

Inception Report

Final Programme Evaluation

Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme (DEAP)



Particip GmbH

Merzhauser Str. 183

79100 Freiburg, Germany

Tel. +49-761-79074-0

Fax +49-761-79074-90 particip@particip.de

Commissioned by
European Commission
Lilongwe

8 November 2018

Table of Contents

1. Context of the Evaluation	3
1.1 Country Background.....	3
1.2 DEAP Background	3
2. Comments on the Terms of Reference and Facilities provided	4
2.1 Comments on the Terms of Reference.....	4
2.2 Possible Risks	4
2.3 Data, services, and facilities to be provided by the Client	5
2.3.1 Data Availability.....	5
2.3.2 Facilities.....	5
3. Methodology and Work Plan	6
3.1 Evaluation Framework.....	6
3.2 Evaluation Questions	7
3.2.1 Relevance.....	8
3.2.2 Efficiency.....	8
3.2.3 Effectiveness.....	8
3.2.4 Impact and Sustainability	9
3.2.5 EU Value Addition	9
3.3 Data Collection Methods	9
3.3.1 Secondary Data Collection	9
3.3.2 Primary Data Collection	10
3.4 Data Analysis.....	10
3.5 Phases of the Evaluation	10
3.6 Planned Activities	11
3.7 Time Schedule	11

1. Context of the Evaluation

1.1 Country Background

1. Despite having posted some positive growth in the past, Malawi has remained economically constrained and has continued to face several developmental challenges that include a frail human capital base; weak social indicators; high incidence of HIV and AIDS; and environmental degradation. Given the country's high level of poverty and vulnerability to shocks, food security has remained a critical issue in the country, resulting in this issue dominating the Government's policy and development agenda.

2. The government has been responding to the country's development challenges through its Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) with the first one covering the 2006-2011 period, followed by MGDS II (2011-2016). In 2018, the country launched MGDS III, which calls for a renewed global partnership to support their respective ambitious targets for Africa's socio-economic transformation and for leaving no one behind in national development. With this new orientation, the need for development effectiveness has become more pronounced and one that focuses on greater result-orientation of public institutions. In spite of the demonstrated enthusiasm to make a positive difference, the country has continued to suffer from quite serious obstacles to growth and development, which include human and institutional capacity challenges. The persistent weaknesses of aligning policies, programmes and budgets have constrained effective service delivery. The credibility of the Government budget has continued to be undermined by the weak links between the MTEF and the MGDS planning process.

3. There also exist disabling challenges with respect to weak public financial management systems. Similarly, results-oriented planning and the national M&E Framework have remained weak in important respects, including frail and under-funded institutional structures and lack of sufficient incentives to motivate both the supply of, and demand for, solid evidence that informs decision and policy making. These challenges are compounded by the reality that Results-Based Management (RBM) practices are rarely used in the Government's planning, budgeting and M&E systems. Presently, there is very little alignment of the planning, budgeting and M&E functions and the data that is available is rarely reliable and/or complete and it is hardly gender disaggregated. Differences in data collection tools and methodologies have worsened this state of affairs. For instance, data on Malawi's poverty rate from the Integrated Household Survey results does not tally with that from Welfare Monitoring Surveys. The existing skills gaps in data collection and analysis contributes to the weak integrity of statistical data that is needed for informed decision making.

1.2 DEAP Background

4. The Development Effectiveness and Accountability Programme (DEAP) whose main Implementing Partner (IP) is the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development, is a joint programme funded by the European Union (EU) and three United Nations agencies, namely, UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women. UNDP and the EU signed a Contribution Agreement that allowed for the pooling of their resources while UNICEF and UN Women, on the other hand, provided parallel financing. The main Outcome of the Programme is stated as: *"Public Institutions are better equipped to manage, allocate, and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery."* DEAP, thus, targeted the support of national institutions to enable them become more results-oriented and to improve the synergies between planning, M&E and aid management functions. Key strategic areas of support under DEAP include (a) institutionalizing Results-Based Management practices in the public sector; (b) harmonization and alignment of development planning and budgeting tools, including the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) and the national budget to support implementation of MGDS priorities; and (c) strengthening capacity for development assistance management. The Programme has three Intermediate Objectives/Outputs that primarily focus on capacity enhancement of government systems and institutions. These are as follows:

- (a) National Institutions utilize results-based management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results.
- (b) National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national

development strategies and Agenda 2030, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), for efficient achievement of development results.

- (c) Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance.

2. Comments on the Terms of Reference and Facilities provided

2.1 Comments on the Terms of Reference

5. The Terms of Reference (ToR) are well articulated and do provide a good basis for carrying out the assignment. The main objectives of this Evaluation are clear, namely, to provide the European Union, interested stakeholders and the wider public with the following:

- (a) An independent assessment of DEAP past performance focusing on the determination of the quality of *Results* (i.e. the entire results chain, namely, outputs, outcomes and impacts) as measured against the Programme's stated objectives.
- (b) Key lessons and recommendations that would inform future interventions.

6. In the context of the above, this Evaluation will critically assess DEAP performance focusing on the main enabling factors that have resulted in positive effects as well as the identification of factors that have hampered positive outturns. The aim is to inform and enlist learned experiences and best practices that could be useful in the programming and implementation of future similar programmes.

7. The Consultants further understand that the Evaluation will assess DEAP using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact (see for details Methodology in Section 2). In addition, the Evaluation will assess two EU-specific evaluation criteria as follows:

- (a) the EU added value, which will relate to the extent to which DEAP has added benefits derived from member states of the regional body.
- (b) the coherence of DEAP with the EU Strategy in the areas of DEAP support as well as with other EU policies and Member State interventions.

8. It is further appreciated that the Consultants are expected to consider whether a number of cross-cutting issues have effectively been integrated in the DEAP at the design, operational and monitoring levels. These will include the promotion of human rights; gender equality; democracy; good governance; rights of children and Malawian citizens; environmental sustainability; and, particularly for Malawi with the high prevalence levels of HIV and AIDS, combating the pandemic.

2.2 Possible Risks

9. There are no anticipated serious risks that could adversely affect the ability of the Consultants to come up with reasonable findings and recommendations. There are, nevertheless, a few aspects that could affect the quantity of data that is collected as well as the depth of analysis. *Firstly*, there is evidence that the breadth of DEAP activities under each one of the three broad Outputs brings with it the challenge of how much the two consultants, with about 28 days each, could meaningfully collect all the information and analyse it with the sort of detail deserving of a complex Programme such as the DEAP. Although the ToR allocates 4 weeks for the Field Phase, only 2 weeks is available since the first of the 3 weeks Malawi mission has been spent for the programmed Inception Phase. In any case, spending 4 weeks on fieldwork alone would exhaust all the 28 days contracted for the entire work, leaving no provision for analysis. Due to the time limitation, there has to be trade-offs between opting for either (a) allocating a longer duration in the field collecting more data

(which would result in leaving insufficient time for handling the sort of in-depth analysis that would adequately inform future programming) or (b) spending more time analysing secondary data but at the risk of having collected insufficient fresh data that better reflects what is currently on the ground. DEAP literally includes almost all the strategic areas of government functions in the area of capacity building/enhancement. Thus, apart from covering central government functions in Lilongwe, the Consultants are to collect data in three districts and without the help of research assistants, which means that their limited time within Malawi has to be skilfully apportioned.

10. *Secondly*, preliminary analysis has revealed that, beyond the main focus areas of DEAP, adequate time has to be spent on the Malawi political economy analysis (PEA) to the extent that the success of a good number of activities under the Programme seems to depend, to a considerable extent, on the political will and on wider macro-level structural and systemic considerations. Without handling this adequately, conclusions drawn primarily upon the assessment of DEAP activities could be misleading. The allocation in the ToR of only one week (5 person-days) to the Synthesis Phase of the assignment (i.e. analysis) clearly underestimated not only the magnitude, breadth and complexity of the DEAP, but that it did so at the risk of reducing the depth and quality of analysis. In the light of this reality, perhaps the most serious risk at this level relates the lack of realism regarding (a) what can realistically be expected to be done within the timeline and person-days provided and (b) the anticipated quality of the Consultants' output.

11. *Thirdly*, considering the diversity of the DEAP activities and how widespread they are countrywide, the time limit of this evaluation, combined with the limited number of personnel to make a meaningful coverage, call for skill in sampling respondents. Since the evaluation has not been designed in this manner, the Consultants will have to significantly depend on secondary data sources with limited interview coverage, thus, bringing in the risk of having to draw conclusions on insufficient data and information which, in turn, has the potential to compromise the quality of results and recommendations. In a situation where there are sufficient reviews previously undertaken that could allow the evaluation to be largely deskwork, this risk could have been averted or reduced significantly. However, although there was a review of the DEAP in 2017, it is generally felt that its quality cannot adequately help in addressing the data/information requirements of the current evaluation.

12. *Fourthly*, there is always the risk of non-availability of key informants. At the central government level, the inaccessibility or non-availability to the Consultants of key senior officials could affect the quality of analysis especially where systemic issues have to be factored in to better understand and interpret challenges at the DEAP operational levels. The amount – and level – of backstopping the Consultants would receive from the Client by way of having someone “open doors” for them could help in securing high profile interviews, thus, reduce this risk significantly.

13. *Lastly*, the professional mix of the evaluators/consultants and their competence and experience in analysis of complex programmes such as DEAP also matter. This calls the Team leader to ensure that that not only are the Consultants sufficiently supported but that they possess individual drive and discipline to remain focused and collaboratively handle complex analytical tasks under very tight timelines.

2.3 Data, services, and facilities to be provided by the Client

2.3.1 Data Availability

14. Based on preliminary discussions with Government officials as well as the EU and UNDP, in addition to having taken into account the documentation that has been made available to the Consultants, it is clear that there exists sufficient information/data that should form a good basis for responding adequately to the Terms of Reference.

2.3.2 Facilities

15. The Government has facilitated office space for the Consultants.

2.4 Management and Steering of the evaluation

16. The Reference Group that has been established for this evaluation shall superintend over the evaluation and will perform the following functions:

- (a) To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and stakeholders.
- (b) To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- (c) To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- (d) To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team.
- (e) To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- (f) To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

3. Methodology and Work Plan

3.1 Evaluation Framework

17. A distinctive feature of the preferred methodology is the Comprehensive Evaluation Framework (CEF), which is developed from the Theory of Change (ToC) of the interventions under DEAP. This methodological approach fully encapsulates the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability which this Evaluation intends to guide the evaluation questions. The starting point will be to take the ToC and translate this into a rigorous CEF. The CEF will be structured in a manner that will take into account the way in which development partners, through their support to DEAP, have contributed to the realisation of capacity enhancement as guided by the goal and objectives of the Programme.

18. In the Terms of Reference's section on Methodology, it is stated that "the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation (Theory of Change) of the logic of the Action [i.e. DEAP] that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain." While recognizing the merits of the Theory of Change (ToC), it is still important to appreciate why this theory is more helpful for this level of analysis when it is blended with the Logical Framework Approach (LFA), complimented by the Results-Based Management (RBM) Approach. ToC is a fairly new methodology that helps to map out the assumptions which inform planned interventions and, in this regard, it is often regarded as an essential tool in designing and appreciating the complex network of factors that influence project outcomes. Notwithstanding this, ToC is currently more amiable to the programming of new interventions (i.e. at the design stage) and adopts a highly participatory process whereby groups and stakeholders in a planning process articulate their long-term goals and identify the conditions they believe have to unfold for those goals to be met. These conditions are modeled under ToC as desired outcomes, arranged graphically in a causal framework. Using relevant stakeholders/groups, ToC describes the types of interventions that would bring about the outcomes depicted in the "outcomes framework map." Using a highly animated and logical process, each intervention is tied to an outcome in the causal framework, revealing the often complex web of activity required to bring about change. As an evaluation tool, ToC identifies the specific goals of the programme under review and ties those goals to particular interventions, exactly in the manner the LFA and RBM function, thus, revealing the three approaches' complementarity. Unlike in the case of the LFA, however, ToC maps out the initiative through stages employing "*backwards mapping*" from the long-term goal by working out the preconditions or requirements necessary to achieve that goal.

19. Backwards mapping, which is a key component of the ToC planning experience, begins with the identification of the long-term outcome and working back toward the earliest changes that need to occur. This is a departure from some of the more conventional planning approached for it starts with asking "What preconditions must exist for the long-term outcome to be reached?" rather than beginning with "What activities should be undertaken to advance programme goals?" It is worth noting, however, that many other planning models presently, including the LFA, begin with the identification of the vision, mission and goals well before getting to activities. In this regard, most professionals in programming and evaluation agree that

ToC is more helpful in structuring the thought process when designing a programme than as a tool to evaluate the outcome of a programme or project that never used it during design stage. It is noteworthy that the development of DEAP did not employ the ToC, which gives credence to the need to compliment it the approaches that it used at the design stage as well as enrich it with those methodologies that place a higher premium of achievement of results/impact. In the light of this reality, important elements of the Logical Framework Approach (LFA), which was used during DEAP design, complimented by the RBM methodology, which the UN System and OECD-DAC have endorsed in their evaluation Guidelines for this kind of work, shall be adopted for this evaluation.

20. With the advent of RBM, the M&E community has now modified LFA so as to render it more *results-oriented* and less input-focused, which makes the approach compliment to the ToC methodology that is more useful in programme design. Suffice to mention that LFA is both an analytical and management tool, which helps at the following levels:

- (a) establish a logical hierarchy of means by which objectives are reached;
- (b) identify the potential risks in achieving objectives, sustainable outcomes and impacts;
- (c) present a summary of the project/programme in a standard format using the standard criteria of relevant, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability; and
- (d) monitor and review the achievements of a project/programme during implementation and evaluation with pre-defined indicators.

21. RBM, which blends well with ToC and LFA, is particularly handy in coming up with *Lessons Learnt*, which the Terms of Reference have placed a high premium upon in this evaluation. At the core of “results-based thinking” under RBM is the concept of the *results chain*, a schematic illustration of the intended causal relationships between various elements of an intervention over time. The results chain clearly shows the plausible, causal relationships among the elements, while also clarifying the various cyclical processes and feedback loops planners, implementers and evaluators need to be aware of. The basic rationale under RBM is to plan from right to left by initially focusing on impact and intended outcome and then identifying the outputs, activities, and inputs required to achieve them. Tracking performance then goes from left to right, feeding information back to inputs and activities to make necessary adjustments and improvements, thus, leading to better *results*. The UN System has actually adopted the RBM as a useful approach to programme design, management, monitoring and evaluation. The core of RBM is its focus on desired *outcomes*, thus, making it a natural complement to ToC for the evaluation of DEAP given the focus of the ToR. RBM’s introduction of the notion of ‘Managing for development results,’ thus, directly speaks to the ‘Development Effectiveness’ thrust that has replaced ‘Aid Effectiveness’ under the current development thinking that started with the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness. RBM thrust need not be seen as a contradiction to ToC but ought to be recognized as an important addition to the sharpening of evaluation tools for it goes beyond the traditional focus on input delivery and activities and places stress not only on the achievement of outputs but, more importantly, *outcomes* and *impact*. In this regard, the recognition of the relevance of LFA and RBM as important tools in structuring the DEAP evaluation thrust (including the crafting of Evaluation Questions) should be seen as a compliment to, and improvement over, the ToC.

3.2 Evaluation Questions

22. Based on the standard DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, and complimented by the essential elements of ToC, LFA and RBM, the following are the proposed Evaluation Questions that are meant to guide the structuring of enquiry during the evaluation of DEAP. These EQs are meant to be broad guides during both primary data collection (guiding what questions to pose in either structured and unstructured interviews) and during secondary data collection (in targeting the relevant documentation). They are not meant to double as questionnaires. Thus, under each broad EQ, several questions can pose during an interview.

3.2.1 Relevance

23. Under the issue of the *relevance* of DEAP, the Consultants will focus on matching the stated objectives of the Programme, as specified in the Programme Document, to the felt needs on the ground. In this regard, the focus will be on examining whether the problems at the national and local levels have been adequately and appropriately addressed in the Programme design and in the subsequent implementation to achieve the desired results. Particular attention shall be placed on the topics of (a) Programme Based Budgeting and (c) Results Based Management, and (c) unexpected outputs produced while addressing identified problems. In this regard, the Evaluation will aim to answer the following questions.

- (a) Has the Programme design, implementation and monitoring adequately addressed the capacity enhancement challenges at the national and local levels?
- (b) Is Programme-based Budgeting system relevant to addressing the current developmental challenges in Malawi?
- (c) Is RBM relevant to the current conditions in Malawi?
- (d) Were there any unexpected DEAP outputs produced while addressing identified problems?

3.2.2 Efficiency

24. At this level, the Consultants will examine how the governance arrangements have affected DEAP implementation. Close attention shall be paid to (a) leadership and commitment aspects; (b) political economy; and (c) synergies and mutual reinforcement of project components. In this respect, the Evaluation will aim to answer the following questions.

- (a) To what extent have DEAP governance arrangements impacted on Programme implementation?
- (b) To what extent have DEAP outputs been efficient and cost effective, including demonstration of value for money?
- (c) Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that the Programme had put in place help to ensure that interventions were managed efficiently?
- (d) Has DEAP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in Malawi?
- (e) Has the choice of staffing affected DEAP implementation and achievement of results? In particular focus should be on the choice between internal (government in-house expertise) and external consultants for project implementation.

3.2.3 Effectiveness

25. At this level, the aim is to establish whether DEAP's interventions have resulted in desirable outcomes and whether they have positively impacted the national systems in terms of effectiveness in service delivery. In this regard, the following EQs will guide the evaluation of effectiveness of DEAP:

- (a) To what extent have outcomes been achieved or positive progress towards their achievement recorded?
- (b) How have corresponding outputs delivered by the Programme affected the outcomes and in what ways have they not been effective?
- (c) What evidence is there that DEAP has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening?
- (d) To what extent has DEAP been effective in supporting national and local initiatives for MDGs/SDGs fulfilment? Considered in aggregate, are these initiatives producing nationally significant results?
- (e) Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the implementing partners supporting DEAP, to what extent were their aid management systems and structures inclined towards effectiveness in meeting the capacity enhancement aspirations of DEAP?
- (f) Is DEAP perceived by stakeholders as a strong vehicle for improving development effectiveness and accountability in Malawi?

- (g) How effective have DEAP partners been in partnering with each other as well as with civil society and private sector towards the enhancing transparency and accountability in the systems and structures that the Programme has supported?

3.2.4 Impact and Sustainability

26. At this level, the EQs focus on the degree to which Government could preserve and enhance the benefits of the achieved results so as to be able to continue improving its overall performance. In this respect, the following EQs will guide the assessment of the impact and sustainability of DEAP interventions:

- (a) To what extent does the government show signs of internal capacity, particularly at the level of accountability, to preserve and enhance the benefits of the achieved outputs and to continue improving overall Government performance.
- (b) What mechanisms have been set in place by DEAP partners to support the government of Malawi to sustain results of the programme? Is there an exit strategy in place to secure continuity after DEAP?
- (c) What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships under DEAP with national institutions, Civil Society Organisations, UN Agencies, private sector and other development partners in Malawi in order to promote long term sustainability of interventions?

3.2.5 EU Value Addition

27. To what extent has the contribution by the EU to the DEAP added value in the light of the nature of the multiple financing partners, particularly regarding complementarity and coordination?

34. The EQs will include an assessment of the extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring of DEAP interventions have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

- (a) *Human rights*: To what extent have the poor, indigenous peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from DEAP?
- (b) *Gender Equality*: (i) To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring under DEAP interventions? Is gender marker data assigned to projects representative of reality (ii) To what extent has support under DEAP promoted positive changes in gender equality?

28. Appendix 1 presents the **Evaluation Matrix** showing the EQs, data source, data collection methods, and judgment criteria/indicators.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

29. Both primary and secondary data collection will be employed to get the required information upon which analysis shall be undertaken. The Consultants will identify the relevant documentation guided by preliminary analysis of the situation on the ground. and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action. Below is the description of data collection approach.

3.3.1 Secondary Data Collection

30. This will entail the collection of existing/published data, which will include the following sources:

- (a) Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to DEAP
- (b) Malawi 11th EDF Country Strategy Paper and Indicative Programmes
- (c) Malawi Growth and Development Strategy III 2017-22
- (d) Development Cooperation Strategy 2014-2018
- (e) Malawi Public Sector Reform Strategy
- (f) PFEMR Programme
- (g) FED/2014/339941 Grant Agreement and Financing agreement and respective addenda
- (h) Annual Progress Reports of DEAP
- (i) EC's Result-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Report

- (j) DEAP's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations
- (k) Audit reports
- (l) Relevant documentation from national/local partners and other donors
- (m) Calendar and minutes of Steering Committee
- (n) Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations

3.3.2 Primary Data Collection

31. Consultants will undertake fieldwork during which primary data shall be collected which will aim to fill the gaps established from secondary data. Most interviews shall be conducted in Lilongwe. However, Field visits to selected districts will be made. The following districts have been chosen:

- (a) Mchinji
- (b) Zomba
- (c) Lilongwe

32. In the light of the above, Appendix 2 presents the interventions that will be targeted during data collection (primary and secondary data) with the lead consultant shown for each one of the three Outputs.

3.4 Data Analysis

33. Based on secondary and primary data collected, the Consultants shall analyse the data/information collected using, to the extent possible, the ToC approach complimented my elements of LFA and RBM, in determining the performance of DEAP. Focus at the analysis level will be the determination of achievements to date and what could be derived from the results of the analysis in terms of lessons learned for future support to Malawi particularly in the area of capacity enhancement for development effectiveness and accountability. Based on the analysis, overarching conclusions will be drawn on DEAP results as well as recommendations on how the potential funding partners, in particular, should adjust their programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, and capacities to ensure that interventions that support capacity enhancement could achieve the intended results.

3.5 Phases of the Evaluation

34. The assignment will consist of four main stages, which translate into the main deliverables. They are as follows.

Inception Phase: The Inception phase aims to come up with a roadmap for the fulfilment of the assignment by the Consultants. In this regard, the Consultants will demonstrate their appreciation and understanding of the scope of the work by way of elaboration on what will be done; how it will be done (including the Methodology, which will include a demonstration of how the Evaluation would be informed by a reconstructed Intervention Logic as well as the Theory of Change); and comment on any other aspects that the commissioning agency may have overlooked in ensuring that the deliverables respond adequately to the stated aim of the evaluation. Any issues that remain unclear regarding the assignment will be clarified during this Phase and a full agreement reached between the Consultants and the Evaluation Reference Group that will oversee this work. In this respect, the Inception Phase will elaborate on the Evaluation's background followed by a kick-off meeting with the Client. Any potential risks that could compromise the smooth discharge of the Consultants' work would be identified, discussed and solutions agreed upon. The Inception Report would finally be produced, which will be discussed with the Client and adopted as the Evaluation's roadmap.

Field Phase: Following the approval by the Client of the Inception Report, fieldwork will be carried out guided by the Evaluation Questions (EQs) and a preliminary report prepared

by the Consultants and presented to the Client for discussion by the Evaluation Reference Group. This will be followed by a Stakeholder Validation Workshop on the preliminary findings.

Synthesis Phase: This phase will include the preparation of the Final Report based on in-depth analysis of the collected primary and secondary data. The Consultants will, firstly, produce the *Draft Final Report*, which will be presented to the Evaluation Reference Group that will comment on it and subsequently offer written comments for consideration by the Consultants as they prepare the *Final Report*, which will be accompanied by an *Executive Summary*.

3.6 Planned Activities

35. As demonstrated above, the Evaluation process will be three-phased, namely, Inception Phase, Field Phase, and a Synthesis Phase. The activities under each one of the three phases are shown in Appendix 3, which also indicates the expected deliverables at the end of each phase.

3.7 Time Schedule

36. Appendix 4 presents the activities that will be undertaken by the Consultants, also showing the locations where they will be carried out; when they will be undertaken; and the Consultants' respective inputs.

Appendices

Evaluation Matrix

DEAP Outcome: “Public Institutions are better equipped to manage, allocate, and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery.”

Outputs:

1. *Intermediate Objective 1:* National Institutions utilize results-based management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results.
2. *Intermediate Objective 2:* National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and Agenda 2030, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), for efficient achievement of development results.
3. *Intermediate Objective 3:* Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Judgement Criteria/ Indicators
Relevance	1. Has the Programme design, implementation and monitoring adequately addressed the capacity enhancement challenges at the national and local levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme Document • UNDP (those involved in DEAP design) • Government • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary data collection • Review of all relevant documentation collected. • Interrogation of the appropriateness, relevance and clarity of the objectives, strategies, activities, institutional housing/location, and M&E protocols related to DEAP interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of well-argued Programme Document with clearly-defined Programme objectives, outputs, operational/management and reporting system, appropriate M&E, informed assumptions, adequate resources
	2. Is Programme-Based Budgeting system relevant to addressing the current developmental challenges in Malawi?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary data • PBB concept Notes and rationale 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree to which PBB speaks to the MGDS goals and objectives
	3. Is RBM relevant to the current conditions in Malawi?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary data • AWP and Annual Reports • MGDS progress reports • DEAP AWP and Budgets • Non-state actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unstructured questions/interviews. Discussion with DEAP partners and stakeholders, generally interrogating the process adopted during activity/output design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevance of RBM at planning, implementation and monitoring levels
	4. Were there any unexpected DEAP outputs produced while addressing identified problems?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary sources, including previous reviews of DEAP • UNDP • Government • NSAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion with beneficiaries, including those in districts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of unexpected DEAP outputs

Efficiency	1. To what extent have DEAP governance arrangements impacted positively on Programme implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government officials Secondary data Minutes of Steering Committee meetings AWPs and Annual Reports MGDS progress reports DEAP AWPs and Budgets Non-state actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews (DPs, Government, SWGs, stakeholders) Establish whether the resource envelope (financial, technical and human) is sufficient/appropriate to meet the set objectives/Outputs and then look at the efficiency of resource use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The degree of support the national system has been supportive of DEAP operationalization (systemic issues)
	2. To what extent have DEAP outputs been efficient and cost effective, including demonstration of value for money?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managers of DEAP activities/interventions Secondary data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the M&E institutional frameworks within Government, EC and UNDP that have been established to manage/implement the DEAP interventions and assess the RBM entry point. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost effectiveness in the delivery of services under DEAP and the degree of sustainability of the interventions The degree to which financial reports have revealed impropriety in resource use/application. The ease with which resources were being disbursed The effectiveness and efficiency of accountability system Low level of resource wastage
	3. Did the monitoring and evaluation systems that DEAP had put in place help to ensure that interventions were managed efficiently?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing M&E tools MGDS progress reports UNDAF M&E protocols Government officials EC and UNDP officials Project/interventions/activities managers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the systems and processes employed by UNDP with respect to its support to the rolling out of RBM Assessment of the nature and extent of interface between UNDP operations and the relevant arms of the Malawi Government and establish whether this is supportive of the realization of efficiency gains <i>vis-a-vis</i> RBM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The internal consistency of the national M&E system The efficacy of the M&E system, including how inclusive it has been. The quality of data used in the monitoring function. Quality of Programme evaluations Appropriateness of the feedback loop to improve implementation and taking timely corrective measures.
	4. Has DEAP been efficient in building synergies and leveraging with other programmes and stakeholders in Malawi?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP Government NSAs 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which DEAP established strong synergies and created bridges among stakeholders. The extent to which DEAP has succeeded to complement other ongoing capacity enhancement

				<p>initiatives, which include the Public Financial and Economic Management Reform Programme (PFEM RP) and the JICA effort that seeks to improve the effectiveness of the Public Sector Investment Programme as well as the work of Norway and DFID supporting capacity building at the National Statistical Office</p>
	<p>5. Has the choice of staffing affected DEAP implementation and achievement of results? (Focus should be on the choice between internal (government in-house expertise) and external consultants for project implementation).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government officials • DPs • Project/interventions/activities managers • NSAs/Civil society organisations 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of personnel measured against their productivity in terms of attaining set delivery targets
Effectiveness	<p>1. To what extent have outcomes been achieved or positive progress towards their achievement recorded?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government officials at national and district levels • Secondary data reviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of all relevant documentation collected. • Examination of the partnership strategies between UNDP, EU and Government under DEAP and establish whether these were/are well conceived for achieving planned objectives and in a sustainable manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well national and local initiatives have been towards championing the MDGs/SGDs Agenda. • The extent to which nationally-significant results have been produced
	<p>2. How have corresponding outputs delivered by the Programme affected the outcomes and in what ways have they not been effective?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU, UNDP, Government, SWGs • DEAP Annual reports • AWP and budgets • Annual Reports 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective, based on evidence, has DEAP contributed to the improvement of national institutional capacity to deliver development.
	<p>3. What evidence is there that DEAP has contributed towards an improvement in national government capacity, including institutional strengthening?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU, UNDP, Government, SWGs • DEAP Annual reports • AWP and budgets • 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of DEAP to deliver on sustainably building the country's capacity requirements.
	<p>4. To what extent has DEAP been effective in supporting national and local initiatives for MDGs/SDGs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP • Government 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of linkages between MDGs/SDGs and their achievements

	fulfilment? Considered in aggregate, are these initiatives producing nationally significant results?			
	5. Taking into account the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the implementing partners supporting DEAP, to what extent were their aid management systems and structures inclined towards effectiveness in meeting the capacity enhancement aspirations of DEAP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP • Government • UNICEF • Other DPs 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree to which DPs systems are aligned to enhancement of capacities of recipient systems • Level of trust in operating under national systems measured by donor use of local structures
	6. Is DEAP perceived by stakeholders as a strong vehicle for improving development effectiveness and accountability in Malawi?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSAs/CSOs • Academics • 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of faith/trust in DEAP among stakeholders measured by amount of satisfaction with, and benefits derived from, DEAP interventions.
	7. How effective have DEAP partners been in partnering with each other as well as with civil society and private sector towards the enhancing transparency and accountability in the systems and structures that the Programme has supported?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary data analyses • CSOs • DPs 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of cooperation and collaboration among DPs that contributed to the DEAP activities • Level of cooperation and collaboration between DPs and NSAs
Impact & Sustainability	1. To what extent does the government show signs of internal capacity, particularly at the level of accountability, to preserve and enhance the benefits of the achieved outputs and to continue improving overall Government performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU, UNDP, Government, SWGs • DEAP Annual reports • AWP's and budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Secondary data reviews 	(a) The degree to which the achievements under DEAP are to survive external support or significant reduction in such support.
	2. What mechanisms have been set in place by DEAP partners to support the government of Malawi to sustain results of the Programme? Is there an exit strategy in place to secure continuity after DEAP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU • UNDP • Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Secondary data sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the DEAP ideals will be sustained
	3. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships under DEAP with national institutions, Civil Society Organisations, UN Agencies, private sector and other development partners in Malawi in order to promote long term sustainability of interventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU • UNDP • Government (Lilongwe and districts) • NSAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existence of a clear Exit Strategy for DEAP that will guarantee continuity founded on built capacities

DEAP activities to be evaluated

Note: The blue shaded activities have been identified by Government as being important for additional focus

	Activity	Lead Consultant
Output 1: Public institutions utilize RBM systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results.		
1	Institutionalization of RBM in ministries and districts <ul style="list-style-type: none">District orientation sessions in RBM practice & practical RBM resource handbook	Dr. Stephen Chipika
2	Support to establish sustainable training capacity in RBM, MGDS/MDG planning	
3	Practical application of Results-Based Management, Performance-based Budgeting, and Human Rights Based Approach	
4	Government institutional capacity to undertake MGDS annual reviews	
5	Strengthening the National M&E system <ul style="list-style-type: none">Support to various district councils to set up M&E frameworksDevelopment of IPMIS proto-typeCustomization of SPSS training at Chancellor CollegeImprovement in data analysis and reporting skills	
6	Support to NSO's National Statistical System	
7	Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS) in Health & Education <ul style="list-style-type: none">Improvement in accountability and use of public resources	
8	Capacity strengthening in Community-Based Monitoring	
9	Support towards linking District Data Banks to budgeting	
10	Development of capacities and instruments for the Organizational Performance Assessment process (OPA) in public sector institutions (Performance Contracts)	
Output 2: National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and Agenda 2030, including the Sustainable Development Goals(SDGs), for efficient achievement of development results.		
11	Improvement in the alignment of policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategy and the MDGs on the basis of RBM	Prof. Oliver Saasa
12	Application of RBM in at least 10 pilot districts and 5 sectors	
13	Strengthening Sector Working Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none">To operationalize ailing SWGs	
14	Piloting of Programme Based Budgeting	
15	Support the development of successor MDGS II and the 2030 Agenda/SDGs	
Intermediate Objective 3: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance		
16	Upgrading of Aid Management Platform (AMP) and CS-DRMS systems.	Prof. Oliver Saasa
17	Provision of capacity building support for strengthening debt and aid management function.	
18	Support to the formulation of Aid and debt policy and strategy.	
19	Improved preparations for Common Approach to Budget Support (CABS) group meetings and High Level Forum (HLF) dialogue	

Phases of the Evaluation and Key Activities

Phase	Location	Key activities	Deliverables
Inception	Home-based and Malawi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary data collection (documents and limited interviews) Preliminary reviews and analysis of collected data/information Methodological design, including reconstruction of Intervention Logic and ToC description Preparation/finalization of Evaluation Questions (EQs) 	(a) Kick-off meeting with the Evaluation Reference Group (b) Draft Inception Report (slide presentation) (c) Final Inception Report
Field	Malawi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collection (both primary and secondary) and limited analysis Preparation of working notes by the Consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intermediary Note: Presentation of Preliminary Findings to Reference Group
Synthesis	Home-based	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final analysis of findings Preparation of Draft Final Report Preparation of Final Report 	(a) Draft Final Report (b) Stakeholder Validation Workshop on findings & recommendations (c) Executive Summary (d) Final Report

Time Schedule for Consultants

	Activity	Location	October 2018					November 2018																														
			27	28	29	30	31	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	
Inception Phase																																						
1	Review of Documentation by Consultants	Zambia / Zimbabwe																																				
2	Consultants arrive in Lilongwe	Lilongwe																																				
3	Kick-off meeting with Client																																					
4	Consultants prepare Inception Report	Lilongwe																																				
5	Submission of Draft Inception Report	Lilongwe																																				
8	Submission of Final Inception Report	Lilongwe																																				
Field Phase																																						
9	Data collection: Documents and interviews: Lilongwe	Lilongwe																																				
10	Data collection: Documents and interviews: Out of Lilongwe	Malawi																																				
	Analysis & Preparation of Intermediary Note																																					
12	Presentation of Preliminary Findings (Intermediary Note) to Reference Group	Lilongwe																																				
17	Consultants leave Malawi	Lilongwe																																				
Synthesis Phase																																						
18	Preparation of Draft Final Report	Lusaka & Harare																																				
19	Prof. Saasa joins Dr. Chipika in Harare	Harare																																				

			December 2018																															
	Result Area / Activity	Location	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
20	Both Consultants finalizing the Draft Final Report	Harare																																
22	Prof. Saasa Returns to Zambia	Harare																																
23	Submission of Draft Final Report	Lusaka																																
24	Consultants travel to Lilongwe																																	
25	Validation Workshop																																	
26	Consultants depart from Lilongwe																																	
27	Review of the Draft Report by the Client ¹	Lusaka & Harare																																
28	Receipt of Comments on Draft Final Report																																	
29	Preparation of Final Report																																	
30	Submission of Final Report																																	

¹ 2 weeks reserved for reviewing the Draft Final Report by the Client.