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**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AICC</td>
<td>Africa Institute of Corporate Citizenship (private company with quasi NGO status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASWAp</td>
<td>Agricultural Sector Wide Approach Programme (formerly the ADP-Agricultural Development Programme until 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP</td>
<td>Annual Work Plan(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDP</td>
<td>District Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>International Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDPC</td>
<td>Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPD</td>
<td>Ministry of Economic Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGDS</td>
<td>Malawi Growth and Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoIWD</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLNR</td>
<td>Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEOR</td>
<td>Malawi State of the Environment and Outlook Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Midterm Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVI</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Poverty and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEF</td>
<td>Poverty and Environment Facility (Nairobi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Poverty and Environment Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODOC</td>
<td>Programme Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>UN Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Main findings
The Malawi Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) is relevant to Malawi’s poverty and environmental problems because it is helping government better understand the nexus between environmental degradation and deepening of poverty and the economic cost of unsustainable natural resource management (NRM). The government’s level of ownership of PEI is high, the result of government commitment to PEI succeeding, and to the location of PEI’s implementation unit in a ministry (MFDP) with good entry points to key ministries in environmental protection, NRM, and poverty reduction. PEI has facilitated high-level policy studies in central co-ordination ministries and sectors such as development planning, finance, president’s office, agriculture, forestry, environment, local government and rural development, energy and fisheries, thus improving government and civil society understanding of poverty environment (PE) linkages and their link to causes of poverty and environmental degradation. There have been implementation delays: it will just be possible to finish all PEI activities with a second 6-month no cost extension.

Sustainability is still evolving: e.g. i) Output 4, which is key to sustainability because it is focusing on increased budget allocations is not yet implemented; ii) it is unlikely that efforts to mainstream PE linkages at sector and district council level will occur and be sustained without considerable, further effort by the government (which faces substantive capacity and resource constraints); iii) integrating and operationalising P-E objectives in key sectors is vital. PEI is implemented by Government of Malawi, supported by the UNDP-UNEP PEI and integrated in UNDAF and One-UN. Malawi has a range of development issues, including gender, land tenure, HIV/AIDS, child stunting and malnutrition, youth employment which have implications for the success or otherwise of P-E mainstreaming. While PEI cannot be expected to address these problems as it does not have the mandate or value added to do so, it would benefit from consideration of these issues in the context of achieving PEI’s objective and getting p-e links included in relevant government and UN agencies’ work focusing on these issues. PEI’s work with the Office of the President is useful in that regard. PEI has suffered some efficiency problems, and is in a sense rather ambitious for its time frame, especially as regards consolidating and operationalising the progress with P-E mainstreaming at national, sector and district council levels, among community base organisations, for which activities there is little more than a year left with PEI Phase I for implementation and consolidation. However, in the remaining work, there needs to continue to be focus on the sector level – that is a more important priority than district level. PRODOC refers to sector work quite substantively.

Main recommendations
Based on the findings presented in the report, the MTR recommends the following for PEI Malawi: i) a no cost extension of six months to allow the PEI to finish all its activities with the present budget; ii) to improve its indicators, introduce OVIs, and carry out simple post training evaluations with course participants so that the impact will be more discernible at the time of the end evaluation; iii) focus now on strengthening the translation into action of the good ideas developed at the policy and sector levels and also (this is a secondary activity) to help the district councils start using the manuals and translate the ideas into actions. This recommendation is foreseen in the strategy (activity 3.2. 3.4, and especially – 1.4, which focuses on working with civil society organisations and community based organisations); iv) More specific activities and indicators will need to be added to the Log Frame to ensure that this coordination takes place. v) PEI is recommended to continue to assist Government reviews of priority poverty-environment polices and strategies – e.g. MGDS, forestry, agriculture energy. (Indeed PEI has already contributed to several sector policy reviews, which could lead to a re-evaluation of this and other policies which appear to be having a detrimental effect on Malawi’s environment and achievement of development goals.) vi) For example, the Forestry review is now ongoing, and PEI is recommended to further assist the Forestry Review by liaising with donors who might help future financing and specifically to help make adjustments to Forestry legislation once the review is finished.
**Main lessons learned**

An inception period allows the Programme Implementation Team to refine the approach, develop a more detailed work plan, and have key staff in place by the start-date.

Ongoing substantive, participatory engagement builds trust, ownership, leads to a programme well aligned with national priorities and increases the chance of uptake of PEI recommendations etc and thus of having an impact.

Twinning international expertise and local institutions for key outputs (e.g. economic study) is important for national ownership, national capacity building and delivering a quality output with up-to-date international analytical techniques but it takes more time to obtain the desired output.

Anticipatory steps should be taken to avoid delays in Programme start-up due to recruitment and procurement delays. For example, while a PRODOC needs to be signed to allow financial commitments, such as recruitment, PEI Africa regional budget could retain funds necessary to start such processes in a timely manner.

The high persuasive power of operationally relevant, sector focused economic evidence on how environmental sustainability is linked to poverty reduction and the achievement of broader development goals.

The value of having explicit poverty focus in the Economics study (earlier studies in other PEI countries did not have such a clear focus), but need to follow-up on that in terms of use of the findings and influencing other PEI activities. (In terms of both design and implementation).

Having strong UNRC/UNDP RR and Country Office support is vital to success

Focusing on achieving inclusion of P-E linkages in cross-government co-ordination mechanisms is very important. It will also help sustain impacts, as such inclusion implies government ministries have to include p-e linkages in their policy development and budgeting work.

More focus on PEI outcomes and measuring impact is required - which is an issue that goes beyond PEI Malawi, PEI global and indeed is a UNDP and UNEP wide issue. There needs to be more focus on using PEI outputs to bring about change.

Focus on key sectors from early stages important – PEI model suggests focus on sectors in Phase II, but PEI Malawi, plus other new countries in Africa suggests focus in Phase I is productive.

Focus on increasing financial allocations in Phase I, because this is a demanding output. This implies, inter alia, more focus on support to ministries of finance from an earlier stage.

The PEI mainstreaming approach has broader applicability – e.g. in Malawi, the PEI model was applied to the Climate Change programme, with MFDPaneading climate change in GoM.

Appropriate ITA should be appointed and that plus other PEI recruitments should be carried out in a more timely manner, including by use of an inception phase

**Introduction**

The overall purpose of this review of the Malawi PEI is i) “serve as a monitoring tool focusing on how the programme is operating and if any major changes are required (Annex 5, TOR p. 5)”; ii) the specific objectives are: i) Assess the current value added of the PEI and whether changes in the wider policy environment, i.e. opportunities and challenges in view of the climate change agenda, green economy, and consideration of other-related initiatives or actors that have emerged since 2002 have implications for how PEI operates to 2012 (relevance); ii) Assess the progress to date of the Initiative and its implementation against the results and resources framework of the Scale-up joint programme.
and identify its strengths and weaknesses. In this sense, emphasis should be put on the analysis of results obtained compared to the “targeted results” that were expected taking into account the actual inputs, outputs and outcomes (effectiveness and efficiency); iii) Provide findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve implementation and delivery. These should focus on: a. The global joint PEI design and arrangements (including the PEF, PEI governance and operational and technical support from UNDP and UNEP); b. PEI regional teams; c. PEI country programme design and implementation.

As far as possible, the reviewer has endeavoured to make “findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve implementation and delivery” of PEI. However, given the budget and time constraints, the level of detail cannot be as deep as would be the case of a country programme review with two to three weeks in-country, two reviewers, the period of time and manpower level that typically would be associated with a country programme review.

**Questions asked**
The main questions the reviewer made refer to: eliciting opinions from stakeholders about the PEI’s *relevance* to national policies, in particular concerning the links between the overall PEI PRODOC result framework and the Malawi PRODOC; and the strategy’s relevance and realism for meeting the implementation challenge on time. **Effectiveness:** i) adequacy of advice and inputs by the PEF delivered to the Malawi country team on PE mainstreaming, including internal and external communication management; and ii) institutional connectedness - whether PEI is effective at linking ministries of finance with line ministries such as fisheries, forestry, environment, energy, and agriculture, and at enhancing collaboration between ministries with environment and poverty related mandates. **Efficiency:** i) assessment of completion of key activities and achieving programme outputs: assessment of progress towards achieving targets and expected outcomes vis-à-vis each result area; ii) review PEI execution modalities, i.e. the management and institutional set-up (membership and profiles, cost-effectiveness, lead agency, national ownership including the role of the national management; the operational efficiency of the technical committee when designing the annual work plans (AWP) and quality controlling project products such as consultancy reports/studies). **Preparing for impact and sustainability:** i) assessment of changes in the degree to which pro poor environmental sustainability is included and operationalised in national, sector and sub-national development plans and budgets; ii) the likelihood of the outputs and outcomes that PEI is producing bringing about durable change and ensuring that environment and poverty concerns are embedded in institutional development planning processes used by different sectors of the government; iii) what outcomes and processes have already taken place (such as training, capacity-building, and the production of enhanced guidelines for environmental management for the country’s 28 district councils (*formerly district assemblies*)), and what initial impacts and potential for impact can be surmised in these outcomes; iv) what the major challenges are to sustaining any momentum gained and what the threats are to new ideas being adopted and embedded permanently at the grassroots level and at the level of the communities where the poverty environment problem set comes into play.

**The reviewed intervention**
PEI was launched in December 2008. Implementation activities started in the second quarter of 2009, when Malawian members of the PEI team were in place.\(^1\) PEI aims to enhance the contribution of the sustainable management of natural resources to poverty reduction, pro-poor economic growth and achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Led by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (MEPD), the intended outcome of PEI is the integration of sustainable natural resources management into national and sectoral policy, planning and budget processes – in order to ensure poverty reduction, economic growth and the achievement of other development outcomes in an environmentally sustainable manner. The PEI programme document (PRODOC) covers January 2009

---

to June 2011. Due to implementation delays, PEI has been extended to end December 2011. The PEI PRODOC includes six main outputs:

- **Output 1**: Increased awareness of links between sustainable natural resources management (NRM), economic growth and poverty reduction and increased capacity to implement among decision-makers, civil society and the public.
- **Output 2**: Strengthened coordination mechanisms and improved capacity within the government for integration of sustainable NRM into policies and plans.
- **Output 3**: Sustainable NRM integrated into the implementation of the Agricultural Development Programme and other relevant sector and district level programmes related to land, water and energy.
- **Output 4**: Increased budget allocations, donor funding, private investment and other financing mechanisms, including environmental fiscal reform, for sustainable NRM.
- **Output 5**: Improved capacity and strengthened systems within the government for monitoring sustainable NRM.
- **Output 6**: Effective programme management and implementation.

**Organisation and management**

PEI follows national execution implementation arrangements while respecting the global nature of the set up of the project. MFDP acts as the implementing agency with the overall responsibility for the oversight and coordination of the joint programme. For operational purposes, the Director of Economic Planning is overall manager in-charge of the PEI. The PEI Steering Committee and the Technical Committee provide ongoing support, do quality control of reports/consultancies; and draw up the Annual Work Plans (AWPs) which they then monitor with support from PEF in Nairobi. Two UN staff from Nairobi based PEI Africa regional team have made quarterly backstopping / M&E missions each year since start-up. They also provide substantive comments on draft TORs, papers, reports and other outputs from PEI Malawi.

**Programme Implementation Team**

The Programme Implementation Team comprises a Programme Manager, a recently appointed ITA plus an Administrative Assistant. The first ITA did not extend her contract and while the PEI and CC ITA positions are combined, there was a gap in ITA support of a few months, which inhibited elements of delivery. (There were issues with the previous ITA, which highlight the need to recruit the appropriate staff. PEI Malawi clarified that the first choice of previous ITA declined the post at the last minute – which caused further delays - and the second choice for ITA was appointed). A Fund manager is under recruitment. The three institutions implementing (MFDP) or supporting the implementation of PEI (UNDP Malawi, PEI Africa Team) seem to have carried out their main activities in a timely and orderly fashion.

**Budgeting and financial management**

The total budget for PEI is USD $2,507,017.50 over a three-year period, fully funded by UNDP-UNEP PEI. Government provides in-kind support, including office space, M&E and administrative support, and staff time (e.g., the Communications Expert, Ms. Mbekeani of MDPC, secretary and driver). Additional funds were provided via UNDAF to PEI in 2010 (200,000 USD) and in 2011 ((200,000 USD²): This means that the total budget is actually USD $2,907,017.50. Since PEI is under the National Execution modality, (NEX) quarterly advances are made to MFDP, which manages disbursements and reports back to UNDP Malawi and through them to the PEF in Nairobi, through the UNDP Atlas system. While the NEX modality is used, some procurements are handled directly by UNDP Malawi. As of end December 2010, USD $ 1.5 were spent. As of August 2011, USD $ 1.9 were spent, leaving 600,000 USD of the original PEI budget. The extra donated 400,000 USD from UNDP via UNDAF have been spent as follows: Note that since planning was done a long time ago, some of the activities were under budgeted. There was a need to mobilise extra resources for this. Activities like review of fisheries policy emerged as necessitating funding after finalising the ASWAp sustainability indicators; so resources have to be channeled there; as well, video production for the MSEOR needed funds. No significant issues concerning financial management have emerged, and disbursements and financial reporting appear to have proceeded smoothly and in accordance with

---

² According to UNDP Malawi.
regulations. Financial implementation rate is as of August 84%, 1.9 million of the total original 2.5 million USD. If the additional 400,000 USD from UNDP is counted as part of the PEI budget, then implementation rate is 66% as of August 2011 (1.9 million of 2.9 million).

**Stakeholders**

The main PEI stakeholders in Malawi are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>PEI relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Development Planning (MFDP)</td>
<td>PEI host and implementation ministry - most highly relevant. Director of Economic Planning is PEI overall manager. Lead Ministry for the MGDS; also provides the Public Relations Officer, Ms Mbekeani, who is developing the communication strategy and who is training the media/private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Affairs Department</td>
<td>Key implementation partner. Lead on preparation of MSEOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP Malawi / Resident Coordinator’s Office</td>
<td>PEI Malawi implementing partner, supporting the PEI activities and processes, UN country lead. Signatory of PEI Malawi PRODOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP and UNEP/ Assistant Resident Representative</td>
<td>Of high relevance to PEI- UNDP technical experts provide QA and feedback on annual work plans, studies, etc. Leads on input PEI into UNDAF and UNDAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP: The Programme Analyst - PEI</td>
<td>Provides technical oversight, vetting, and feedback on proposals from the Technical Committee and the workings of the Technical Committee related to the annual work plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agricultural Organisation / Assistant Resident Representative</td>
<td>Formal partner in PEI. Key in Agricultural sector. Formal partner of the project. Provides technical support in the agricultural related outputs of the project. It sits on the technical and steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA Anand Babu (ITA CC &amp; PEI)</td>
<td>PEI/Climate Change ITA (MFDP/UNDP): Most highly relevant as provides QA and feedback on annual work plans, studies, etc. Brings required international expertise, helps build national capacity, leads on preparation of policy briefs, leads on liaison with donors, key interface with UNDP Malawi. I believe it is his high involvement in a lot of programme planning and implementation that gives him an upper hand. He has wider understanding of Malawi and its agro economical issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jere</td>
<td>Agricultural economist – highly relevant to PEI, particularly given his role in supporting PEI agriculture sector work and was national consultant during the PEI Malawi Preparatory phase. Also helped cover ITA vacancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former International technical advisor</td>
<td>Highly relevant did not extend contract – now replaced by - See above under ITA Anand Babu for role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mmangisa</td>
<td>PEI Project Manager – Most highly relevant manages the PEI in direct coordination with all the actors. Responsible for core project delivery and identifies problems, bottle necks and suggests solutions to problems to take PEI forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (renamed on September 12 the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development)</td>
<td>Implementing Partner. Highly relevant, given critical relevance of Agriculture sector to poverty-environment issues in Malawi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance (Now joined with MDPC to form MFDP)</td>
<td>Budget Director and Principal Budget Officer / PEI relevance is high once economic and livelihoods benefits of improving PE links are proven, this ministry can allocate more spending for PE concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development</td>
<td>Of high relevance to PEI as this ministry must translate downwards to the district councils and village development committees, the policy decisions for PE mainstreaming being taken at higher levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President and Cabinet</td>
<td>Of high relevance to PEI as this agency leads on, inter alia, cross-government coordination issues and provision of policy development guidance. This includes for cross-cutting issues such as environment. OPC can assist achievement of P-E objectives by developing and putting in place policy guidelines that require Ministries to include p-e issues, for example. Can promote higher pro poor and pro environment legislation and budgetary allocations-in tandem with other relevant government offices and parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Fisheries</td>
<td>Of high relevance to PEI as this ministry is in charge of a vital sector to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>PEI relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Department</td>
<td>Key stakeholder in charge of overseeing the Malawian forest reserves and promoting income generating fuel efficient stoves and training rural poor women and youth who work in charcoal production to do other pro environmental economic activities- of high relevance to PEI and PE concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
<td>Provides solar and wind energy around the country and promotes electrification and fuel efficient stoves- is thus highly relevant to PEI and a key stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>Companies in sectors such as mining, forestry, agriculture (cotton, rice, tea, sugar), energy and alternative energy, fisheries, all of relevance to PEI concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>NGOs in different sectors, and media organisation reporting on environmental and livelihoods concerns- all relevant to PEI concerns as media, civil society, and academia contribute to PE knowledge base and also provide good governance services by informing citizens of their rights and responsibilities vis a vis the use of natural resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

**Progress on results**

**Relevance**

Malawi faces very substantive poverty and social problems- (see Annex 5). The Human Development Rank had slipped from 163 out of 174 countries in 1998 to 165 out of 177 countries in 2002. High population density and poverty exert unsustainable pressure upon natural resources. In 2008, 84% of the employed were engaged in agriculture, forestry and fishing, indicating direct dependence on natural resources. For women, the percentage so employed was larger than the national average, at 90%. The number of people employed in formal and informal agriculture in rural areas at 90%, was higher than in urban areas at 24%. Over 90% of the value of Malawi’s exports is accounted for by natural resource sectors. Most of this originates from agriculture, with tobacco contributing about 67% to the country’s exports. Despite the economic value of natural resources to Malawi’s economy, they are not used sustainably. Forestry resources are degrading at a rate of 2.6% per year, caused by agricultural expansion and rapid population growth. Annual consumption of forest products is estimated at 15 million m3, while sustainable supply is 8 million m3. Projections based on primary forest loss between 1990 and 2005 suggest that all primary forest in Malawi will be degraded or deforested by 2020. Inadequate electricity generation (only 9% of the population have access to electricity), contributes to forest degradation by increasing firewood and charcoal demand in the major centres. Poverty incidence has declined to 45% (2006), 40% (2007), and 39% (2010). The decline in the incidence of poverty is mainly attributed to increased food production facilitated by the subsidized fertilizer programme; and to recent high rates of economic growth. However, increased soil degradation, erosion, and fertiliser use practices and soil runoff are having negative economic consequences.

PEI is relevant to Malawi’s combination of poverty and environment factors, in particular regarding the nexus between, on the one hand, needing the soil, water, and forests to provide livelihoods, fuel, shelter, and food for the majority (84%) of the population and, on the other, destroying the NR base.

---

5 Source: Interview with Mr. Mhango, Deputy Director of Energy, Dept. of Energy.
6 A charcoal seller interviewed in Area 9 near Madidi Lodge on Sunday morning was selling charcoal at 950 Kwacha per bag to Area 9 rich houses with electricity. According to the seller, “these householders buy charcoal in case there are cuts in electricity in Lilongwe”.
7 Malawi PEI Economics report, Lilongwe, 2010
by unsustainable/destructive practices. PEI in its goals is relevant to Government policy in the areas of pro-poor growth and protection of the environment, as established in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy 2006-2011. PEI in output 1 is relevant because Malawi needs to understand better the PE nexus given the severity of key threats (high population growth rate, possible disappearance of forests by 2020, annually increasing soil erosion and soil loss, etc.). Given the severe limits on capacity – especially at decentralised (district council) levels – of government agencies (Forestry, Agriculture, Fisheries) to enforce environmental legislation and to deliver programmes to improve environmental management while simultaneously safeguarding livelihoods, PEI is relevant in its choice of human and financial resources in design and strategy; and in its choice of partners from the UN, Government, and civil society sectors. PEI is relevant to the needs of the rural and urban poor of Malawi whose livelihoods depend heavily on the diminishing natural resource base. Finally, PEI is relevant to the policies of One UN / UNDP and UNEP policies (PEI is part of the UNDAF Malawi).

PEI entry points are relevant to poverty reduction and improved NRM objectives. PEI sits in Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, a high level government agency where PEI has maximum opportunity to champion and lobby for PEI concerns in cross-government planning and budgeting as well as policy making. In addition to MFDP, PEI has high-level links with Environmental Affairs Dept., Agriculture, and Office of the President and Cabinet. In the key agriculture sector, entry points are reinforced by having the Director of Land Resources & Conservation Department on the PEI Technical Committee and the MoAIWD, additionally, as a member (PS) of the Steering Committee. PEI has, additionally, a relevant level of ambition regarding entry points with national donor-supported programmes, evidenced by the following statement from the PRODOC (p. 11): “It is fully recognised that PEI cannot alone achieve comprehensive mainstreaming and related capacity building in all sectors and at decentralized levels. Hence the PEI aims to help mainstream environmentally sustainable NRM in key ministries and sectors to demonstrate … that further investment in environmentally sustainable NRM is justified in order to assist the country to attain priority development objectives.”

Other development partners

Even though lack of mention (not all donor-supported programmes that could be mentioned in the PRODOC existed at time of formulation!) in the PRODOC does not imply that other development partners were not considered in PEI design and formulation, the PRODOC could increase relevance if it made more mention of other important donor supported programmes in poverty reduction / NRM- e.g., i) the EU supported Improved Forest Management for Sustainable Livelihoods Programme10 (EU-9th EDF and 10th EDF, 2 phases, phase 2 ongoing); i) USAID-financed Community Partnerships for Sustainable Resource Management in Malawi, whose purpose is to enhance household revenue from participation in community-based natural resource management initiatives that generate income as well as provide incentives for sustainable resource use in Malawi (Kambewa, B et al., 2007); ii) mention of the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) compact for Malawi (currently suspended) is relevant because improving power supply will benefit PE concerns in Malawi11. PRODOC states (p.7) “A priority for the PEI is to work with in-country donors to increase financial support for environmentally sustainable natural resource management”. This is reflected in Output 4 of the PRODOC.

Recommendation: More specific activities and indicators – and the raising of donor finance under Output 4 activities- will need to be added to the Log Frame to ensure that this coordination with other

---

9 Kambewa & Chiwaula 2010.
10 http://www.ifmslp.org/
11 Malawi’s $350.7 million MCC compact is a single-sector programme focusing on activities aiming to revitalize Malawi’s power sector. By reducing power outages and technical losses, enhancing the sustainability and efficiency of hydropower generation, and improving service to electricity consumers, the compact intends to reduce energy costs to enterprises and households; improve productivity in the agriculture, manufacturing and services sectors; and support the preservation and creation of employment opportunities in the economy. In July 2011, MCC placed an operational hold on the Malawi Compact.
programmes/donors takes place and so that the resources needed to implement Output 4 are mobilised.

**Gender**

Given the disproportionate burden on women and female-headed households caused by poverty, environmental degradation, and unequal access to resources (mainly land), PRODOC design would be more relevant to the needs of the most vulnerable in Malawi (women) if it included gender equality and gender disaggregation of data. There is a strong argument that gender should be prioritised in PEI Malawi where—due to the functioning of the kinship system and the land-ownership and -inheritance system—women are structurally unequal and discriminated against. Although PEI is a lobbying, high level project focusing on championing PE linkages and influencing policy, PEI has nuts and bolts activities (under outputs 1 and 3) which require gender disaggregation of monitoring and also require gender focus in training and capacity building activities. It is however promising that a product of the PEI, the Malawi State of the Environment (MSOTE) report, recognises the problems of gender inequality in relation to land, inheritance and the kinship system. PEI Malawi has pointed out that their focus on the agricultural sector reflects, inter alia, recognition that addressing P-E issues in the agriculture sector is a key to addressing key gender issues in Malawi—including rural poverty which has a disproportionate impact on women and children.

Relevance of policies of donors in Malawi who also back the PEI: Donors such as UK’s Department for International Development (DFID), Norway, the EU and Ireland have provided a substantive amount of support to a range of issues highly relevant to PEI. This include for food security and broader rural development, forestry, climate change and disaster risk reduction. Support for the agricultural sector, including to achieve food security objectives, is a particularly relevant issue to PEI, given its focus on the agriculture sector and there are a number of P-E issues in agriculture and other sectors on which PEI should continue to focus. For example, soil erosion and fertiliser use practices have significant negative environmental and economic implications, as reflected in the Malawi economics study and the Malawi State of the Environment and Outlook Report (MSEOR).

**Preliminary recommendation:** PEI is recommended to assist the Government in reviews of sector policies and strategies with substantive poverty-environment implications. Indeed PEI has already contributed to several sector policy reviews (see “Impact” below), which could lead to enhancements of policies and strategies which appear to be having detrimental effect on Malawi’s environment and achievement of linked development targets. This is a preliminary recommendation, since this is an area that needs a detailed study to come up with this recommendation.

**Relevance of design:** PEI’s design reflects fully the policies and objectives of the Government to promote sustainable development by using environmental natural resources more sustainably at the same time as stimulating the economic activities in the country that depend on or use natural resources, and is thus highly relevant to Government policies now and in the future. The relevance of the PEI strategy is further demonstrated by key documents such as the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy, which have improved their references to sustainability at least partly due to PEI’s influence.

**Use of international technical assistance (ITA) model:** Although an ITA was appointed, the ITA did not renew the contract and there were some issues with the ITA who did not appear to have the appropriate experience for working within the Malawi Civil Service. After a gap of some months, it was decided to combine the roles of the CC and PEI ITA, as these programmes both focus on mainstreaming, are under the same Steering Committee and are co-located. The PEI Malawi team has
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12 "Women in Malawi have largely remained marginalized when it comes to land rights, despite their high degree of involvement in agricultural production. Whether in patrilineal or matrilineal societies, access to land is typically mediated by men (spouses or uncles). Women have difficulty both in making independent decisions about land use, and in accessing the benefits derived from land ownership" (Malawi State of the Environment and Outlook Report, Lilongwe, 2010).

highlighted the importance of the ITA role in terms of providing technical advisory services based, inter alia, on international experience, helping build national capacity, liaison with donors and UNDP. The experience with the first ITA highlights the need to appoint a suitable candidate to the post.

Relevance of strategy: The strategy is based on a number of elements. The first is conducting studies that will produce an updated, high quality knowledge base that make the case for p-e mainstreaming and on which to form new polices to promote pro poor and environmentally sustainable growth in Malawi. The second part of the strategy is to improve the inclusion of p-e issues in key government policy development and co-ordination mechanisms – i.e. to better include p-e issues in what can be termed the machinery of government – how government develops and implements policy. The next is to integrate p-e objectives into relevant sectors and other programmes. The fourth part of the strategy is to increase the financial allocations to implement p-e objectives. A further part of the strategy is to improve monitoring systems. The final part of the strategy is to provide the necessary level of management and technical advisory support, including technical advisory support from the PEI Africa regional team.

This strategy is relevant to UN and Malawi’s objectives to promote poverty reduction and sustainable NRM.

Output 1 (knowledge and awareness) therefore aims to increase awareness in all key government institutions at central and decentralized levels; in academia, civil society, media, interest groups such as farmers, vulnerable groups depending on natural resources such as charcoal-producers, artisanal fisher folk, etc. and the general public by: i) producing key studies such as the Economic Study. It is relevant to improve the knowledge base in order to improve planning and strategies for pro poor growth. The ministries, academia, civil society and media organizations all express high appreciation of the relevance of the new studies produced by PEI, because the studies provide the actors with improved tools for planning.

Output 2 (Government coordination & policy strengthened) Achieving improved pro-poor environmental sustainability outcomes requires a cross-government approach, thus support to improving government co-ordination will help ensure this cross-government approach. This will, inter alia, help bring environment issues out of the environment silo and link them with development objectives. It is also necessary for sustaining the impacts of p-e mainstreaming – e.g. by ensuring government co-ordination mechanisms embed consideration of cross-cutting issues like environment in line ministry policy and budgetary development and implementation. This is a key element of capacity development for p-e mainstreaming. It is institutional capacity development.

Output 3 (Sustainable NRM integrated into the ASWAp and other ..programmes related to land, water and energy) depends on a combination of studies feeding into capacity building and training at different levels of government, and the challenge is to translate the new ideas and guidelines into operational policies in sectors plans, budgets, and – secondarily- on the level of the 28 district councils and at the level of the grassroots. Interviewed officials report being aware of the considerable challenges (note we are in phase 1 only) of the next stage: to translate new poverty environment concerns which are now being increasingly adopted (with PEI support) in the high level plans and policies into workable and sustainable activities and practices at the level of the communities in Malawi. An optimistic development is the fact that PEI consultants go to the field with Agriculture officials and write joint back to office reports, e.g., under activity 3.2, “support for selected capacity building activities,” showing good coordination of PEI and AgSWAp.

While the PEI Scale-Up PRODOC refers to focusing on integrating p-e objectives into national development plans in Phase I and integration in sectors in Phase II, in Malawi the design phase of PEI

Malawi highlighted that there were substantive opportunities to integrate P-E objectives in sectors, particularly the agricultural sector plan, so PEI took advantage of those opportunities.

**Output 4: Increased budget allocations, donor funding, private investment and other financing mechanisms, including environmental fiscal reform, for sustainable NRM.**

This is the key output in terms of ensuring sustainability and PEI Malawi has not yet managed to achieve sufficient progress on this output. More emphasis on achievement of this Output is required, which is acknowledged by the PEI team. In particular, an important issue is to assess the amount of budgetary allocation now and in subsequent budgets for relevant P-E investments. For example, it appears that the sustainable land and water pillar of the Agricultural Sector plan requires more investment, as does rural energy supply, forestry and fisheries, among others. For example in the energy and agricultural sectors increased investments in the following would bring substantive environmental and poverty reducing benefits: i) the rural electrification programme- the more households that can get connected to electric power, in theory, there may be less demand for firewood for cooking although not for charcoal production-for-sale; and ii) agricultural diversification programme, to reduce, deforestation, soil erosion, unsustainable use of mineral fertilisers sedimentation of rivers, degradation of river habitat and fish breeding grounds, and flooding.

**Output 5: Improved capacity and strengthened systems within the government for monitoring sustainable NRM.** This output is relevant to PEI concerns nationally/globally, and is being achieved via the production of the key studies and policy reviews produced by PEI, and available to government planners in key sectors (e.g., Fisheries policy review) to enable better environment and pro poor growth planning. A major product of this Utput 5 is the MSEOR Report.

Relevance of log frame and indicators: The PRODOC results framework has UNDAF outcomes that are relevant to achieving improved and mainstreamed poverty environment planning; but the indicators in the PRODOC are rather weak and need fleshing out, and it will be consequently difficult to measure impact. Indicators are especially important in a project like PEI which is a process and outcome project, with many capacity building/training and knowledge promotion activities. An example of two indicators under Output 1, “Knowledge and awareness” are: “b) Increased media coverage on sustainable NRM and c) Increased number of CSOs/CBOs active on (sic) sustainable NRM”. Indicator b) may be measurable with some research work (i.e., a researcher reviews one year of the main newspapers in 2009 and then compares to the situation in 2012, counting articles on PE concerns in the two before/after years); but indicator c) will only work if a before and after postal baseline survey delivered to all CBOs/CSOs were carried out, and it is not possible now given the implementation stage of PEI. Some of the key training and capacity building sessions (e.g., under outputs 1, 2, and 3 are not evaluated in a concerted or documented way. Knowing empirically what people learned and whether they say they can apply the new knowledge in their work becomes impossible without simple one-page evaluation sheets administered after session-end, and makes the review and future evaluation difficult, if not impossible.

**Recommendation:** PEI is recommended as soon as possible to introduce basic objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) into the results based framework of the PRODOC, and to apply simple one-page evaluation sheets after capacity-building sessions. This will assist Government and UN and the final evaluation team in 2012 to evaluate impact.

**Conclusion on relevance**

Overall the PEI is found to be: i) highly relevant to Government policy in the areas of poverty reduction, pro-poor growth and protection of the environment, and is relevant to the development challenges in Malawi; ii) relevant in design and strategy; iii) relevant in its choice of partners from the UN, Government, and civil society sectors; iv) relevant to the needs of the rural and urban poor of Malawi whose livelihoods depend heavily on a diminishing natural resource base; and v) relevant to the policies of One UN and UNDAF Malawi’s poverty reduction and environmental objectives.

However, the relevance and potential success of the overall strategy requires appropriate implementation of Output 4 in this phase plus the necessary long-term, follow up actions that focus on
implementation and capacity development; particularly in key p-e relevant sectors and 10 (+18) pilot district councils (formerly District Assemblies). The recently-completed (September 2011) Revised Decentralized Environmental Guidelines will need extensive piloting and support in order to operationalise them. It is acknowledged that this PEI Malawi is a Phase I (with enhanced focus on key sectors compared with a ‘classic’ PEI model). If there is a PEI Phase II it would be more possible to secure the aimed-for outcomes of the PEI with increased emphasis on implementation, including budget allocations and capacity-building.

In terms of financing for implementation and capacity building, Output 4 is critical. The PEI has produced a range of knowledge products which can continue to be used to increase knowledge-generation and awareness-raising. These include the MSEOR, the economics study and the new manuals for environmental management in councils and village development committees. Additionally, more detailed and targeted knowledge products on p-e linkages may be necessary; for example, in specific sectors like agriculture and for budget guidelines for p-e investments. The challenge is to operationalize the already acquired knowledge, future acquired knowledge and the improved inclusion of p-e objectives and indicators. In particular, how to implement and operationalize these objectives and indicators in sector, budget support / sector programme level, and decentralised levels, in the new and improved strategies that will emerge from the policy reviews in sectors such as MOLGRAD, Fisheries and Forestry. New training in government and civil society at both central and decentralised levels, at the level of the fishermen, women farmers, and district councils will be needed to cement impact. This report therefore makes recommendations for taking the PEI forward into the next stage (see sections below, especially “Impact” and “sustainability”).

Efficiency

Assessment of completion of key activities and achievement of programme outputs and assessment of progress towards achieving targets and expected outcomes vis-à-vis each result area: PEI has experienced some delays in implementation. Due to start in the final quarter of 2008, PEI started in the first quarter if 2009, mainly due to difficulties in finding qualified staff and consultants. These initial delays increased the workload in later stages, necessitating a six-month extension (already approved by PEF before this review). The budget is large, 2,704,102 Million USD (plus PEI has added additional 200,000 USD in 2010 and another 200,000 USD in 2011), and the level of activities is quite ambitious for an original, anticipated time frame of 24 months. (With hindsight, 36 months would have been a more reasonable time frame.)

Capacity absorption has been an issue for government agencies involved in training: e.g., Forestry was not ready and hence unable to initially take up the offer of the PEI financed policy review at the planned time. According to one agency, Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development (MOLGRAD), there were inefficiencies in PEI, viz.: “late disbursement of PE funds caused delays of 3-4 months in the work of LEAD South Africa (the consultant doing a study for MOLGRAD): additionally, the tendering process was delayed too”. But, according to another agency, Forestry, i) “disbursements were fast and smooth and coordination with the technical committee is smooth and timely”; ii) Forestry’s participations in the Tripartite Review Meetings has been very useful, timely and smooth”.

Recommendations: A no cost 6-month extension from June-December 2012 is recommended. This is necessary to ensure delivery of a number of outputs, including, inter alia, the Forestry review and legislation adjustments, Outputs 4 and 5 and M& E.

PEI execution modalities: Regarding the management and institutional set-up, and the efficiency of the membership, the operational efficiency of the technical committee and the Tripartite Review Meeting when designing the AWPs and quality controlling project products such as consultancy reports/studies has been generally satisfactory. Agencies such as Forestry, Local Government, and
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15 The energy sector review was not carried out under PEI because Energy was not ready to be reviewed; so Forestry was given the funds originally designated for Energy.
civil society and media recipients of training activities have generally expressed satisfaction with disbursement and planning arrangements. While the need to replace the first Accounting Assistant caused some delays, PEI has got back on track, with the caveat that it cannot complete all activities without a total of 12 extra months (6 approved, 6 recommended, this review). National ownership including the role of the national management is good- interviewed government agencies clearly have full ownership of PEI, and they express satisfaction at PEI products (Economic Study, MSTOE, policy reviews) or at products financed by PEI (e.g., media – TV radio -programmes on PE concerns, etc.).

**Conclusion on efficiency**

PEI’s level of efficiency has not presented major problems, although overall efficiency was not optimal – due to, inter alia, some substantive recruitment and procurement delays. Two lessons learned are: Appropriate ITA should be appointed and that plus other PEI recruitments should be carried out in a more timely manner, including by use of an inception phase. The use of the PEI Africa regional budget to initiate recruitments is another option that should be considered.

**Effectiveness**

Advice and inputs by the PEF delivered to the Malawi country team on PE mainstreaming, including internal and external communication management, have been satisfactory. Regarding institutional connectedness, PEI has been effective at linking Finance with ministries, e.g., Fisheries, Forestry, Agriculture, Environment, Energy, and Local Government, and at enhancing collaboration between ministries with environment and poverty related mandates. Furthermore, media and civil society groups have had access to PEI services, e.g., capacity funding and training sessions in PE issues and provision of funding (activities 1.1.3, 1.3) to make PE programmes reach the public as part of the communication strategy. PEI has been effective at providing products that have increased support for PE mainstreaming and that Government and sector agencies need for improving inclusion of PE linkages in policy design and service delivery. In key sectors, public and private, PEI has effectively delivered PE advice: for Agriculture, even though AgSwap was mainly developed before PEI started, AgSwap was not finalized and approved when PEI started, so PEI could provide TA to modify and mainstream some of the indicators for sustainable NRM. An example of the indicators modified with PEI assistance is: “Estimated total soil loss”, already recorded in MSOTE and in the MDG.

Agriculture subject matter specialists (crops, livestock, extension, and planning officers) in land resources and conservation officers were trained by PEI (see “Impact” below). PEI has been effective at including private sector organizations in PE initiatives: e.g., the Africa Institute of Corporate Citizenship (AICC) is included in the AWP; AICC’s CEO is also in the technical committee. However, the initiatives with private sector have not led to any real impact as yet (see “Impact” below).

**Conclusion on effectiveness**

PEI has over three years effectively influenced and financed 100% the development of policy documents in several sectors: Energy, Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries; and is in the process of bringing improved PE knowledge to district councils to enable the 28 district councils to plan in an improved way sustainable NRM and district development activities. The major challenge for the Government is to operationalise and sustain this kind of policy development activity in sector plans and budgets, both within the current phase of PEI, in any future phase and after PEI withdraws (see “Sustainability” below); It will also be a challenge for district councils to sustainably operationalise (budgetarily & with manpower) their new guidelines, and use them in planning for environmentally sustainable change and development. Similarly, for the ministries, major challenges for them are how to use the new studies (Economic Study, MSTOE) and the new policy studies, given that they still face human and financial resource constraints and still have a substantive dependence on donor financing.
Impact
An assessment of possible changes in the degree to which pro poor environmental sustainability is included and operationalised in national, sector and sub-national development plans and budgets so far shows that PEI has demonstrated impact on a number of fronts:

i) PEI played significant role in the mainstreaming of the environment issues via., MGDS.

ii) The economics study influenced decision-makers by showing how environmental unsustainability makes it more difficult to achieve national development targets. That study played a key role in changing the policy landscape with respect to PE issues.

iii) Substantively increasing awareness by key Government decision-makers of how poverty reduction and environmental sustainability are linked through the Malawi PEI economics study and MSEOR and the more general implementation of PEI Malawi. A notable feature of the economics study was its explicit focus on the poverty impacts of unsustainable natural resource use.

iv) Substantively contributing to the improved inclusion of PE in the MGDS – e.g. there is now a Key Priority Area focused on climate change, natural resources and environment. When PEI began in 2008, Government needed more data to mainstream PE in new planning, and PEI’s contributions to updating key sectors has contributed positively to the new MGDS;

v) Improved Government inclusion of environmental sustainability in the Office of the President policy guidelines; Increased the ability of the Ministry of Finance (Now in Ministry of Finance and Development Plan) to include p-e linkages in budgets.

vi) **Agriculture**- a) inclusion of improved PE indicators to measure sustainable NRM in AgSwap; b) development (ongoing) of 10 indicators for AgSwap with PEI support; and c) joint field visits and joint back-to-office reports (under activity 3.2 “Support for selected capacity building activities”); d) “PEI has improved coordination between Agriculture and the other sectors- e.g., academia, water boards, Fisheries, Forestry, Bureau of Standards, and the private sector actors like DUDU poultry company (a heavy polluter)”. It is difficult to surmise yet impact of the training for a total of approximately 156 agricultural extension officers in Mzuzu, Mchinji, Salima, and Zomba. The training was done through the technical committee task force with Fisheries, Land Resources Conservation, Agriculture, Water Resources. According to Agriculture officials, this type of multi sectoral training has improved coordination. Although improved coordination between sector agencies involved in NRM is important as a goal in itself (on the grounds that coordinated government agencies can do coordinated and hence better PE planning), inter agency coordination does not of itself lead to improved NRM.

vii) **MOLGRAD**: PEI has helped MOLGAD access data which has helped MOLGRAD coordinate better between the different sectors in their work. MOLGRAD stated there is considerable potential impact of the district development plans (DDP): under Activity 4.3 (“support for integration of sustainable NRM into DDPs and related budgets in [10 + 18], districts”) MOLGRAD will use the new environmental management guidelines to liaise with local people to a) better manage natural resources; b) to design improved DPP. The new environmental management guidelines have however not been approved yet (September 2011) and – with only 15 months before recommended close down of PEI. It is late to start using them to see any impact.

viii) **Fisheries**: PEI has a good impact potential in the crucial fisheries sector, but, according to an official, “...so far we have not taken the fisheries issues that we have learned from our PEI studies down to the fisherman level and the community level”. PEI has supported publication (IIED) of case studies of fishermen on Lake Chilwa- there will be potential value from this study at the policy level because it elucidates why fishermen use Seine nets, do illegal trawling, the continuous in-migration of new fishermen into Lake Chilwa area, and the rapid decline of fish stocks; iv) **Forestry**: PEI is supporting the ongoing forestry review, with
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16 Interview at Ministry of Agriculture, Mr. Hastings Ngoma, Planning & M&E Division.
17 District development plans are three-year plans and include a socio economic plan.
18 Mr. Friday Njaya, Dept. of Fisheries, Chief Fisheries Planning Officer.
coordinated support from Office of the President, Environmental Affairs, Energy; - meetings have been held with all district councils, forestry managers, chiefs, and district commissioners, and the policy should be finalized by December 2011, so it is too early to measure impact of this policy review.

ix) Civil society, media organizations, and journalists report appreciating training in new ideas and assistance in making new programmes on PE concerns aimed at influencing the public and spreading the message in wider society about PE issues.

x) The PEI p-e mainstreaming model, including having MFDP lead, was adopted for the climate change mainstreaming programme.

xi) PEI Malawi is a best practice example of UNDP-UNEP co-operation, including in terms of how well PEI Malawi is embedded in the UNDP country office work programme, UNDAF and UNDAP; Plus with a UNDP ARR who acts as a UNEP focal point.

Conclusion on impact

PEI Malawi is making an important contribution to outcomes and processes in mainstreaming p-e concerns at all levels and in key sectors in Malawi, including civil society and media organisations. The major outcomes and processes that have already taken place include training, capacity-building, drawing up of policy reviews, the Economic Study and Malawi State of the Environment Report, assisting enhanced coordination at high and decentralized levels between agencies involved in NRM, and the production of enhanced guidelines for environmental management for 10 pilot district councils. It is still too early in the latter case of MOLGRAD to surmise initial impacts and potential.

PEI made important contributions to designing improved PE indicators in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries sectors. There are however major challenges to sustaining the momentum gained, and the threats to new ideas being adopted and embedded permanently at the different levels – national, sector and local where the p-e problem-set comes into play include: i) capacity lacks in enforcement operations (e.g., forestry fisheries); ii) poor people are desperate and illegal fishing, firewood cutting, and charcoal production are essential to thousands of households in the absence of employment, and in the absence of land for many households; iii) it is difficult to find a new, more environmentally friendly way to feed Malawi’s people given the declining soil fertility and other stresses such as erosion and huge soil loss each year; iv) the vast majority of farmers have less than half a hectare for growing food; v) population growth rate is still too high; vi) women – who bear the brunt of poverty and who look after many children, including grandmothers caring for AIDS orphans, are still discriminated against, by a kinship and social system that mitigate against them owning or accessing land.

In addressing some of these challenges in terms of the PEI Malawi Phase I PRODOC, successful delivery of remaining activities, particularly Output 4, is necessary. A number of challenges require a longer-term focus by PEI and in terms of challenges where PEI does not have a value added – such as population growth – PEI should place more effort in ensuring that the relevant Government and UN agencies include consideration of p-e linkages. For example, by continuing to support OPC to operationalise the cross-government guide to decision-making PEI helped produce.

Sustainability

It should be noted, in assessing sustainability, that PEI is still in Phase 1, and when Output 4 activities are more under way, sustainability will be more likely.

Regarding the likelihood of the outputs and outcomes that PEI is helping to produce bringing about durable change and ensuring that PE concerns are embedded in institutional development planning processes used by different sectors of the government, officials have clear opinions. Agriculture: Outlook for sustainability is good but it will take time for all the actors to really mainstream environment into poverty and other areas of governance. The first step of developing the improved p-e indicators was relatively “easy”. Now the challenge is how to sustain their inclusion in meaningful ways in government planning and development strategies in the future. Several agencies assisted by PEI show good degrees of sustainability, measured as financial independence. E.g., Forestry:
PRODOC foresaw using a consultant & PEI funds to do the Forestry review, but Forestry has financed the review itself with own funds. Once the policy ideas on offer from PEI have been owned and imbibed by government agencies, and expressed in the new studies and policy papers, the hypothesis is: is PEI necessary any more to sustain its ideas at the high level? PEI probably does not need to continue to have the same level of focus on generating awareness at the higher level decision-makers responsible for development planning – for example because of the key studies and documents that have been produced.

However, sustainability depends critically on operationalising existing commitments in national and sector level planning documents, such as the MGDS and agriculture sector plan, though, inter alia government budgets and donor allocations. P-E objectives also need to be better reflected in Government planning document and strategies M&E systems. While UN (UNDP) already finances additional PEI activities in Malawi, they have indicated that further resources are needed from the PEI.

While a number of donors also finance similar or PEI related activities/programmes, there is not yet the substantive, cohesive focus on financing p-e investments as envisaged by the PEI PRODOC (see output 4). Such a substantive, cohesive level of support from government and donors sources is vital for longer-term capacity development and for detailed operationalisation of p-e objectives at sector and particularly decentralised levels. (Not least as PEI is a catalytic programme and not designed to finance detailed operationalisation).

At the decentralised levels of government, sustained achievement of PEI objectives is indeed substantively challenging, one reason being the lack of resources of key agencies. E.g., the budget for Fisheries for 2011 is: 63,000,000 MWK (approx. USD 382,000) for Central Government, and 70,000,000 MWK (424,000 USD) for local government: these small sums go mainly on salaries, leaving little for essential areas such as enforcement and community based awareness raising.

**Conclusion on sustainability**
Sustainability of the PEI concept and an improved and more mature understanding in government top levels seems likely- the ideas enjoy good ownership and are well appreciated. Sustained operationalisation at both the sector and decentralized level in the district councils and village development committees, is still a substantive challenge. Sustainability of PE concerns in the media and civil society organizations that are being introduced to p-e ideas in the still ongoing communication strategy is quite promising, but these organizations are dependent on funds.

While it may be expected that there are calls for financial support for a PEI Phase II from Government and other stakeholders in Malawi, it is clear that operationalising and sustaining the clearly substantive gains to date will require increased attention and more time. This is consistent with the PEI experience to date in other countries and the findings of the Norwegian evaluation.

**Conclusion**
In Malawi, the PEI has shown itself to be relevant to government policy, fairly efficient in implementation, effective in providing benefits to government and civil society/ media, has demonstrated some substantive impacts to date and will show increased impact in policy change and inclusion of improved indicators for measuring PE concerns by the end of Phase I. Given the disproportionate burden on women of poverty and environmental problems, it would have been more relevant to have highlighted gender concerns directly in PEI.

Being very well owned and integrated into Government planning processes and documents, plus the fully joint programming approach between Government, UNDP Malawi and PEI, has been key to embedding PEI in the UNDAF and UNDP Malawi work plan.
The main challenge facing PEI is to get improved p-e objectives operationalised via sector plans and budgets and down at the decentralized level. There are less than 15 months left (including the recommended extra 6). The chance for success as the level of the district councils is very slim in the time left since the PEI Phase I only has a year or so. This highlights the importance of Output 4 of the present PEI Phase I and also reflects the PEI programmatic model where Phase II focuses on meeting the implementation challenge. Future government and UN initiatives – including any PEI Phase II - therefore have to confront the problems of capacity and lack of resources at national, sector and local government levels.

The PEI also needs to be viewed in the context of the broad range of very substantive development and social challenges in Malawi. These include population growth, child stunting, malnutrition, land tenure issues, HIV/AIDS, the potential impact of climate change plus others. While it is acknowledged that PEI does not have the resources, mandate or value added to address a number of these issues, it would be useful for PEI to at least identify links between p-e issues and broader development challenges. Then, it could engage with relevant stakeholders in the relevant development agencies in Government and the UNCT to highlight the relevance of addressing these linkages within by these agencies. The work with OPC is relevant in this regard. This issue also brings to mind the views of the Norwegian evaluation of the PEI Africa pilot phase that PEI should include a better focus on higher level policy issues – which, inter alia, related to these broader development challenges.

Consideration of the above, and study of PEI Malawi outputs to date, also leads to the conclusion that there is insufficient focus on the P (Poverty) in the PEI and “too much E” (environment). An improved focus on the P would help PEI Malawi to be more relevant to addressing these broader economic and social problems, such as with health and education and high population growth – with increased population density a significant contribution to environmental degradation in rural areas. The poverty analysis included in the PEI Malawi economics report provides very useful evidence to build an increased poverty focus into PEI Malawi.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings presented in the report, the MTR recommends the following for PEI Malawi:

i) a no cost extension of six months to allow the PEI to finish all its activities with the present budget;

ii) to improve its indicators, introduce OVIs, and carry out simple post training evaluations with course participants so that the impact will be more discernible at the time of the end evaluation;

iii) focus now on strengthening the translation into action of the improved p-e objectives developed in policy at national, sector and desentralised level, including to help the district councils start using the manuals and translate the ideas into actions. This recommendation is foreseen, inter alia, in the strategy (activity 3.2, 3.4, and- especially – 1.4, which focuses on working with civil society organisations and community base organisations). This also implies more focus on support to Finance.

iv) more specific activities and indicators need to be added to the Log Frame to ensure that this coordination takes place;

v) PEI is recommended to assist Government reviews of key p-e relevant sector policies and strategies. Indeed PEI has already contributed to several sector policy reviews, which could lead to improvements in these policies which appear to be having detrimental effect on achievement of Malawi’s environment and development objectives.

vi) E.g. The Forestry review is now ongoing, and PEI is recommended to assist Forestry to make adjustments to Forestry legislation once the policy review is complete. So too is PEI support to policy and strategy review in other sectors, including agriculture.
vii) Preparation of a concept note for a PEI Phase II with a focus on achieved sustained operationalisation of PEI objectives.

Lessons learned

Ongoing substantive, participatory engagement builds trust, ownership, leads to a programme well aligned with national priorities and increases the chance of uptake of PEI recommendations etc and thus of having an impact.

Twinning international expertise and local institutions for key outputs (e.g. economic study) is important for national ownership, national capacity building and delivering a quality output with up-to-date international analytical techniques but it takes more time to obtain the desired output.

Anticipatory steps should be taken to avoid delays in Programme start-up due to recruitment and procurement delays. For example, while a PRODOC needs to be signed to allow financial commitments, such as recruitment, PEI Africa regional budget could retain funds necessary to start such processes in a timely manner.

The value of having Planning/Development as lead agency.

The high persuasive power of operationally relevant, sector focused economic evidence on how environmental sustainability is linked to poverty reduction and the achievement of broader development goals.

The value of having explicit poverty focus in the Economics study (earlier studies in other PEI countries did not have such a clear focus), but need to follow-up on that in terms of use of the findings and influencing other PEI activities. (In terms of both design and implementation).

Having strong UNRC/UNDP RR and Country Office support is vital to success

Focusing on achieving inclusion of P-E linkages in cross-government co-ordination mechanisms is very important. It will also help sustain impacts, as such inclusion implies government ministries have to include p-e linkages in their policy development and budgeting work.

More focus on PEI outcomes and measuring impact is required - which is an issue that goes beyond PEI Malawi, PEI global and indeed is a UNDP and UNEP wide issue. There needs to be more focus on using PEI outputs to bring about change.

Focus on key sectors from early stages important – PEI model suggests focus on sectors in Phase II, but PEI Malawi, plus other new countries in Africa suggests focus in Phase I is productive.

Focus on increasing financial allocations in Phase I, including because this is a demanding output. This implies, inter alia, more focus on support to ministries of finance from an earlier stage. The PEI mainstreaming approach has broader applicability – e.g. in Malawi, the PEI model was applied to the Climate Change programme, with MFDP leading on climate change in Government of Malawi.

Appropriate ITA should be appointed and that plus other PEI recruitments should be carried out in a more timely manner, including by use of an inception phase
Annexes
Annex 1  Progress on implementation of activities

The presentation below provides an overview of the implementation progress of PEI Malawi.¹⁹

I – Institutional Framework for P-E Mainstreaming

1. **Existing national policy, planning and budgeting frameworks**
   
   • Vision 2020
   • Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy
   • Malawi Growth and Development Strategy
   • MDG-based Planning

¹⁹ Presentation prepared by PEI Malawi Country Team
I – Institutional Framework for P-E Mainstreaming

2. **Key national institutions and coordination frameworks**
3. Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC)
4. Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation (MDPC)
5. Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment
6. Ministry of Finance
7. Ministry of Lands and Urban Development
8. Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
9. Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
10. Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development

II – Institutional Framework for P-E Mainstreaming

3. **Existing projects or partners apart from PEI**
   - OXFAM
   - Millennium Challenge Cooperation (MCC)
   - Coordination for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (CURE)
   - PROBIC and COMPASS
   - ActionAid
   - World Vision Malawi
II – PEI Country Program

The UNDP-UNEP PEI supports governments to:

- Sustainable management of the environment is a core objective in development planning & implementation.
- Ensure poverty reduction & other economic development objectives are not undermined by the unsustainable use of natural resources.
- Build capacity to assist decision-makers on:
  - How environment contributes towards growth & development.

II – PEI Country Program

2. PEI expected/anticipated results

1. Evidence-based decision making on the impacts of current unsustainable natural resource management and the benefits of more sustainable management approaches.
2. Improved ENRM policy harmonisation at national, sectoral and district levels.
3. Sustainable land, water and energy management.
II – PEI Country Program

2. PEI expected/anticipated results

4. Provide decision-makers with a rational basis for deciding whether to investment in sustainable ENRM.

5. Integration of sustainable ENRM into M&E frameworks for the MGDS, the ASWAp and other sectoral plans and programmes.

III – PEI Activities

PEI planned/ongoing activities

- Economic Analysis on the Unsustainable Use of Natural Resources.
- Integration of ENRM into National Environmental Budget Guideline (MoF).
III – PEI Activities

PEI planned/ongoing activities

- Develop ENRM Communication Strategy (MDPC)
- Integration of ENRM Indicators into the ASWAp (MoA&FS)
- Develop ENRM indicators as part of M&E of MGDS (MDPC)
- National Forestry Policy 1996 review
- Fisheries Policy, Fisheries and Aquaculture Management Act 1997 review

IV - Implementation

Institutional management/implementation modalities for PEI in Malawi

1. UNDP Malawi is responsible for:
   - Facilitating the development of AWPs;
   - Making timely disbursements of advances to the IPs;
   - Recording of financial reports;
   - Support Government in mobilising resources;
   - Following up on reporting requirements; and
   - Organizing programme audits.
IV - Implementation

Institutional management/implementation modalities for PEI in Malawi

2. MDPC is responsible for:
   • Coordination and leadership of the PEI Programme
   • Developing Annual Work Plans (AWPs);
   • Overall management based on the AWPs; and
   • Management (accounting and reporting) of funds.

3. UNDP-UNEP PEI Africa Team is responsible for:
   • Providing overall technical advice;
   • Facilitating fund transfer to UNDP Malawi; and
   • Ensuring quality control in programme implementation.
IV - Implementation

Institutional management/implementation PEI Malawi

4. **Steering Committee** - for Climate Change, Environment, and Natural Resources for overall and strategic guidance.

5. **Technical Committee** – comprise representatives of government institutions, CSOs and donors who provide technical guidance and ensure adequate co-ordination between PEI and other relevant activities.

6. Project Mgr, Technical Advisor and FAA based at MDPC.
   (The Director responsible for the coordination of project and contact person)

---

VI – Progress and Achievements

PEI’s achievements to date in Malawi

Output 1A *knowledge-base and network that increases awareness and capacity sustainable ENRM, economic growth and poverty reduction developed/established*

1.1 A study on economic valuation of sustainable natural resources use in Malawi

1.2 Incorporation of climate change, environment and natural resources management in the MGDS II

1.3.1 Capacity building for journalist on the economic valuation report on sustainable natural resources in Malawi

1.3.2 Coverage of the study findings in the print media, electronic media

1.3.3 Draft joint communication strategy on CC & ENRM
VI – Progress and Achievements

PEI’s achievements to date in Malawi

Output 2 **Capacity of GoM’s policy coordination, for effective collaboration on the integration of ENRM into policies and plans enhanced**

2.2 Guidelines for integrating ENRM into the Guide to Executive Decision Making Processes Handbook

2.4 Government-donor working group meetings- resources from One UN and TRAC

2.5 Training of 3 MoAFS staff in environmental mainstreaming
   Training of PM, PEO and CE in poverty, environment and development nexus

Output 3 **Sustainable land, water and energy management in place**

3.1.1 Sustainability indicators developed and incorporated into the ASWAp M&E Framework
   Proposal to update the soil loss and fertiliser use efficiency

3.1.2. Subject matter specialists (123) in MoAFS trained in sustainability indicators for the ASWAp M&E Framework

3.3. Fisheries Policy and Fisheries and Aquaculture Management Act under review
VI – Progress and Achievements

PEI’s achievements to date in Malawi

Output 3 *Sustainable land, water and energy management in place*

3.5 TOTs in the making and utilisation of energy efficient stoves (345).
   Entrepreneurs identified and being trained
   National Forestry Policy 1996 under review

---

VI – Progress and Achievements

PEI’s achievements to date in Malawi

Output 4 *Budgeting and financing for sustainable development incorporated*

4.1 ENRM into the National Budget Guidelines incorporated
4.3 Draft Decentralised Environmental Management Guidelines awaiting vetting of the technical working group
4.4 Joint concept for the formulation of CC and ENRM SWAp
4.6 Integration of ENRM halted. Awaiting the completion and vetting of the ENRM integration guidelines for the National Budget Guidelines
VI – Progress and Achievements

PEI’s achievements to date in Malawi

Output 5 A Monitoring and Evaluation System to ensure sustainable ENRM developed

5.1 Environmental addendum to the MGDS
   MSEOR 2010 compiled and undergoing print
   Video production for the MSEOR underway

5.2 Sustainability indicators for the MGDS II developed

Output 6 Management, monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of PEI program strengthened

6.4 CC & ENRM one of the priority areas in the MGDS II
   Joint Steering Committee for CC and ENRM Projects
   A collaborative publication among IIED, MPDC and PEI
   on “lessons learnt on environmental mainstreaming in Malawi”
VII – Lessons learned

1. Regular / consistent communication, information sharing and monitoring key to project success.
2. Involve senior officials from all key sectors & ministries.
3. Consultancy contracts require scrutiny to ensure compliance to outputs and deadlines.
4. Sequencing of key studies to inform the project vital before implementation begins, e.g. Economic Analysis.
5. Model of UNDP and UNEP collaboration

6. High level involvement of key players i.e. UNDP, MDPC, PEI and implementing partners is means to ensuring progress
7. There are high transaction costs to ensure the work is done especially in the sectors.
8. Realistic planning is also vital for a project of this nature. Some of the activities were heavily underestimated on time and resources
VIII – Next steps

1. Dissemination of Economic Analysis report on Unsustainable ENRM.
2. Steering Committee for Climate Change, Environment and Natural Resource Management.
3. Implement and monitor
   1. Guideline for Executive Decision-making,
   2. Guideline for Decentralised Environmental Management, and
   3. Revision of the GoM Forestry Policy.
4. Guideline for Environmental Budget Process(w/ODI)

VIII – Next steps

5. Facilitation of development of the CC-ENRM SWAp
6. Joint communication strategy for climate change and ENRM
7. Establishment of PEI Phase II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belgian Development Cooperation</th>
<th>Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DAKIDA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Irish Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA Norway)</td>
<td>Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (Swedish EPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation (SIDA)</td>
<td>UK Department for International Development (DFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation</td>
<td>Department of State United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you

http://www.unpei.org
Annex 2  Methodology for data collection and analysis

The methodology used by the MTR in Malawi comprises the following elements:

- Interview key stakeholders, individually or in small thematic groups: Ask key questions that are not leading, listen with respect and engage in a mutual learning process in reviewing project progress. This attitude is important for reviewing the PEI because PEI is a programme with great emphasis on lobbying, advocacy, and mentoring.
- Desk review of key documents
- Key questions to key stakeholders that emerge from reading key documentation
- Coordination with the Malawi PEI programme team, the PEF team
- Testing findings and recommendations with staff from PEI Malawi, UNDP Malawi, and PEF Nairobi
- Participation in a short presentation by media organisations in the Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation
### List of persons met and mission itinerary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Sept</td>
<td>David Moore</td>
<td>07.00 am check in Montevideo airport: 09.00 Fly from Montevideo to Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sept</td>
<td>David Moore</td>
<td>10.15 am- Arrive Buenos Aires. 8 hours’ wait in Buenos Aires (check in to day hotel near airport); 18.30 Fly from Buenos Aires to Jo’burg 9.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>David Moore</td>
<td>Arrive 07.30 Jo’burg; 11.00 Fly from Jo’burg to Lilongwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>David Moore</td>
<td>Land in Lilongwe at 13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>David Moore</td>
<td>14.30-16.30: Meeting in hotel with following Project staff and consultants from academia, viz:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>Michael Mmangisa</td>
<td>Programme Manager/UNDP-UNEP Poverty and Environment Initiative Project Ministry of Finance and Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>Anand Babu Prakasam</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Climate Change/UNDP Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>Patrick Kambewa</td>
<td>Professor Economics, Chancellor College, Univ. of Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>Paul Jere</td>
<td>Consultant to PEI Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sept</td>
<td>John Mlava</td>
<td>Lecturer in Land Resources Management, Univ. of Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Paul Jere</td>
<td>Agricultural Economist/Consultant to PEI Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Hastings Ngoma</td>
<td>Economist/Planning Division- M&amp;E Unit of Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Esme Nhlane</td>
<td>Ag. Economist/ Ministry of Local Government &amp; Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Moses Zuze</td>
<td>Ag. &amp; Envir. Economist / Ministry of Local Government &amp; Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Jonathan Banda</td>
<td>Economist / Ministry of Local Government &amp; Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Doshani Kadokera</td>
<td>Ag. Economist / Ministry of Local Government &amp; Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Walusugu Kayira</td>
<td>Chief Economist/ Ministry of Local Government &amp; Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Tithokoze Carolyn Samuel</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance - Assistant Budget Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Richard Dictus</td>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator / UNDP Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>Jan Rijpma</td>
<td>Assistant Res Rep./UNDP Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>i) Alex Namaona</td>
<td>Min. of Development Planning &amp; Cooperation / Deputy Director, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>ii) Mzithembi Mbekeani</td>
<td>Min. of Development Planning &amp; Cooperation / Public Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>iii) Patrick Kanchowa</td>
<td>UNDP-PEI Malawi / Administrative &amp; Finance Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>iv) Michael Mmangisa</td>
<td>UNDP-PEI Malawi /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>v) Paul Jere</td>
<td>UNDP-PEI Malawi / Consultant- international technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept</td>
<td>vi) Anand Babu</td>
<td>UNDP-PEI Malawi PEI/Climate Change international technical advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Lewis Mhango</td>
<td>Department of Energy / Deputy Director of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Joseph Kalowekamo</td>
<td>Department of Energy / Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Nyuma Mughogho</td>
<td>Forestry / Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Thomas Makhambera</td>
<td>Forestry / Deputy Director, Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Mustafa Kaunde</td>
<td>Forestry / Principal Forestry Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Mr. John Ngalande</td>
<td>Forestry / Deputy Director, Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Aloysius Kamperewera</td>
<td>Environmental Affairs Dept. / Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sept</td>
<td>Themba Kalua</td>
<td>UN-PF Nairobi / Briefing/status update on Malawi review in hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Mzithembi Mbekeani</td>
<td>Ministry of Development Planning and Cooperation/Public Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Zainah Liwanda</td>
<td>UNDP/Communications Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Joseph Claude Simwaka</td>
<td>National Publications Ltd./ Editor of “Fuko” (“Nation”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Raphael Mweninguwe</td>
<td>Chazale Creative Communication, Printers &amp; Designers/Consultant, creative writer (Sunday Times columnist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Emmanuel Thuwala</td>
<td>Malawi Broadcasting Authority, Development Broadcasting Unit /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Mike Kambalame</td>
<td>Story Workshop / Video Media Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Victor Chikwawe</td>
<td>Ministry of Information / Editor of “Boma Lathu” (“Our Government”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Daisy Kambalame</td>
<td>Country Manager/African Institute of Corporate Citizenship (NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept</td>
<td>Friday Njaya</td>
<td>Chief Fisheries Officer/Department of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sept</td>
<td>Elliot Phiri</td>
<td>Office of the President and Cabinet / Ag. Director of Policy Research, M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sept</td>
<td>Walusungu Kayira</td>
<td>Chief Economist / Min. of Local Government &amp; Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sept</td>
<td>Moses Chirwa</td>
<td>Min. of Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4  References consulted in the MTR for Malawi


Letter of agreement between the united nations development programme and ministry of economic planning and development on the implementation of poverty environment initiative when undp serves as executing entity.


January 2010. INTEGRATING ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN POLICY MAKING AND PLANNING IN MALAWI. Procedural Guidelines
Annex 5  The cycle of poverty that leads to environmental degradation

Land, Health, AIDS, educational failure, and poverty are linked to and cause the cycle of poverty in Malawi. Land is a diminishing resource. The quality of its soils and water is decreasing. Bosworth (1998) identified the following as being some of the most pressing problems on customary land: a) Diminishing holding; b) Landlessness; c) Land conflicts; d) Land management practice: The breakdown in the systems of managing natural resources has led to the degradation of natural resources. A large number of households are experiencing diminishing holding sizes as a result of reallocation to relatives and children. In 1998, 3% of households in the customary sector (about 75,000 households) had no land for cultivation. Conflicts in the customary sector have been on the increase mainly as a result of land pressure. Long illness and death due to HIV AIDS has led to children having to take on increasingly more responsible jobs in the household, drop out of school, and take on agricultural labour to produce food for their families and generate income (Mbaya 2002), e.g., by charcoal production (Malawi State of Environment and Outlook Report).

HIV/AIDS have a huge negative impact on land and NRM issues in Malawi. AIDS is a leading cause of death in the 15 - 49 age groups. High numbers of professionals have died from AIDS in Malawi. HIV/AIDS results in high rates of absenteeism from work, medical bills, funeral costs and payment of premature death benefits. There is a growing number of child headed families. - HIV/AIDS is resulting in a growing number of orphans. Life for children and women in Malawi is characterized by poor access to healthcare and a high incidence of diarrhoea, malaria and other communicable diseases. Malnutrition levels have remained high for over a decade and 46 per cent of children under the age of five are stunted. Malawi is at the epicentre of the HIV epidemic. AIDS related illnesses are robbing the country of people in their prime – life expectancy at birth now stands at 45 years. Close to a million people are living with HIV and AIDS, including more than 100,000 children under the age of 15. The government has demonstrated a resolve to improve social service delivery by increasing budgetary allocations. In the country’s 2008/2009 budget, the health sector received the largest allocation of 14.3 per cent, followed by the education and agricultural sectors, including food security and nutrition. The health, education and agriculture sectors all have Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAps) while the SWAp for the water and sanitation sector is in process. What this means is a more coherent and coordinated approach to developing, funding and implementing programmes that have a direct impact on the quality of children’s lives (UNICEF Malawi Annual Report 2009).

Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVCs): The AIDS epidemic in Malawi is leaving behind a generation of parentless children. In 2009, an estimated 800,000 children are orphaned and many more are vulnerable by living in families with chronically sick parents and family members. Extended families, neighbours and family friends across the country are taking on the responsibility of caring for orphaned children. But they too are affected by poverty and cannot always provide the best care for these vulnerable children. Malawi is working to establish a protective environment for children. Legislative and policy frameworks are being strengthened, such as the newly enacted national Birth Registration Bill and the establishment of a national birth registration system. A Child Care, Protection and Justice Bill and the Will’s and Inheritance Act are waiting to be enacted by Parliament (UNICEF Malawi Annual Report 2009).

Despite the abolition of school fees in 1994, over 10 per cent of children of primary school age are not in school, and only 40 per cent of those who enrol in Standard 1 reach Standard 4. Net enrolment rates are high in grades one and two for both boys and girls, but only 26 per cent of children complete their education, with completion rates as low as 16 per cent for girls. Class sizes are huge, with an average of 107 pupils to one teacher. Malawi's schools would need more than 30,000 new classrooms to ease overcrowding. Many schools don't have desks and chairs, sports fields and playgrounds, libraries, and enough teaching and learning material, all which impact negatively on the quality of education. Malawi's low completion rate points to major weaknesses in primary education and makes it unlikely that the MDG of attaining universal primary education will be reached by 2015. The government is making efforts to address these challenges through the National Education Sector Plan (UNICEF Malawi Annual Report 2009).

The importance of education and self development for children and young people cannot be underestimated. Education is widely regarded as the route to economic prosperity, the key to scientific and technological advancement, the means to combat poverty and unemployment, the foundation of social equity, and the spread of political socialization and cultural vitality. It is also a human right and every child is entitled to develop his or her inherent potential. The Child-Friendly School, a comprehensive and dynamic educational model aimed at helping schools achieve safe, healthy and protective environments, is a cornerstone to a quality improvement programme in Malawi, supported by UNICEF. The Ministry of Education has taken the leadership in developing the CFS programme, and in 2009 developed a policy toolkit to support the implementation of
CFS at all levels. The toolkit consists of all the important chapters of the most relevant policies as reference material for decision makers and school managers. In 2009, 100,000 school children stood to benefit from activities that would transform their schools into child-friendly spaces of learning. Child-friendly infrastructure and resources for 313 schools, such as classrooms, latrines and teachers’ houses and teaching and learning materials, were built and provided during the year. Two thousand teachers were equipped with knowledge about the principles and practices of CFS. When putting their new skills into practice, the teachers would be able to reach 180,000 pupils around Malawi. The CFS approach goes beyond the school. The active involvement of parents and community members in how schools are run is an integral part of its vision. Transforming educators into leaders that can inspire staff and students is also one of its core principles. 2009 saw community capacity building bear fruits. In Mulanje district every single school developed school improvement plans with support from UNICEF. The process of making sure that all schools in Malawi have a realistic and relevant school improvement plan is currently underway (UNICEF Malawi Annual Report 2009).
Annex III

MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE UNDP-UNEP POVERTY-ENVIRONMENT INITIATIVE (PEI) SCALE UP.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1 – Background and Introduction

PEI – FROM THE PILOT TO THE SCALE-UP

The UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) has its roots in the growing appreciation of how environmental sustainability can contribute to pro-poor growth and poverty reduction that emerged in the late 1990s and was endorsed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 in Johannesburg. UNDP launched the first PEI activities during the late 1990s. This was a policy initiative focused on desk studies and policy recommendations. Meanwhile, UNEP launched its own poverty-environment project which concentrated on the significance of ecosystem services for poor people.

Increasingly substantive collaboration between UNDP and UNEP commenced in early 2005 and the initial joint UNDP-UNEP PEI was formally launched at a side event – Environment for the MDGs – at the 2005 World Summit, with strong donor support. The two institutions effectively combined their efforts and their funds in support of a set of 7 country programmes in Africa. This is referred to as the PEI Pilot Phase. (The one PEI country programme in Asia remained a UNDP supported programme)

In late 2006, UNDP and UNEP undertook a vigorous effort to learn from the experience gained in this Pilot Phase. With the backing of key donors, UNDP and UNEP jointly prepared a formal proposal to seek financial support for a UNDP-UNEP PEI Scale-up. The favourable reaction by donors to this proposal led to UNDP and UNEP launching the joint UNDP-UNEP PEI Scale-up in February 2007. The joint programme document for “Scaling-up the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative” (commonly referred to as the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC - see Annex I) set an initial target of expanding the programme to work in about 25-30 countries (from 8 in the pilot phase) with a budget of $33 million over five years. Its implementation effectively started in 2008.

THE POVERTY-ENVIRONMENT INITIATIVE IN BRIEF

The PEI is a global UN programme that supports country-led efforts to mainstream poverty-environment linkages into national development planning, from policymaking to budgeting, implementation and monitoring. We provide financial and technical assistance to governments to set up analytical, institutional and capacity strengthening programmes with the aim of influencing policy and budgets and bringing about enduring institutional change by increasing the understanding of country poverty-environment linkages. In order to achieve that, PEI works increasingly in collaboration with other relevant actors at the country level such as leading practitioner and knowledge organizations, civil society organizations, and the private sector. It is a significant example of commitment to UN Reform, including One UN.

The UNDP-UNEP PEI:
- Was formally launched in 2005 and significantly scaled-up in 2007;
- Currently works in Africa, Asia-Pacific (PEI A-P), Europe and the CIS (PEI ECIS) and Latin America and the Caribbean (PEI LAC). There are currently 16 PEI country programmes under implementation, 5 under preparation and 5 where PEI provides targeted technical support ; (Note: this number is under review consistent with resource realities).
- Operates through a joint UNDP-UNEP Board, a global Poverty-Environment Facility (PEF), four regional teams (RTs) and the UN country teams (UNDP COs);
- Funding has been provided by the Governments of Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Norway, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the European Commission and core funding from UNDP and UNEP;
- Contributes to the UN ‘Delivering as One’ process and strengthening the capacity of its host agencies to mainstream environment in their country operations.

The value added of the PEI is that there is a demonstrable need to improve the incorporation of environmental sustainability in country development processes and that the PEI is the one major international programme that attempts to operationalise the integration of pro-poor environmental sustainability into national development processes and budgets – using a country-led approach based upon experience and lessons learned. Furthermore, the UNDP-UNEP PEI is a leading example of UN interagency co-operation and UN reform in action. Our team has achieved a significant expansion of the existing PEI programme through a formal UNDP-UNEP joint programme which will now undergo a mid-term review.
PEI IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

PEI is a pioneering example of a joint UNDP-UNEP programme – with a Joint Management Board, the Poverty-Environment Facility (PEF) and four PEI regional teams (RTs). Both host institutions contribute core staff – some full-time, some part-time - at the global, regional and country levels. Since PEI is a jointly managed initiative with pooled funds, contributions from PEI Scale-up donors are pooled and jointly managed by the PEF under the UNDP Atlas system.

The PEI Joint Management Board consists of the Director of UNDP’s Environment and Energy Group, UNEP’s Director of the Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (Note: originally and until August 2010, the UNEP representative was the Director of the Division of Regional Cooperation). The PEF based in Nairobi is jointly managed by a Director and a Manager, appointed by UNDP and UNEP, who report to the Board. It is charged with global coordination and management of the programme – including budget management and reporting to donors on expenditure and results. It also offers knowledge management and technical advisory services to the regional and country programmes. Each country programme is developed jointly with the Government and formalized in a joint Programme Document (PRODOC) approved by the main Government partners, the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Facility, and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO). The four regional teams support the design and delivery of country programmes, in cooperation with the UNDP COs and the Government, and are responsible for responding to demand in their respective region. Under the guidance of the PEF, the regional teams use the results framework in the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC and report with our country partners against this results framework and associated indicators. DAVID COMMENT: i.e monitoring itself rather+ than actual measuring poverty reduction indicators / environmental improvement indicators using MDGs/

A Donor Steering Group (DSG) formed by donor contributing to the PEI Scale-up meets annually and provides guidance and feedback to management. Reporting to donors is done through a consolidated annual progress report - rather than individual donor reports - as agreed with the Donor Steering Group. In addition to reporting on progress and results, the annual report is used for disseminating information on lessons learned in programme countries and other outreach purposes. During the last DSG meeting it was agreed David: why ? to reconvene the PEI Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to provide strategic advice to the management of the PEF.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS - PEI COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

PEI's strength is in the proven approach it employs at the country level. PEI works with the government to establish institutional and management arrangements that create a well-functioning team that works to deliver sustainable results for poverty reduction and improved environmental management. PEI country programmes operate through the UNDP CO, with joint support from PEI regional teams and the broader UN country team. In general, the ministry of planning and finance is the most suitable entity to lead the effort, in close collaboration with environmental institutions. In most cases PEI is integrated in an existing government-led:

- Steering Committee- including high level environment institutions, planning and finance ministries, sector ministries, subnational actors, and non-governmental actors, which provides strategic and political guidance to the poverty-environment mainstreaming process.
- Technical committee or task team- Provides technical inputs and guidance throughout the poverty-environment mainstreaming process. This team can be composed of external experts, government officials, UN staff, and local officials.

The PEI country teams vary in composition. Drawing on support from the PEI RT and the PEF they focus on a specific entry point, such as a development policy process, budgeting process, sector or local planning process, or similar process to integrate environment into development and poverty-reduction policies.

THE PEI PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH

The PEI has developed a programmatic approach for mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into national development planning. This programmatic approach consists of three components or phases:

1. Finding the entry points and making the case, which sets the stage for mainstreaming
2. Mainstreaming poverty-environment linkages into policy processes, which is focused on integrating poverty-environment linkages into an ongoing policy process, such as a PRSP or sector strategy, based on country-specific evidence
3. Meeting the implementation challenge, which is aimed at ensuring integration of poverty-environment linkages into budgeting, implementation and monitoring processes

The diagram below explains the activities of the three phases in more detail. This approach is flexible and can be tailored to each country context.

2 – Objectives of the external PEI mid-term review
Section 3.5 of the Joint Programme Document “Scaling-up the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative” (PEI Scale-up PRODOC), states that “an external mid-term review (MTR) will be carried out in Year 3”. This PEI MTR will be conducted according to these TOR.

The PEI Scale-up proposal also indicates that the objective of the external mid-term review of the PEI Scale-up is “to assess overall programme progress. An external evaluation will be conducted in Year 5 to assess programme results and to make recommendations for a second-year phase”. This review follows a mid-term evaluation and final evaluation of the pilot African PEI programme. These evaluations were prepared for Belgium and Norway, respectively (copies of the reports are contained in the memory stick). Hence this MTR will not cover pilot African PEI country programmes.

According to the above, and as suggested by donors, the purpose of this MTR is to serve as a monitoring tool focusing on how the programme is operating and if any major changes are required, while the final evaluation would look at the overall programme objectives; what impact has been achieved and lessons learned to be applied to a new programme and/or alternatively to develop indicative recommendations for PEI post 2012.

The specific objectives of this external MTR are:
1. Assess the current value added of the PEI and whether changes in the wider policy environment, i.e. opportunities and challenges in view of the climate change agenda, green economy, and consideration of other-related initiatives or actors that have emerged since 2002 have implications for how PEI operates to 2012 (relevance).
2. Assess the progress to date of the Initiative and its implementation against the results and resources framework of the Scale-up joint programme and identify its strengths and weaknesses. In this sense, emphasis should be put on the analysis of results obtained compared to the “targeted results” that were expected taking into account the actual inputs, outputs and outcomes (effectiveness and efficiency). David: Impact?
3. Provide findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve implementation and delivery. These should focus on:
   a. the global joint PEI design and arrangements (including the PEF, PEI governance and operational and technical support from UNDP and UNEP)
   b. PEI regional teams
   c. PEI country programme design and implementation.

The key documents that will guide the review are (A memory stick will be prepared with all the key PEI documents for the reviewers):
- Annex I: the PEI Scale-up proposal
- Annex II: the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC,
- Annex III: the PEI pilot phase Norwegian evaluation,
- Annex IV: the PEI pilot phase Belgium evaluation,
- The PEI Scale-up Annual Progress Reports for 2008 and 2009,
- The PEI proposed M&E framework for the PEI Scale-up,
- Relevant PEI Scale-up country PRODCOs (to be provided to the MTR team).

The target groups for the results of this review are the main PEI stakeholders: i) the PEI teams (includes beneficiary countries), ii) PEI donors (including both the Technical Advisory Group and the Donor Steering Group and iii) UNDP and UNEP Senior Management (includes the PEI Joint Management Board).

3. Scope of the MTR
The review will cover PEI Scale-up work carried out over the first three years of the PEI Scale-up at global, regional and country level (up until December 2010) in PEI Scale-up countries in Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and the CIS and Latin America and the Caribbean.

Reporting requirements: The MTR will provide the main PEI stakeholders indicated in general and the PEI management in particular (including the PEI Joint Management Board and the Donor Steering Group) with a review of the implementation and performance of the PEI and it will make recommendations to improve those for the remaining period. The review will include a detailed management response with action plans to implement recommendations.

Limits of the MTR: Due to the early stages of implementation of many PEI Scale-up country programmes, it is too soon to provide substantive evidence on PEI’s possible impact on poverty reduction and sustainable growth. Furthermore, the joint PEI Scale-up PRODOC (see page 16) already points out at the fact that: “An assessment of PEI, therefore, must focus on the processes generated or facilitated by the programme [...]”. The impact assessment is, by definition, relatively less applicable in a mid-term review exercise, since impact assessment examines the achievements made by the results in the longer term. This MTR should instead provide recommendations on the likelihood that PEI outputs will deliver the expected outcomes and impact in
beneficiary countries as indicated in their respective country PRODOCs. In this sense, the MTR will address important aspects impacting on present and future performance, such as country ownership or UNDP and UNEP joint programming related issues. It will also review design and implementation – including organizational and institutional arrangements or project design - to identify process issues that may impact on overall PEI delivery.

As such, and in line with the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC, the review team will focus on understanding and commenting on the extent to which the PEI is assisting in creating the enabling conditions needed to effectively mainstream poverty-environment in national development plans and policy processes and the likelihood that those PEI-driven changes have an impact on the ground. For example, that additional investment will be made in sustainable agricultural practices.

CRITERIA AND SPECIFIC TASKS
The five OEDC/DAC traditional evaluation criteria will be the substantive focus of this review - relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Standard evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness will be used to assess the core of the MTR, i.e. the performance of the PEI, as follows: (Some suggested modifications may be discussed in the MTR review inception report, but any substantive changes would require the agreement of donors).

Relevance - the MTR will comment on whether the portfolio of different outputs undertaken by PEI country programmes are the right ones to deliver the enabling conditions for poverty-environment mainstreaming in the light of the context post-2002 as indicated for the specific objective 1). In particular, the MTR will address the following key review questions:
1. Assess PEI’s value added, including areas of strength and competitive advantage and areas for improvement;
2. Assess whether the three project outputs, as formulated in the Scale-up joint PRODOC, still represent the best project strategy for achieving PEI objectives;
3. Assess the consistency of the PEI Scale-up country programmes to be reviewed (e.g. two from the Africa and Asia-Pacific regions and one from ECIS and LAC, respectively) with the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC and where there are significant differences, assess the rationale for such differences and their broader implications for the PEI. This includes in terms of both process and content;
4. Considering the time left until the end of the PEI, assess whether the timeframe is still realistic to deliver on the expected outputs in the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC. If applicable, outline recommendations for a process that would lead to revised timings for the remaining implementation time;
5. Assess the PEI phased and adaptive mainstreaming model, with a view to clarify: a) the ‘exit’ criteria, i.e. conditions, pre-requisites and steps including making a transition to other stakeholders at the country level, b) the post 2012 scenario for PEI, i.e. integration in the structure/work of the two host organisations (related to bullet point 5 under effectiveness).

Effectiveness - the extent to which the programme is contributing to its objectives or its desired potential outcomes through delivery of outputs and through its implementation at national, regional and global levels, including the degree to which the programme responds to national priorities:
1. Review progress and achievement of the PEI Scale-up poverty-environment mainstreaming outputs at global, regional and country levels (in the selected countries) in the PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC;
2. Review the adequacy of advice and inputs by PEF, RTs and selected PEI Scale-up country teams on poverty-environment mainstreaming, including internal and external communication management;
3. Assess the main underlying factors beyond the programme’s immediate control that influence outcomes and results. Consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project’s management strategies for these factors: e.g. review the proposed PEI Theory of change;
4. Review the appropriateness and effectiveness of the partnership between UNDP and UNEP with respect to the PEI Scale-up at the global, regional and country level, including UNDP and UNEP support for the PEI Scale-up in programmatic, operational and governance terms. This should include of both poverty and environment elements of UNDP, i.e. the role of UNDP and UNEP against the requirements set out in the PRODOC;
5. Review the degree to which PEI is integrated in UNEP and UNDP and delivers experiences, approaches, network and partners etc. to other UNEP and UNDP activities.

Efficiency - the cost-effectiveness of the transformation of inputs into outputs. This MTR should provide an analysis and recommendations on the use of available resources in terms of timeliness and quality delivery of services.
1. Assess the evolution, effectiveness and efficiency of the current M&E design for PEI, and identify any changes needed to ensure that the M&E system provides adequate measure of results, including performance and impact indicators.
2. Review the PEI country programmes’ execution modalities, i.e. assess the management and institutional set-up (membership and profiles, cost-effectiveness, lead agency, national ownership including the role of the national management;
3. Identify the major factors that have facilitated or impeded the progress of the country PEI programme in achieving its desired results/objectives. This should also take into account the political and institutional country situation during programme implementation and related impacts;
4. UNDP and UNEP resource mobilization efforts to the PEI pooled fund, plus PEI country programme resource mobilisation efforts;
Preparing for impact and sustainability

Impact - for the purpose of this review, impact represents changes in the degree to which pro-poor environmental sustainability is included and operationalised in national, sector and sub-national development plans and budgets, whether planned or unplanned, positive or negative, that the programme brings about. This MTR should provide recommendations on the likelihood that PEI outputs deliver the expected outcomes and impact in beneficiary countries as indicated in their respective country PRODOCs. Note: as the PEI is a partnership programme, with country programmes strongly embedded in existing government processes and agencies, impact should be assessed in such a partnership context, the policy and budgeting processes where all parties play key roles, rather than impact on enhanced environment and poverty conditions.

Sustainability – the MTR will comment on the likelihood that the outputs and outcomes that the PEI is producing and contributing to will bring about significant and durable change and will ensure that environment is embedded in institutional development planning processes used by different sectors of the government.

5 - Methodology or review approach
The MTR will be a progress review, focusing on whether the UNDP-UNEP PEI outcomes are likely to be achieved. The independent review will take into account the changing global environmental and poverty debate as well as evolving international concerns and priorities. It must provide evidence-based information that is independent, credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by the main stakeholders and applicable to the remaining period of PEI Scale-up joint PRODOC duration.
The evaluation will consist of three main phases in the course of which five methodological stages will be developed.

Three Main Phases of Development: Five Methodological Stages:
Structuring of the evaluation
Inception/design Data collection
Implementation Analysis
Synthesis/reporting/dissemination phase Judgements on findings
Recommendations

The MTR should provide as much gender disaggregated data as possible. It will be carried out by the MTR team through the following elements:
• Documentation review (desk study): the list of relevant documents includes those listed under section 2, related reports and internal guidance documents. These and other relevant documents will be made available as indicated in section 7. The desk study should be complemented by a participatory approach including the full range of PEI Scale-up stakeholders and the following elements:
• Global and regional consultations: headquarters and regional centres will be contacted by the MTR team to interview UNDP and UNEP staff and to consult with selected staff of partner organizations and stakeholders operating at global and regional levels. These will include bilateral donors, plus international NGOs and institutions with overlapping interests, priorities and concerns such as the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) or the World Resources Institute (WRI).
• Country Field visits: should be made to at least one country PEI programme per region (two in Africa and two in Asia-Pacific), i.e. a total of six countries. For this purpose the team will carry out substantive analyses of background documentation, plus interviews with key stakeholders focusing on country teams (key Government officials, UNDP CO, national project managers and coordinators, technical advisors) and relevant non-governmental actors and bilateral and multilateral donors. The team will also direct observations on a small sample of programme and project sites, in order to gather evidence to respond to the key evaluation questions.
• The main criteria for country selection are to attain a regional balance and include a mix of country typologies -not only least-developed, but also middle income countries. Other important criteria include: i) country programme developed as part of the Scale-up, ii) enough progress made to provide valid data to the MTR, iii) cost-effectiveness of travel by the MTR team.
• Desk reviews, including phone calls with Management and Senior Management from additional country offices and regional centres will be used in a number of the other PEI countries.
• Use of questionnaires or mini-surveys as needed to complete and validate the information obtained through other sources to respond to the review questions. Indicators for measuring achievement of the objectives are validated according to generally accepted criteria, such as SMART. Disaggregated data should be presented to clarify any differences between sexes and between different groups of poor people, included excluded groups.

Taking into account that the conceptual nature of the subject does not lend itself easily to quantitative analysis, the approach to the review will be further discussed, refined and finalized with the MTR team.

6 - Expected outputs and timeframe
The main output will be a final MTR report, not exceeding 30 pages, excluding annexes. The final report will synthesize the evidence from all the components of this evaluation. The findings, conclusions and recommendations will be summarized in an Executive Summary.

Preparation: the review team will submit a technical and a financial proposal for the review, including in-country visits and interviews during the implementation of the MTR. This proposal should follow the methodology indicated above and include draft travel agendas and persons to be interviewed in each country. The proposal should detail costs and be presented to the PEF for review and approval. There will also be reports from the 6 country studies that will not exceed 10 pages each, excluding annexes. The country reports will be summarized in an annex to the main report. The draft report will highlight recommendations to address issues identified. It will be presented to the PEF for comments by the end of June 2011 [26 of September].

Final report: based on feedback from the PEF and lead donors, the external review team will present a final report consistent with the objectives, scope and methodology of the review as set out above by the date agreed to with the PEF. The final report will be approved by the PEF and the findings will be presented to the main PEI stakeholders. The report will also be circulated to the participating UNDP and UNEP units and country offices, partner organizations and other key stakeholders. The final report (maximum of 30 pages without annexes) should include:
• Executive summary (no longer than five pages summarizing findings, conclusions and recommendations)
• Introduction (including description of the review methodology)
• Findings and review outcomes following an analysis consistent with the above taking into account best practices and lessons learned, focusing on internal factors (strengths, weaknesses) affecting implementation and management arrangements of the programme, areas for corrective action, areas for potential success and external factors (opportunities, threats) affecting the implementation (i.e. such as Government commitment or political will)
• Conclusions
• Recommendations*
• Annexes: TOR, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, samples of questionnaires and tools used for the review, etc.

*Recommendations:

The report should provide detailed and operational recommendations, relevant within the UNDP and UNEP contexts, organised by target groups. These recommendations should be ranked and prioritised according to their relevance and importance to the purpose of the evaluation. Options to implement the recommendations with the indication of the respective limits and possible risks should be presented. Recommendations will in all cases need to be cross-referenced to the corresponding conclusions. Furthermore the evaluation team may select (and justify) the 3 most important recommendations that should be highlighted to PEF, RTs, country teams (including recipient governments), UNDP and UNEP management. Appropriate feedback mechanisms shall be provided so that all types of evaluation results are transmitted effectively to all persons responsible for decision-making.

The other output will be a stakeholder validation/a review workshop at which all team members and the full range of stakeholders discuss and agree on findings, conclusions and follow-up recommendations.

Timeframe:
The proposed timeframe of the MTR will be 60 person days plus travel time and mission time in-country over a maximum period of three months from the beginning of April 2011 [mid of July 2011], with the draft report being available for comments by the mid of June 2011 [26 of September].

7 - Profile of the MTR team and qualifications of the external consultants
The MTR will be managed by the PEF in collaboration with lead donors, including the choice of evaluators. The PEF will have final responsibility for the selection of the external consulting firm. All external consultants will be hired in accordance with the UNDP rules and regulations. Its composition will be announced by the PEF.
to donors as soon as it is confirmed. The external review team will be responsible for the development, research, drafting and finalization of the MTR, in close consultation with the PEF. Areas of expertise required for the external consultants include the following:

• Advanced technical knowledge and experience in development cooperation policy, and poverty-environment mainstreaming and linkages.
• Knowledge of the UN system and the ‘Delivering as One’.
• Recent demonstrable knowledge of current evaluation theory and practice in field situations (results-based management evaluation methodologies) and several years of experience in evaluating poverty-environment-related development programmes and projects.
• Recent demonstrated experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios.
• Recent demonstrated experience applying UNDP’s results-based evaluation policies and procedures and recent knowledge of UNDP and UNEP M&E Policy is an advantage.
• The team should demonstrate analytical skills, consideration for gender balance and familiarity with the different regions.
• The team leader must have demonstrable strong management, negotiation and communication skills and expertise in the subject matter.
• Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to natural resource management projects is an advantage.
• Excellent English communication skills. French, Spanish and Russian knowledge an advantage.

It is also worth taking the following into consideration:

• Reviewers are independent from the development intervention, including its policy, operations and management functions, as well as intended beneficiaries.
• Possible conflicts of interest are addressed openly and honestly.
• The MTR team is able to work freely and without interference, i.e. it is assured of co-operation and access to all relevant information.

Management Arrangements
The MTR team will be responsible for the development, research, drafting and finalization of the MTR, in close consultation with the PEF. All team members will be responsible for drafting components of the report while the team leader will be responsible for drafting the integrated final report and executive summary, with the support of the PEF. The PEF will be responsible for the overall direction of the MTR process. It will provide backstopping support and ensure coordination and liaison with all concerned UNDP and UNEP units and other key agencies; it will provide overall guidance, focused on ensuring delivery consistent with the MTR TORs. In the case study countries and regions, the country teams and regional teams will support the MTR team in liaising with key partners and in discussions with the team, and make available to the team all relevant review material. They will also provide support on logistical issues and planning for the country visits by the evaluation team. In addition, each country team and regional team will appoint a focal point for the MTR that will assist in preparing relevant documents and setting up meetings with all relevant stakeholders in connection with the respective country missions.

The UNDP-UNEP PEI will meet all costs related to conducting this review and will manage its process, providing support and ensuring coordination and liaison with key development partners. The PEF, in collaboration with the MTR team leader, will be responsible for presenting the MTR report to the PEI Joint Management Board and the Donor Steering Group during its Annual Meeting in 2011.