of the alignment process included an assessment of targeting of beneficiaries, portfolio management, exit strategies and scale/scaling up considerations at the level of the country programme.

**1.4 Extension of the UNDAF and Country Programme**

As expected the UNDAF 2012-2016 is aligned to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II (July 2011- June, 2016). Thus, the next UNDAF, 2017-2012, was expected to be aligned the national development strategy for the period July, 2016 to June, 2021. However, due to developments in the political economy, the successor national plan to the MGDS II will not be ready in 2016. It is not certain when the plan will be ready but this is unlikely to happen before July, 2017. Consequently, the UN Country Team in Malawi has requested for a two-year extension of the current UNDAF.

1. **Purpose of the evaluation**

This end of term evaluation is carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy. In line with the Evaluation Plan of the CO, evaluations are being conducted in 2016 to assess the impact of UNDP development assistance across the major thematic and cross cutting areas of Democratic Governance and Public Sector Management, Disaster Risk Management, Climate Change, Environment and Natural Resources Management, Inclusive Sustainable Economic and Inclusive Growth, HIV and AIDS and Gender. The evaluation will capture evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of current programming, which can be used to strengthen existing programmes going forward and to set the stage for new initiatives. The evaluation serves an important accountability function, providing stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results. The will provide an opportunity for UNDP to engage key stakeholders to discuss achievements, lessons learned and adjustments required in response to an evolving development landscape and changing national priorities.

1. **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

The end of term evaluation will be conducted before the end of August, 2016, with a view to compiling what the programme has achieved while providing strategic direction and inputs to the preparation of the next country programme, specifically the evaluation will assess:

 The relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP CO support to national development agenda.

1. The programmes and strategies devised to support on to democratic governance and public sector management; environment and natural resources, disaster risk, climate change management; inclusive and sustainable economic growth, HIV/AIDS and gender, including partnership strategies, and whether they are well conceived for achieving planned objectives.
2. The progress made towards achieving the CP outcomes through specific projects and advisory services, and including contributing factors and constraints.
3. The lessons learnt from the experience with the design and implementation of programmes.

The evaluation will also take into account the findings of the UNDAF and four UNDAF/CPD outcome evaluations.

The objectives of the end of term evaluation are to:

Assess whether the outcomes and output in the Country Programme Document have been achieved or the extent to which they have been achieved;

Assess the impact of the Country Programme;

* Provide evidence of UNDP’s contribution towards the achievement of six Country Programme outcomes:
* Determine the strategic positioning and relevance of UNDP in these sectors – the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps - especially with regard to the appropriateness of their partnership strategy (including choice of beneficiaries), their Theory of Change (ToC), and any need for mid-course adjustments to meet the outcomes;

Propose areas of re-positioning and re-focusing of future CPDs within the current Malawi’s development context, and in light of UNDP’s new strategic plan;

Review of factors influencing the achievement of results;

Assess the sustainability of results achieved and likely to be achieved during the implementation of the Country Programme;

Assess the extent to which gender was mainstreamed in the design, implementation and reporting of the country programme;

* Distil lessons learnt and provide recommendation for future programming, including to inform higher level evaluations and future decision-making and planning for the remainder of the programme cycle.

**6. Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

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

**Relevance**: The extent to which the programme designed and implemented were suited to national priorities and realities:

to what extent are the outcomes and outputs of the CPD relevant and contributing towards national development priorities and outcomes such as the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) and other strategic documents.

Are the intended outputs and outcomes aligned with the key development strategies of the country? Are they consistent with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries?

Do the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the human development goals of the country?

To what extent has UNDP Malawi selected method of delivery been appropriate to the development context of the country?

Has UNDP Malawi been influential in Country debates on CPD-related initiatives and has it influenced policies on any of the thematic areas?

To what extent have UN reforms influenced UNDP Malawi’s support in the country and in what sectors?

**Effectiveness**: the extent to which the CP has achieved its intended outcomes and planned results.

* Were the stated outputs achieved? Did they contribute to the stated outcomes? What are the key development and advisory contributions that UNDP has made/is making towards the outcomes, if any?
* If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outcomes has been made as measured by the outcome indicators presented in the results framework. What evidence is there that UNDP support has contributed towards an improvement in the country’s capacity, including institutional strengthening in the themes areas of the CP?

Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming initiatives and processes?

Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP Malawi CO, is UNDP well suited to providing the respective thematic support in the country?

What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP performance in various areas of the CP?

What/How is the quality of expertise provided to the partner government institutions?

What concrete successes in policy formulation, advice and coordination have been achieved, where applicable?

How useful has the knowledge and skills transfer proven to be so far?

How effectively has the CPD been structured? How has the surrounding structure in which the CPD operates affected its delivery?

How can the effectiveness of support to the CPD be strengthened in future country programmes?

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

Are UNDP approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?

 Were the results delivered in a reasonable proportion to the operational and other costs?

Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Could a different type of intervention lead to similar results at a lower cost? How?

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

Were alternative approaches considered in designing the Projects?

**Sustainability:**

What is the likelihood that UNDP’s interventions are sustainable?

Are there exit strategies in place for different programmes and projects?

What mechanisms have been put in place by UNDP Malawi to support the government/ institutional partners to sustain improvements made through these CPD interventions?

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

**Partnership strategy**

Has the partnership strategy as indicated in the CPD and projects been appropriate and effective?

Are there current or potential complementarities or overlaps with existing regional partners’ programmes?

How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs?

Has UNDP worked effectively with other donors to deliver on the CPD initiatives?

How effective has UNDP been in partnering with civil society (where applicable) and the private sector to promote its initiatives in the Country?

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

**Human rights**

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

**Gender Equality**

To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of CPD interventions? Is gender marker data assigned the projects representative of reality

To what extent has UNDP promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects? Information collected should be checked against data from the CO Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period under review.

**Capacity Building**

• Did the CPD adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency?

• Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc. where applicable) delivered by different interventions adapted to country needs?

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

**6. Methodology and approach**

The evaluator will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including government, development partners, academicians and subject experts, private sector representatives, relevant Civil Society Organizations and UNDP staff.

The evaluation of outcomes is expected to take a “theory of change’’ (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP has supported, and observed progress in the different portfolios. The evaluator will develop, in consultation with the programme team, logic models of how UNDP interventions are expected to lead to achievement of results. The models will be validated by the Programme Leaders.

The evidence gathering will closely track the results and resources framework (RRF) for the outcomes. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

The steps in data collection are anticipated but not limited to the following: the evaluation will determine the approach best suitable to conduct the evaluation.

Desk reviews: The evaluator will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following: i) national programme documents; ii) project documents and activity reports; iii) past evaluation/ self-assessment reports; iv) client surveys on support services provided to institutions if any; v) country office reports; vi) UNDP’s corporate strategies and reports; and viii) government, media, academic publications.

Interviews and focus group discussions: The evaluator will conduct face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) at the Country Office; and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups and donors in the country. Focus groups may be organized as appropriate.

Field visits: The evaluator will visit selected programme sites to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. A case study approach will be used, as appropriate, to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the programme

1. **Deliverables**

The following reports and deliverables are required for the evaluation:

* Inception report
* Draft CP Evaluation Report
* Presentation at the validation workshop with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries)
* Lessons Learned report
* Final report on the CP Evaluation

One week after start date of the consultancy, the evaluation manager will produce an **inception report** containing the proposed theory of change for UNDPs work under the different outcomes. The inception report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. Annex 3 provides a simple matrix template. The evaluator will also propose a rating scale in order that Performance rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The inception report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables, and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. Protocols for different stakeholders should be developed. The inception report will be approved by the Deputy Resident Representative (Programme) or her designate in consultation with the Senior Management of CO before the evaluator proceed with programme visits.

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

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

See Annex 7 of the UNDP M&E Handbook for the evaluation report template and quality standards.

1. **Evaluation Required Competencies**

**Required Qualifications of the Evaluator**

* Minimum Master’s degree in economics, political science, public administration, development studies, international relations or other related social sciences;
* Minimum 7 years of professional experience in at least two subject areas of UNDP Malawi’s work: democratic governance and public sector management; environment, natural resources, disaster risk and climate change management; inclusive and sustainable growth and gender equality;
* Proven experience in leading evaluations of national policies, strategies or programmes of government and international aid organisations;
* Knowledge and experience in gender mainstreaming;
* Excellent reporting and communication skills;
* Fluent in written and spoken English.

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

 **Evaluator’s competencies:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

An evaluation Reference Group will be set up in order to ensure objectivity as well as technical soundness of the process. Specific tasks of the Reference Group will be to review and provide guidance to the evaluation process, including the evaluation questions, Inception Report, facilitate access to information, comments to draft reports, among others. The evaluation Reference Group will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluator is required to address all comments of the reference group completely and comprehensively. The Evaluator will provide a detail rationale for any comment that remain unaddressed. The composition of the Reference Group:

* Debt and Aid Management Division, Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development
* Economic Planning and Development Department, Ministry of Finance;
* Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Mining;
* Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
* Ministry of Industry, Trade and Private Sector Development
* Ministry of Gender, Child Welfare and People with Disabilities
* Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
* Public Sector Reforms Management Unit, Office of the President and Cabinet
* National Statistics Office
* UNRCO
* UN Agencies (UNFPA, UNWomen and UNICEF)
* EU
* Council for Non-Governmental Organization of Malawi (CONGOMA)
* University of Malawi
* Malawi Confederation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry (MCCCI).

**8. The End of Term Evaluation process**

The review will unfold in three phases, each of them including several steps.

1. **Inception phase**

* Document and desk review (review of all relevant documents (project documents and reports regarding the CPD 2012 -2016)
* Stakeholder mapping (a mapping of stakeholders relevant to the CPD. The mapping exercise will include government and civil society stakeholders and will indicate the relationships between different sets of stakeholders)
* Analysis of the Results and Resources Framework (Result Resource Matrix and M & E Plan).
* Finalization of the list of evaluation questions.
* Development of data collection and analysis strategy as well as concrete work plan for the field phase

At the end of this phase, the evaluator will produce an Inception report, displaying the results of the above mentioned steps and tasks.

1. **Field phase**

After the design phase, the evaluator will undertake a two‐week in‐country mission to collect and analyze the data required in order to answer the final evaluation questions, consolidated during the design phase. At the end of the Field phase, the evaluator will provide the UNDP CO with debriefing presentation on the preliminary results of the assessment, with a view to validating preliminary findings and testing tentative conclusions and/or recommendations.

1. **Synthesis phase**

During this phase, the evaluation mission will continue the analytical work initiated during the field phase and prepare a first draft of the evaluation report, taking into account comments made by the UNDP CO at the debriefing meeting. The first draft of the report will be submitted to the Reference Group for comments in writing. Based on the comments from the Reference Group, the second draft of the report will be prepared. The second draft will be presented at the In‐country validation seminar, which should be attended by the key programme stakeholders, including Implementing Partners, and UNDP staff. The final report will be drafted shortly after the validation seminar, taking into account comments made by the participants.

Availability: The consultant should be available between 1 August and 31 October, 2016.

1. **Duration of contract**

The assignment is expected to require 35 work days. UNDP will pay the consultant fees per working day. Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) will be paid per night spent at the place of the mission following UN DSA rate applicable

Payment of fees will be based on the delivery of outputs, as follows:

* 20% upon submission of acceptable inception report
* 40% upon submission of acceptable draft report
* 40% upon satisfactory completion of assignment and endorsement of the evaluation report by UNDP CO.

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

It is planned that the evaluation starts on 1 August, 2016 and shall expire on the satisfactory completion of the services of the services described above by 31 October, 2016.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMELINE - Tentative** | **ACTIVITY** |
| By end of 1st week | Contract Signature and Submission of Inception Report |
| End of 4th week | Data collection |
| End of 5th week | Preparation and Submission of Draft report  |
| End of 7th week  | Review of draft report and comments |
| End of 8th week | Stakeholders workshop |
| End of 9th week | Submission of final report |

**Annexes[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**Annex 1 – List of Key stakeholders and partners**

**Government**

Secretary to the Treasury, Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development, Lilongwe.

Chief Director, Department of Economic Planning and Development, Lilongwe

Secretary for Performance Enforcement, Performance Enforcement Department, Officer of the President and Cabinet, Lilongwe.

Principal Secretary, Office of the Vice President, Lilongwe

Principal Secretary (Administration), Office of the President and Cabinet, Lilongwe

Secretary for Human Resource Development and Management, OPC, Lilongwe

Secretary for Natural Resources, Energy and Mining, Lilongwe 3

Director, Environmental Affairs Department.

Secretary for Disaster Management Affairs, Department of Disaster Management Affairs, OPC, Lilongwe

Secretary for Local Government and Rural Development, Lilongwe

Secretary for Gender, Children, the Elderly and People with Disabilities, Lilongwe 3

Secretary for Industry, Trade and Tourism, Lilongwe 3

Secretary for Health, Lilongwe 3

Secretary for Justice and Constitutional Affairs, Lilongwe 3

Executive Secretary, Malawi Human Rights Commission, Lilongwe

Ombudsman, Office of the Ombudsman, Lilongwe

Clerk of Parliament, National Assembly, Lilongwe

Commissioner, Malawi Electoral Commission (MEC), Blantyre

Chief Executive, Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS), Blantyre

General Manager, Malawi Investment and Trade Centre, Lilongwe

Secretary, Malawi Local Government Association (MALGA), Lilongwe

Chief Executive Officer, National Aids Commission (NAC), Lilongwe

Commissioner, National Statistics Office, Zomba

Executive Secretary, Centre for Multi-Party Democracy, Lilongwe

Coordinator, Gender Coordination Network, Lilongwe

Head, DFID, Lilongwe 3

Head of Programmes, RNE Embassy, Lilongwe 3

Head of Development, Irish Embassy, Lilongwe 3

Head of Economic Section, EU Delegation to Malawi, Lilongwe 3

Head of Programmes, Flanders Government, Lilongwe 3

Country Manager, World Bank, Lilongwe 3

**Annex 2 - Documents to be consulted**

* Malawi UNDAF 2012-2016
* Country Programme Document 2012-2016
* UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017)
* All programme documents (2012-2016)
* National Human Development Report
* Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II
* Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) II Comprehensive Review Report, March, 2016
* Malawi Millennium Development Report – End Period, September, 2015
* UNDAF Evaluation Report, May, 2015
* Outcomes 1.2; 4.1; 4.2 and 4.3 Mid-Term Evaluation Reports
* High Level Forum Report, 2015

**Annex 3 - Evaluation Matrix**

|  |
| --- |
| **EVALUATION MATRIX** |
| **Relevant****evaluation****criteria** | **Key****Questions** | **Specific****Sub-****Questions** | **Data****Sources** | **Data collection****Methods/Tools** | **Indicators/****Success****Standard** | **Methods for Data Analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. *Annexes 1, 2 are part of the project documents. Annex 3 will be given when the contracts have been signed. Annex 5 will be provided with the contract for signature* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)