



Canadian International  
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de  
développement international

# CIDA Malawi Country Program Evaluation 1998-2008

## Synthesis Report



Evaluation Directorate

Strategic Policy and Performance Branch

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

July 2010

Canadian International Development Agency  
200 Promenade du Portage  
Gatineau, Quebec  
K1A 0G4

Tel: (819) 997-5006

Toll free: 1-800-230-6349

Fax: (819) 953-6088

(For the hearing and speech impaired only (TDD/TTY): (819) 953-5023

Toll free for the hearing and speech impaired only: 1-800-331-5018)

E-mail: [info@acdi-cida.gc.ca](mailto:info@acdi-cida.gc.ca)

**Canada** 



## A c k n o w l e d g e m e n t s

First, I would like to thank the independent team who undertook the evaluation of the Malawi Country Program and whose respective responsibilities are indicated below:

- Gerry Cooney, Team Leader, responsible for coordinating the evaluation and preparing the Main Technical Evaluation Report, Governance Sector and Management;
- Annette Wenderoth, Consultant, Education and Gender Equality;
- Silvia Grandi, Consultant, Health and Gender Equality;
- Emmanuel Gaudensio Malangalila, Consultant, HIV/AIDS and SWAp;
- Dr. Maxwell Nkhokwe, Consultant, Education.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Malawi Program Management at CIDA headquarters (including James Parson, Stefan Paquette and Anne Banwell) and in the field (including Valérie Young, Roger Roome, and Robert Foote) who, despite their already very busy schedules, took the time to contribute to this evaluation in many ways by providing documents and participating in interviews, and for their ongoing support and assistance before, during, and after the data collection missions to Malawi.

I would like to thank all the project managers, technical advisers, and support staff at the Canadian High Commission and the Program Support Unit who made possible the realization of this Country Program Evaluation.

Special thanks to CIDA Evaluation Directorate Staff, particularly Maryse Hébert, Senior Evaluation Manager, who has done excellent work in coordinating this Country Program Evaluation and to Marie-Eve Fortin and Amélie Geoffroy, who prepared the Program Profile and contributed to the statistics, tables, and appendices.

Goberdhan Singh  
Director General, Evaluation Directorate  
Strategic Policy and Performance Branch (SPPB)  
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

(Cover photo credit: Silvia Grandi, COMWASH project)



## Contents

Executive Summary .....	ix
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Context .....	2
2.1 Malawi Context .....	2
2.2 International Development Assistance Context .....	3
2.3 CIDA Context .....	5
3. Profile of the Malawi Country Program .....	7
4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology .....	10
4.1 Evaluation Questions and Issues .....	10
4.2 Evaluation Data Gathering .....	10
4.3 Key Challenges and Limitations .....	11
5. Sector Overview .....	12
5.1 Health .....	12
5.2 Education .....	12
5.3 Governance .....	13
5.4 Gender Equality .....	13
6. Findings by Evaluation Criteria .....	14
6.1 Introduction .....	14
6.2 Relevance .....	14
6.3 Effectiveness/Results .....	17
6.4 Sustainability .....	23
6.5 Program and Project Coherence .....	24
6.6 Efficiency and Resource Management .....	25
6.7 Principles of Aid Effectiveness .....	30
6.8 Cross-cutting Issues .....	31
6.9 Program Management, Structure, and Monitoring and Evaluation .....	33
6.10 Program Implementation and Delivery Mechanisms .....	38
7. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Corporate Considerations and Recommendation .....	39
7.1 Conclusions .....	39
7.2 Lessons Learned .....	40
7.3 Corporate Considerations .....	40
7.4 Recommendation .....	41

## Exhibits

Exhibit 3.1 Disbursements by Sector and Branch (in \$CAD million).....	8
Exhibit 6.1 Comparison of O&M Costs to ODA for Selected CIDA Programs (2006/07 and 2007/08).....	27

## Appendices

Appendix I LFA (1999).....	42
Appendix II Abbreviated Terms of Reference.....	44
Appendix III Abbreviated Program Evaluation Matrix and Project Rating Tool.....	46
Appendix IV Stakeholders Consulted.....	55
Appendix V Documents Reviewed.....	62
Appendix VI Projects Reviewed.....	68
Appendix VII Malawi CPE Project Ratings.....	70
Appendix VIII Status of the Recommendations of the Malawi Country Program Mid-term Review (2004).....	72
Appendix IX Strengths and Weaknesses of Delivery Models.....	75
Appendix X List of Findings.....	78
Appendix XI CIDA's Management Response.....	81

## Acronyms

AECPU	Aid Effectiveness and Country Program Unit
AfDB	African Development Bank
APPR	Annual Project Performance Report
BFO	Southern and Eastern Africa Directorate
CBS	Canada-based Staff
CDPF	Country Development Programming Framework
CDSS	Community Day Secondary Schools
CEAA	Canadian Environmental Assessment Act
CFA	Canadian Facilitation Agent/Agency
CHC	Canadian High Commission
COMWASH	Community Water Supply, Sanitation and Health Project
CPB	Canadian Partnership Branch
CPDS	Country Program Development Strategy
CPHA	Canadian Public Health Association
CPM	Country Program Manager
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAGG	Development Assistance Group on Gender
DFAIT	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade
DHRMD	Department of Human Resources and Management Development
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party
EC	European Community
EFA	Education for All (Action Plan)
FRAU	Financial Risk Assessment Unit
GAP	Government Assistance Project
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GESP	Gender Equality Support Project
GFATM	Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
GoC	Government of Canada
GoM	Government of Malawi
GSES II	Grant Support to the Education Sector Phase II
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Country
HoA	Head of Aid



## Acronyms

HoC	Head of Cooperation
HoM	Head of Mission
HRCC	Human Rights Consultative Committee
IDA	International Development Association
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPF	Indicative Planning Figure
IPS	International Policy Statement
IPTE	Improving the Quality of Primary Education
IQPE	Initial Primary Teacher Education
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
LDC	Least Developed Country
MCO	Management and Consular Officer
MCP	Malawi Congress Party
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MGDS	Malawi Growth and Development Strategy
MGPB	Multilateral and Global Programs Branch
MHEN	Malawi Health Equity Network
MoEST	Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
MoIWD	Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
MPRSP	Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
NATAFOGAI	National Task Force on Gender Advocacy Initiatives
NESP	National Education Sector Plan
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OCHA/IRIN	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs /Integrated Regional Information Network
ODA	Official Development Assistance
ODG	Office of Democratic Governance
OPC	Office of the President and Cabinet
PBO	Parliamentary Budget Office
PEG	Project for Economic Governance
PIF	Policy and Investment Framework
PIP	Project Implementation Plan

## Acronyms

PMF	Performance Measurement Framework
PSU	Project Support Unit
RBM	Results-based Management
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SDI	Staff Development Institute
SIP	Strategic Implementation Plan
SOCAM	Society of Chartered Accountants of Malawi
SSTEP	Secondary School Teacher Education Project
STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
UDF	United Democratic Fund
WATSAN	Water and Sanitation



## Executive Summary

### Background

Canada has provided development support to Malawi through various programming channels since the 1960s. In 1998, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) approved a 10-year bilateral country program development strategy (CPDS) aimed at helping Malawi reduce poverty and better provide for the basic human needs of its people. It focused on two priority sectors: education and health, and four cross-cutting priorities: HIV/AIDS, gender, governance, and environment. Between 1998 and 2008, CIDA invested CAD\$216 million in Malawi through a total of 452 project investments in all programming channels. The sectors receiving the greatest CIDA support were health (45%), education (22%), and governance (12%); other sectors received a total of 21% of CIDA disbursements over the period. In October 2008, CIDA Evaluation Division (ED) contracted Universal Management Group to conduct an external evaluation of the Malawi Country Program.

The Country Program Evaluation (CPE) for Malawi was undertaken in response to the Canadian Federal Accountability Act, which requires all departments to assess the performance of their programs every five years, and as an input to a Treasury Board requirement to review program-based approaches (PBAs) including budget support.

This summative evaluation of the Malawi Program had three main objectives: (a) a summative review of the Malawi Program investments during the 1998-2008 period (taking into account the results/conclusions/lessons of the mid-term review of the Malawi Program in 2004); (b) an assessment of the performance of the various delivery mechanisms including program-based approaches (mainly the Canadian contribution to the Government of Malawi PBA in HIV/AIDS which is currently underway, and of emerging PBAs including one in basic and primary education, and one in water and sanitation), as well as directive and responsive projects; and (c) a forward looking analysis of findings and lessons to inform future programming. However, due to uncertainties about the status of the Malawi Program at the time of the evaluation, the Malawi CPE was directed more toward accountability purposes than for guidance on future directions.

### Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation team carried out the data gathering and analysis in close consultation with CIDA/ED. The evaluation approach was consultative, participatory, and utilization-focused, and was executed in conformity with the principles, standards, and practices set out in the CIDA Evaluation Guide (2004), the DAC Principles for evaluations (1991), and the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2007) which are consistent with the Treasury Board Evaluation and Policy Standards.

With input from CIDA, the evaluation team developed a detailed methodology and an evaluation framework. As requested by CIDA, the evaluation team applied a scaled rating tool to quantify performance information on projects reviewed in detail. The Malawi CPE team made some changes to the rating criteria in CIDA's generic tool to clarify how criteria would be applied at the country program and project levels. This led to the inclusion of new criteria to: address the cross-cutting issues of governance and HIV/AIDS, assess the realization of planned/actual outputs and outcomes as part of the effectiveness criteria, and reduce potential overlap between the coherence and relevance criteria.

Given the timeframe and resources, the evaluation focused on a sample of 18 investments selected during the work planning stage; these included CIDA bilateral, multilateral, and partnership investments. In addition, the evaluation team reviewed CIDA's support to the PSU over the period in terms of its contributions to CIDA program management. The initiatives reviewed represented 63% of CIDA's investment during 1998-2008 (approximately CAD\$135 million out of a total of CAD\$216 million).

There were three major sources of data for this review: people, documents, and site visits. The evaluation team reviewed numerous documents, consulted 180 stakeholders through semi-structured face-to-face and telephone interviews, and conducted two site visits to Malawi: a one-week scoping mission during the inception phase (November 2008) and a two-week data collection mission during the implementation phase (March 2009). The team used descriptive, content, and comparative analyses to analyze the data for this study and, to the extent possible, ensured validity through data triangulation (confirming data from multiple sources). Based on the data analysis, the evaluation team developed findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

### Limitations

**Basis for measuring program, sector, and thematic performance** – There is no up-to-date performance measurement framework or tool that provides an appropriate basis for assessing the Malawi Country Program’s overall effectiveness. Neither the original program LFA (1999) nor the CPDS outlined program, sector or thematic level results and related indicators that would have been suitable to guide the evaluation. The evaluation team focussed on actual achievements and progress towards implicit results, even if these were not necessarily outlined in the original LFA or the CPDS. In our view, using the existing LFA or CPDS as the sole basis for assessment would not allow telling the full ‘performance story’ of the Malawi program.

**Availability of program-level information** – It was difficult to obtain information that captured CIDA’s program-level performance in Malawi over the 10-year period due to considerable staff turnover and documentation that related only to individual projects. In several instances the evaluation team had to rely on information provided in existing project documents such as progress reports and evaluations, and some ratings are based on the team’s interpretation of the available data. Readers should therefore consider the project ratings as *indicative* rather than definitive.

**Reviewing strengths and weaknesses of delivery mechanisms** – The evaluation team assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the mix of delivery mechanisms used in the Malawi Program. However, since CIDA’s portfolio in Malawi included only one example of a program-based approach project (its contributions to the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund), the evaluation team could not make a comparison with other PBAs or make conclusive statements about the strengths and weaknesses of this and other delivery methods.

### Malawi Country Overview

Malawi is one of the poorest countries in the world. In the 2007/08 UNDP Human Development Report it ranked 164 out of 177. Although the percentage of people living below \$1 a day dropped from 53.9 percent in 1998 to 45 percent in 2006, economic growth over the years has not had a significant impact on poverty levels.<sup>1</sup> Malawi is prone to both drought and floods that affect its agriculture-based economy. In years when agricultural productivity is insufficient to feed the country, or when humanitarian disasters occur, public and political attention and resources shift to the immediate needs for survival, and social development issues tend to be sidelined.

Despite these significant development challenges, progress has been made in numerous areas over the years and the current outlook for Malawi – should present trends continue – is not as bleak as it once was.

- Malawi is one of the few countries in Africa on track to meet the MDG to reduce the under-five mortality rate.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source World Development Indicators database, April 2009. Malawi Data profile. [http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/ext/ddpreports/ViewSharedReport?&CF=1&REPORT\\_ID=9147&REQUEST\\_TYPE=VIEWADVANCED&HF=N&WSP=N](http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/ext/ddpreports/ViewSharedReport?&CF=1&REPORT_ID=9147&REQUEST_TYPE=VIEWADVANCED&HF=N&WSP=N)

- Malawi is a top performer regionally regarding sanitation and has made significant progress in containing HIV/AIDS.
- Malawi has been lauded by the world's main financial institutions as a responsible spender of international aid money, and has demonstrated a commitment to achieving sound economic management and political governance, restoring fiscal discipline and strengthening macro-economic management. In 2006, Malawi was approved for relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) program.
- The government has launched a large number of parliamentary, civil service, public financial management, economic and other reforms.

Malawi's multi-party political system established in 1994 has brought new freedom of speech and association. In recent years, political debate has increased, especially among the young and educated. Civil society organizations (CSOs) have mushroomed since 1994, in particular advocacy and human rights NGOs. These NGOs, despite serious limitations in terms of capacities and resources, constitute an important voice in Malawian society today.

Donors provide about 40 percent of Malawi's annual budget. Data for 2006/2007 indicated that more than 40 percent of donor spending is targeted towards social development, a field which includes both the education and health sectors. In the last ten years, CIDA has been the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> largest bilateral donor in Malawi. However, according to a recent report,<sup>2</sup> CIDA was the 15<sup>th</sup> largest donor in Malawi in 2007/08 (including bilateral, multilateral, UN agencies, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria [GFATM]). The main donors are: DFID, the World Bank, the EC, the Global Fund, the African Development Bank, Norway and USAID. China has become a new player in Malawi. In recent years, a variety of sector specific plans and strategies (e.g., in HIV/AIDS, Health, Education, Water & Sanitation) have been developed, or are currently being drafted by the Government of Malawi (GoM). Donors are actively being encouraged to support these joint programs.

### Main Findings

Overall, CIDA's program in Malawi between 1998 and 2008 was very relevant to the developmental needs of Malawi. It realized and exceeded most of the developmental objectives as defined in the CPDS. However, the sustainability of results has varied among projects. CIDA's development approach in Malawi has been generally congruent with the principles of aid effectiveness outlined in the Paris Declaration. It has realized greatest success at the program level in relation to gender equality as a cross-cutting issue; its success in other cross-cutting priorities is modest. CIDA has been more successful in striving for coherence with other development partners than it has been within the Agency and across delivery channels. CIDA's potential efficiency and effectiveness has been limited by the lack of program-level and sector strategies and monitoring mechanisms as well as its shrinking investment portfolio since 2006.

**Relevance** – Until 2006, CIDA's Malawi Country Program was relevant to the overall development and poverty reduction priorities of the GoM, to Malawian priorities and needs within the sectors of CIDA focus. CIDA's work has also complemented the work of other donors in these sectors. More specifically:

- CIDA's contributions to establishing the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund and strengthening its capacity have been highly relevant and have led to progress in the health sector. CIDA's contribution and a joint contribution by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) tied as 3<sup>rd</sup> out of nine donors to the pooled fund.

---

<sup>2</sup> Malawi Aid Atlas (FY 2007/08) GOM, 2009. Information on CIDA's de facto contributions to Malawi in 2007/08 are understated in the Malawi Atlas due to the timing of CIDA's disbursement to the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund which was made in March 2007 prior to the GOM's 2007/08 reporting period.

- Similarly, CIDA's strategic support in the water sector has been congruent with GoM plans to design a Water and Sanitation SWAp. In 2007/08, Canada ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of eight donors in Malawi that supported the water sector.
- In the education sector, CIDA programming has been aligned with and has addressed some of the key priorities outlined in the 2001 Malawi Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) for the education sector as well as in the 2008 National Education Sector Plan (NESP). In 2007/08, Canada ranked 9<sup>th</sup> among Malawi's 13 donors in the education sector.
- Canada was one of a very few donors to support improved governance in Malawi a decade ago, with a particular focus on strengthening the National Assembly, the Public Service, and the role played by civil society in Malawi. Other donors, including DFID, are now active players in the sector. In 2007/08, CIDA ranked 9<sup>th</sup> among Malawi's 11 donors in the governance sector.
- CIDA's focus on gender equality-related capacity building, awareness-raising, and technical assistance were aligned with Malawi National Gender Policies (2000 and 2008) and the Malawi National Gender Program (2005). In 2007/08, Canada ranked 5<sup>th</sup> out of Malawi's eight donors that supported gender equality.

Canada's relevance decreased slightly in recent years due to shifts in GoM priorities from social development to economic development and infrastructure.

**Effectiveness** – Most individual investments reviewed met their planned outputs and often their outcomes. The Malawi Program has made considerable achievements, in particular in health (HIV/AIDS and water sub-sectors), education, governance and gender equality as illustrated below:

- **HIV/AIDS:** CIDA made significant contributions to progress in the HIV/AIDS sub-sector, mostly through its involvement in the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund, the first program-based approach established in Malawi. The support of pooled fund partners contributed to the capacity and effectiveness of the National AIDS Commission (NAC) in coordinating Malawi's national response to HIV/AIDS. This has contributed to a significant increase in the antiretroviral therapy coverage in Malawi, with a special focus on pregnant women, an increase in the number of HIV testing and counselling sites, and improved support for orphans and vulnerable children among other results.
- **Water and Sanitation:** CIDA support to the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development (MoIWD) helped it to pilot community-managed water schemes, contributed to GoM policies and practices for water and sanitation (e.g., National Water Development Program, Malawi Sanitation Policy), played an instrumental role in fostering donor coordination through the Water and Sanitation Development Partners group, and contributed to planning for a Water and Sanitation SWAp.
- **Education:** CIDA has made visible and significant contributions to progress in the education sector, particularly in the areas of capacity building for textbook supply and procurement, and to a lesser degree, in secondary teacher education.
- **Governance:** CIDA support helped to increase civil society and public participation in national budget processes in Malawi and thus increase their influence on budget priorities. It also helped to increase the capacity of Parliamentary Committees to scrutinize issues relevant to poverty and social protection, provide oversight on government spending, and conduct public hearings.
- **Gender equality:** CIDA is widely recognized for its concrete achievements in gender equality in Malawi and for its role in continuously encouraging its partners to address gender in their own work. According to consulted donors, NGOs, and GOM representatives, CIDA's work on gender has increased its visibility and reputation in Malawi.

While there is considerable evidence that the program achieved results in all of CIDA's priority sectors in Malawi, it is difficult to assess effectiveness at sector and program levels due to the absence of sector and program level strategies, expected results and indicators, and a system to track such results.

The CIDA Malawi Program established a positive Canadian reputation among a broad range of stakeholders in Malawi. It was very successful in leveraging resources of other donors to support Malawi's development priorities. However, the long period of uncertainty and the recent decisions about Canada's future presence and level of engagement in Malawi have negatively affected Canada's reputation.

**Sustainability** – While CIDA support has contributed to an impressive number of results in Malawi since 1998, the likelihood of these being sustained is quite mixed and modest overall. This reflects Malawi's challenging context as well as some of CIDA's practices in managing for results.

Some good practices that are likely to help support the sustainability of results include:

- *Institutionalization* of new approaches, programs and policies in Malawian institutions (e.g., MoEST procurement unit, distance education for secondary teacher training, readmission of teen mothers to school, Bill and Plan of Action on Prevention of Domestic Violence).
- *Diversifying funding sources* (e.g., the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund) and attracting funding from other agencies (e.g., CIDA investments in civil society, media, Parliament, and Ministry of Finance attracted funding from UNDP, DFID, Trocaire, Oxfam, Irish Aid, EU, and others).

Some practices (or absence thereof) were less successful in supporting sustainability, including:

- *Absence of sustainability strategies* at both program and project levels (e.g., in many reviewed projects, sustainability was not considered until the project was closing)
- *Short-term investments and lack of follow-up* (e.g., while short-term initiatives may be appropriate in some cases, given the limited absorptive capacities of organizations, many of CIDA's catalytic initiatives are not likely to be developed or sustained).

**Coherence** – While country program managers for Malawi made some efforts to build coherence across bilateral projects in Malawi within and among the program's themes, connections among such projects have been largely accidental. CIDA has made some efforts to link bilateral priorities and Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB) and Multilateral and Global Program Branch (MGPB) projects. This reflects the fact that the CPDS was not a truly corporate document that was binding on non-bilateral channels and that coherence among CIDA branch programs was not an over-riding CIDA priority during the period under review.

### **Efficiency and Resources Management**

- **Project level efficiency:** Most bilateral projects were completed within budget and on time, and some leveraged funding from other donors – e.g., Project for Economic Governance (PEG) and the Gender Equality Support Project (GESP). The bilateral projects reviewed had a mix of efficiency ratings, from highly satisfactory to unsatisfactory. Unfortunately, evaluations of many CIDA projects in Malawi did not assess project efficiency and the CPE team could not rate these projects in terms of their efficiency.
- **Program level efficiency:** At the country program level, a review of the ratio of operations and management (O&M) expenses to ODA for the Malawi program indicates that its management costs were relatively modest in 2007 and 2008<sup>3</sup> (6.5% and 8.5%) respectively, and similar to

---

<sup>3</sup> Due to changes in CIDA financial systems, the CPE was not able to obtain comparable data for earlier years and focused analysis on 2007 and 2008.



other similar CIDA programs. While CIDA uses the ratio of O&M to ODA expenses as a proxy measure for assessing program efficiency, it excludes some management costs, such as PSU expenses, which are currently considered by CIDA as developmental rather than O&M costs.

- **Resources management (Program management):** Despite the CPDS's stated emphasis on sectors and themes, most bilateral resources were allocated to project needs, which limited the potential for strategic program-level management, synergy, and learning. Until 2004, the Malawi Program managers focused on collaborating with partners to grow the program. Since 2006, the managers have concentrated on managing existing investments and generating information to determine the program's future. The absence of a clear formal arrangement between CIDA and DFAIT regarding the common services that would be provided to CIDA to support its programming in Malawi contributed to several program inefficiencies.
- **Resources management (PSU):** The PSU in Malawi greatly facilitated the start up of the program. Over the past decade, its technical expertise in education, HIV/AIDS, water, and gender equality has been highly respected and appreciated by the Malawian authorities and the donor community. However, as a consequence of the program's uncertain status since 2006, the PSU had limited opportunity to assume a role in program development and analysis as envisaged.

**Principles of Aid effectiveness** – At the project level, CIDA's development approach in Malawi has been generally congruent with the principles of aid effectiveness outlined in the Paris Declaration as illustrated below:

- **Ownership:** CIDA actively sought GoM ownership in several ways during the design of individual projects. There was a strong focus on capacity development of GoM departments and entities in several projects such as the Grant Support to the Education Sector Phase II (GSES II), the Community Water Supply, Sanitation and Health Project (COMWASH), and the HIV/AIDS support program. CIDA supported mechanisms such as SWAPs and pooled fund arrangements that could be led by the GoM. In other instances, CIDA encouraged the active involvement of Malawi government ministries in project oversight.
- **Alignment:** The evidence suggests that the CPDS was aligned to the priorities identified by the GoM in its main development strategies. The CIDA Malawi Program and individual projects were designed on the basis of reviews of existing national strategies, priorities, and needs, using extensive consultations with GoM and other local and international stakeholders.
- **Harmonization:** CIDA played an active and acknowledged role in donor coordination and harmonization in Malawi, notably in the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund and in the preparation for other possible SWAPs in water and sanitation and education. It also played an active role in developing partner sector coordination groups and, in several cases, provided the Secretariat for these groups. CIDA's positive record in donor coordination and harmonization has been weakened in recent years by its limited financial commitments for SWAPs.
- **Results:** All CIDA partners in Malawi acknowledge the Agency's focus on results, and credited it for having supported RBM capacity building among its partners for example through the GESP and within the Development Assistance Group on Gender (DAGG). However, CIDA has been more effective at utilizing these approaches at the project level, rather than sector, thematic or program levels.
- **Mutual accountability:** At the project level, CIDA has shared project reports and evaluations with relevant ministries and other key stakeholders. While CIDA did report regularly to the GoM on financial expenditures in Malawi, it is not evident that CIDA informed the GoM of developmental results at the program, sector, or thematic levels on a formal, regular basis. CIDA's limited investments in Malawi after 2006 combined with CIDA's limited consultations and communications to determine the future of the program in Malawi raised concerns by its partners about its future assistance plans. Lessons from other donors highlight the importance of

open dialogue and a respectful process that recognizes mutual accountabilities. Following the recent decision on geographic focus, the Malawi Program has been having discussions with the GoM regarding programming plans.

**Cross-cutting issues** – Consulted stakeholders commended CIDA for its attention and commitment to gender mainstreaming, and there is evidence that CIDA-supported projects made significant contributions in this area. At the program level, it is difficult to track or assess the program’s effectiveness in mainstreaming these issues as the program did not establish specific objectives, strategies, and practices or allocate resources and responsibilities to systematically address cross-cutting issues. At the project level, CIDA management paid attention to cross-cutting issues (gender, HIV/AIDS, governance, and environment), particularly to gender equality. Environmental concerns were not an issue in the type of projects funded by CIDA, but all projects complied with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) principle to “do no harm”.

### **Program Management, Structure, and Monitoring & Evaluation**

- **Strategic management:** To launch a country program in Malawi in 1997-1998, CIDA crafted a focused, distinct, innovative, and bold development strategy that was carefully designed to maximize the impact of Canada’s relatively modest resources. The CPDS for Malawi guided CIDA bilateral investment decisions in Malawi up to 2004. Since then it has had much less influence over the program’s investment decisions and directions, primarily due to the uncertainty surrounding the future of CIDA’s bilateral programming in Malawi. The program’s LFA had limited utility as a basis for capturing and measuring performance beyond the project level. In 2004, CIDA conducted a Mid-Term Review of the Malawi Program to review results achievement, sustainability of results, relevance of the program and its effectiveness. The Mid-Term Review made nine recommendations. An analysis of the status of these recommendations (see Appendix VIII) indicates that seven of the nine recommendations were partially, mostly, or fully addressed. The recommendation to create a new position in the Malawi program was not addressed, largely due to the uncertain status of the program. The recommendation that the program establish and maintain an appropriate program LFA was marginally addressed: the LFA was updated but was never formally approved.
- **Structure and leadership:** The CIDA Malawi Program’s atypical management structure between 1998-2003 (in which the PSU Director filled the role of Head of Cooperation in addition to his formal role) allowed the program to become operational quickly. The combination of strong leadership, close collaboration with development partners in Malawi, staff continuity and dedication, and flexible procedures helped Canada earn a very positive profile and reputation in Malawi until 2004. A combination of staff turnover and a vacuum in CIDA leadership in 2004/05 negatively affected the performance of CIDA’s Malawi Program. Starting in 2006, the uncertainty about the future of the program continued to affect its management and leadership.
- **RBM and M&E:** Over the past decade, the program concentrated mainly on project-level monitoring and reporting. In all cases, projects have applied RBM principles and tools in meaningful ways and have used appropriate project management systems and resources, as well as risk identification and mitigation processes. At least one project developed their partners’ capacities in RBM. CIDA had various mechanisms in place, including the use of external monitors, to identify risks at the project level. Similar mechanisms did not exist at the program level.

**Delivery and funding mechanisms** – The Malawi and CIDA contexts over the decade warranted CIDA’s use of a mix of program implementation and delivery mechanisms, such as project-based and program-based approaches (i.e., SWAps, pooled funding). Most consulted stakeholders confirmed the validity of CIDA’s approach which mixed different delivery and funding mechanisms and spread investment risks.

## Conclusions

The findings of this evaluation need to be understood within the context of the Malawi Program's evolution over the past decade. The 10-year CIDA Malawi Country Program had three distinct phases. The first phase (1998-2003) was characterized by the excitement of establishing a new program and relationships. The period was marked by a focused CPDS, strong Canadian leadership, and close cooperation with development partners in Malawi. The second phase (2004 and 2005) was marked by major changes and transition in the program's management structure, high turnover of several individuals in leadership positions in Canada and Malawi, and changes in relationships between CIDA and its partners in Malawi which had marked effects on the program's performance. In the third phase (since 2006), the uncertain status of the bilateral program in Malawi within Canada's overall aid program, modest program investments, and continued personnel turnover had a negative effect on those working in the program and on relations with Canada's partners in Malawi.

Given the challenges and constraints it faced, the Malawi Country Program has performed well in terms of the results achieved and the relevance of its financial investments and technical expertise in health, education, governance, and gender equality. It gained considerable respect from the Malawi government and other donors and partners for its leadership in gender equality and HIV/AIDS and its role in encouraging and supporting donor coordination. Its shortcomings relate to the lack of program-level and sector strategies and monitoring mechanisms, the sustainability of some project results, and the efficiency of the program in recent years.

## Lessons Learned

### Concerning country program design and management:

- To be effectively managed, programs require deliberate strategies, accountabilities, mechanisms, and resources for planning, monitoring, and reporting at both program and sector levels.

### Concerning managing for sustainable results:

- The sustainability of project results is more likely when sustainability is addressed at the project design stage and considered throughout implementation, not in the last year(s) of a project.
- Project managers are more likely to pay continued attention to sustainability of results if this is identified and managed as a priority in project and program management practices.

### Concerning program transition:

- Early warning and clear communication with key stakeholders are necessary ingredients in respecting good partnership principles and fostering a smooth transition when there is a major change in program status.

### Concerning CPE design and management:

- A CPE can assess only those dimensions and concepts in a meaningful way that have actually been relevant for and have been used by (or could have been used by) the respective program (e.g., the concepts of program coherence and efficiency).
- Carrying out several CPEs at the same time can create opportunities for synergy, as it is likely that all evaluations will be struggling with similar issues. Opportunities for synergy can be lost however if: i) scheduling does not allow time for systematic exchange between evaluation teams, and ii) commonalities between different CPEs are merely assumed in prescriptive methodological guidelines, but are not backed up by empirical evidence or actual experiences gained during the evaluation process.

- A CPE is most valuable when conducted at a point in time where the findings and recommendations can actually be used to inform planning and decision-making regarding the program's future.

### **Corporate Considerations**

The overall good achievements of the Malawi Program notwithstanding, the evaluation identified areas where improvements can be made to enhance this performance. Some of these pertain to broader Agency-level improvements, such as the issue of whole-of-Agency approach, the strengthening of performance management processes and the guidance on managing country program transitions. Considering that the Agency has taken decisions on these aspects, and actions are underway to address them, as indicated in CIDA's Management Response to the Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG) and in CIDA's Aid Effectiveness Action Plan, they will not be the subject of specific recommendations.

### **Recommendation**

Given uncertainties about the status of CIDA's future program in Malawi at the time of the evaluation, the TORs for the Malawi CPE excluded an analysis of CIDA future programming directions in the country. For this reason, the Evaluation Team does not provide any recommendations to the Malawi Program related to its future strategic direction.

One recommendation is addressed to the program on management issues. – The Malawi Program remains in transition from a core program to one of modest presence. It is generally expected that the program budget will be much smaller than before, with a smaller program infrastructure in Canada and abroad.

**Recommendation 1:** The managers of the CIDA Malawi Program should identify efficient ways to deliver this modest presence country program.



## 1. Introduction

Canada has provided development support to Malawi through various programming channels since the 1960s. In 1998, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) approved a 10-year bilateral country program development strategy (CPDS) aimed at helping Malawi reduce poverty and better provide for the basic human needs of its people. It focused on two priority sectors: education and health, and four cross-cutting priorities: HIV/AIDS, gender, governance, and environment. Between 1998 and 2008, CIDA invested CAD\$216 million in Malawi through a total of 452 project investments in all programming channels. The sectors receiving the greatest CIDA support were health (45%), education (22%), and governance (12%); other sectors received a total of 21% of CIDA disbursements over the period.

CIDA's Performance Review Policy calls for periodic, independent evaluations of the Agency's investments to assess results, inform decision making, and promote organizational learning, accountability and transparency within the Agency. The Malawi Country Program Evaluation (CPE) has been undertaken as a response to the Canadian Federal Accountability Act, which requires all Departments to assess the performance of their program every five years. Further, when approving the Terms and Conditions for CIDA in 2007, the Treasury Board asked it to perform a review of its program-based approaches (PBAs), including direct budget support.

In October 2008, the CIDA Evaluation Division (ED) contracted Universal Management Group to conduct an external evaluation of its Malawi Country Program. The evaluation had three major objectives:

- 1) A summative review of the Malawi Country Program investments during the 1998-2008 period (taking into account the results/conclusions/lessons of the mid-term review of the Malawi Program in 2004);
- 2) An assessment of the performance of the various delivery mechanisms including program-based approaches (mainly the Canadian contribution to the Government of Malawi PBA in HIV/AIDS and of emerging PBAs including one in basic education, and one in water and sanitation), as well as directive and responsive projects; and
- 3) A forward looking analysis of findings and lessons to inform future programming.<sup>4</sup>

This summative evaluation of the Malawi Country Program covers the implementation period of the CPDS from 1998/99 to 2007/08, including all disbursements made up to March 31, 2008. Given the nature and the scope of the resources, the evaluation focused primarily on the bilateral program, but also considered the investments of other branches. The primary audiences for the evaluation are CIDA's Strategic Policy and Performance Branch (SPPB) and CIDA Malawi program staff at HQ and in the field. Secondary audiences include CIDA Southern and Eastern Africa Directorate, Geographic Programs Branch (BFO/GPB), Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB), Multilateral and Global Programs Branch (MGPB), as well as program partners in Canada and Malawi, in particular the Government of Malawi (GoM).

This synthesis report outlines the main conclusions and findings of the evaluation. A list of findings is presented in Appendix X. The full technical report is available from CIDA upon request.

---

<sup>4</sup> Given uncertainties about the status of CIDA's future program in Malawi at the time of the evaluation, the TORs for the Malawi CPE excluded an analysis of CIDA future programming directions in the country. For this reason, the Evaluation Team did not provide any recommendations to the Malawi Program related to its future planning and programming. This approach has varied from other CPEs for which looking forward was an important objective to guide their review.

## 2. Context

### 2.1 Malawi Context

**Overall** – Malawi is one of the poorest countries in the world and ranked 164 out of 177 countries in the 2008 UNDP Human Development Report. Although the percentage of people living below \$1 a day decreased about 9% in the last ten years, economic growth over the years has not had a significant impact on poverty levels. Malawi is prone to both drought and floods that affect its agriculture-based economy. In years when agricultural productivity is insufficient to feed the country, or when humanitarian disasters occur, public and political attention and resources shift to the immediate needs for survival, and social development issues tend to be sidelined.

Health data in Malawi depict a relatively bleak situation: Malawi has one of the world's highest maternal mortality ratios, HIV prevalence remains high, with severe consequences for the country's public health system and the overall productivity and social fabric of the nation. In education, while enrolment rates in primary education are high (94 percent for girls and 88 percent for boys in 2006), only 55 percent of children complete a full course of primary education. Malawi's literacy rate is higher than the regional average (approximately 71 percent of adults and 82 percent of youth).

Despite significant challenges, Malawi has made progress in numerous areas over the years. It is on track to meet the MDG to reduce the under-five mortality rate, and has surpassed its 2015 targets for drinking water. It is a top performer regionally regarding sanitation and has made significant progress in containing HIV/AIDS. Malawi has been lauded by the world's main financial institutions as a responsible spender of international aid money, and has demonstrated a commitment to achieving sound economic management and political governance.

**Political Context** – Since its peaceful transition to multi-party democracy in 1994, Malawi has held three elections. In 1999, Bakili Muluzi of the United Democratic Front (UDF) was re-elected as President for a second term. His successor, economist Bingu Wa Mutharika was elected in 2004 and re-elected in 2009 and his party, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), won a strong parliamentary majority. President Mutharika launched a crackdown on corruption and took steps to improve fiscal discipline, actions which restored the confidence and support of international donors.

During the past decade, the government has launched a number of reforms (parliamentary, civil service, public financial management, economic, etc.) and national level plans and strategies: Malawi Vision 2020 (2000); the 2002 Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy (MPRS); the 2003 Malawi Economic Growth Strategy (MEGS); the 2006 Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) 2006-2011; and the 2006 Malawi Development Assistance Strategy (DAS) 2006-2011.

The multi-party political system has brought new freedom of speech and association. Political debate has increased, especially among the young and educated, and civil society organizations have mushroomed since 1994, in particular advocacy and human rights NGOs.

**Cultural Context** – During the Banda era the main values in Malawian society were unity, obedience, discipline and loyalty. While the public rhetoric increasingly moved away from the paternalistic and authoritarian values that dominated public discourse for generations, these values still influence large portions of Malawian society. Traditional rules and behaviours prevail, especially among the rural population, and continue to influence social norms, expectations, and behaviours.

Unequal gender roles are deeply rooted, and male authority over women is widely accepted. On the UNDP gender equality-related development index Malawi ranks 139 out of 157 states. Literacy among adult women (63 percent) is lower than among male counterparts (79 percent). While girls have high enrolment rates in primary school, they have a much higher drop-out rate than boys, mainly due to poverty, early motherhood, and care responsibility for chronically sick family members (due to AIDS,

TB or other illnesses). Gender equality in secondary school is far from being attained: in 2007, the ratio of girls to boys in secondary schools was 0.70 to 1. Women's share in paid employment in the non-agricultural sector increased from 13 percent in 2000 to 15 percent in 2006. Women's representation in Parliament increased from 9 percent of seats in 1999 to 21 percent in 2009, largely due to a civil society campaign. In Cabinet, women's representation is 26% including the Vice-President.

### **Development Aid in Malawi –**

Donors provide about 40 percent of Malawi's annual budget. According to the GoM Malawi Aid Atlas (FY

2007/08), the main donors are: DFID, the World Bank, the EC, the Global Fund, the African Development Bank, Norway and USAID. In the last few years, China has become a new player in Malawi. Some observers are concerned that China's unconditional aid and low interest loan strategy may undermine long-term efforts to build a democratic and accountable administration in Malawi.

In 2006/2007, more than 40 percent of donor spending was targeted to social development (which includes the education and health sectors). The GoM raised concerns in the Joint Country Program Review in May 2007 that other key areas such as economic growth and infrastructure are not being given sufficient attention.

Over the past decade, the GoM has shown increasingly active leadership with regard to development strategies, aid, and donor coordination. It is committed to the principles of aid effectiveness as outlined in the Paris Declaration and ranks in the top ten countries globally in terms of aid effectiveness.

The GoM is working hard to achieve the Paris Declaration objectives on aid effectiveness. A strong unit in the Ministry of Finance monitors all aid to Malawi and encourages donors to work within GoM priorities. The GoM suffers from human resource and institutional weaknesses, but donors have noted progress in these areas. Donors themselves must make further efforts to align with national systems, harmonize procedures, consult with the GoM, and provide aid in a predictable manner.

The 2006 Malawi Development Assistance Strategy (DAS) states that the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development should be involved in the planning of all projects that development partners are asked to fund to ensure that they align with the MGDS. It further states that "the government's preferred modalities of aid delivery are budget support and basket funding within SWAps." Development partners are encouraged to provide up to 70 percent of their development assistance using these modalities. Donors are increasingly harmonized in the provision of development assistance. Program-based approaches (PBAs) are in effect in health and HIV/AIDS, and new PBAs in education and water are nearing completion. In addition, the United Kingdom, Norway, the European Union, the African Development Bank, and the World Bank provide general budget support. To date, however, much of the aid delivered by the international community still takes the form of project support. In 2006/2007, project support amounted to two-thirds of total aid disbursed.

## **2.2 International Development Assistance Context**

International events and changes in aid architecture in the past decade have had major impacts on relationships between international development agencies and their development partners. Increased global attention to and investment in peace and security concerns, as well as the global financial crisis, are affecting priorities for foreign aid and will likely have adverse effects on developing countries such as Malawi that are seen as having limited strategic importance.

**Global declarations** – The ways in which development aid is delivered have been influenced by global events and declarations such as the Millennium Development Goals (2000), the UN Monterey summit (2002), and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005). The Paris Declaration principles have led

### **Canada's development support to Malawi**

CIDA was the 15<sup>th</sup> largest donor in Malawi in 2007/08 (including bilateral, multilateral, UN agencies and the Global Fund). In the last ten years, CIDA has been the 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> largest bilateral donor in Malawi.



to a stronger focus on managing by and reporting on results, and to a greater emphasis on supporting national development plans. There is an increased focus on delivery mechanisms that maximize country ownership while aligning and harmonizing donor efforts, including PBAs and budget support. Good practices and lessons learned are emerging, but donors and partner countries are still experimenting. While the Paris Declaration has become a reference point for most bilateral and multilateral donors, there has also been growing critique of its gaps and shortfalls. One common criticism has been its lack of focus on the importance of non-governmental organizations and human rights issues including gender equality. The aim of the 2008 High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra was to review and reflect on the Declaration's practical impacts on aid effectiveness. One consequence of the application of aid effectiveness principles is that donors are increasingly concentrating their ODA in a limited number of countries and sectors.

**New funders and funding mechanisms** – The architecture for global aid has become increasingly complex over the last decade, with a proliferation of aid channels, the growing importance of non-DAC and other emerging donors (such as China), and a significant degree of earmarking. According to the International Development Association (IDA), the average number of donors per country rose from about 12 in the 1960s to about 33 between 2001 and 2005. There are currently over 230 international organizations, funds, and programs; donor proliferation is most pronounced in the health sector (more than 100 organizations are involved). New donors bring more resources to help developing countries reach the MDGs, but also new challenges for harmonization and alignment.

According to IDA, about half of the ODA delivered through multilateral channels in 2005 was earmarked by sector or theme. The boom in earmarking of aid for specific uses through global or “vertical” programs and funds<sup>5</sup> began in the late 1990s when several large vertical funds were created, primarily in the health and education sectors. Vertical funds have resulted in unprecedented funding and attention for needy causes such as infectious diseases, but critics claim they contribute to the fracturing of aid, a lack of donor harmonization, the weakening of in-country systems, and misalignment of the priorities of donors and recipient countries. Many vertical programs have started to take steps to better integrate with country systems and become more “Paris-friendly”. These include the Global Fund and the GAVI Alliance which have both signed the Paris Declaration and can be considered among the more advanced global programmes when it comes to evaluating their practices against aid effectiveness principles, and the Education for All – Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) that expressly focuses on alignment, harmonisation and mutual accountability.

**Global conflict and security agendas** – Over the past decade, an increasing proportion of global resources have been invested in security concerns. The events following September 11, 2001, as well as the emergence of conflicts in various parts of the world have led to massive investments in peace and security initiatives. Currently, the conflicts in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq are absorbing considerable global resources and the attention of world leaders, thus reducing attention paid to other developing countries, in particular those categorized as having limited strategic importance such as Malawi.

**Global economic crisis** – For many developing countries, the implications of the current global financial crisis will depend primarily on the prices of the primary commodities they export. According to the AfDB Chief Economist, Africa's generally weak integration with the rest of the global economy may mean that many African countries will not be affected by the first round of effects of the crisis. In the long run, however, foreign investment in Africa is likely to diminish as donor countries cut their aid budgets and foundations reduce the number and size of their grants.

---

<sup>5</sup> The OECD and the World Bank define vertical programs as “international initiatives outside the UN system which deliver significant funding at the country level in support of focused thematic objectives.” This is in contrast to the horizontal approach of country-based aid.

According to the World Bank, the short-term impact of the financial crisis on Malawi has so far been limited, because the financial sector is small and not sophisticated. Nonetheless, in the medium to long term, the financial crisis could have a significant negative impact through its impact on Malawi commodity exports and international aid, as predicted by the IMF. Malawi's productive sector could be severely affected through reduced demand for the country's exports, mainly tobacco, sugar, and tea; and exchange rate movements in the west are having a negative impact on some foreign aid inflows to Malawi.

## 2.3 CIDA Context

Over the past decade, CIDA has shifted its priorities, countries of focus, and aid delivery approaches. Changes in countries of focus have had a fundamental effect on the scope and design of the Malawi Country Program.

**Dynamic political context and changing priorities** – During the review period, CIDA has been affected by various changes within the agency and in the wider Canadian context, including: four elections, two Prime Ministers, five changes in CIDA ministers, as well as four changes in CIDA presidents. Each has affected the agency's priorities, strategies, and resource allocations at the corporate level and within CIDA branches. Over the past 15 years, a number of policies and strategies have reflected changes in priorities – the key documents are listed in the sidebar.

### CIDA's Key Policies and Strategies

Canada in the World (Canadian Foreign Policy Review), 1995  
 CIDA's Social Development Priorities: A Framework for Action, 2000  
 Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness, 2002  
 Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World, 2005  
 CIDA Results Based Management and Accountability Framework, 2007  
 Sustainable Development Strategies: 1997-2000, 2001-2003, 2004–2006, 2007–2009

The overall purpose of Canada's ODA has not changed since 1995 (see sidebar) and its overarching ODA priorities (health, education, gender, HIV/AIDS, governance, and the environment) remained the same, with some slight shifts in their interpretation and relative importance. This changed in 2009 when CIDA announced new priorities: increasing food security, stimulating sustainable economic growth, and securing the future of children and youth.

"The purpose of Canada's ODA is to support sustainable development in developing countries, in order to reduce poverty and to contribute to a more secure, equitable and prosperous world."  
 Canada in the World, 1995

**Geographic focus** – Since the 2002 policy statement *Strengthening Aid Effectiveness*, Africa has continued to be important for CIDA programming, but resource allocations have been significantly influenced by Canada's commitments to Afghanistan (2002) and Haiti (2006), and increased interest in Latin America and the Caribbean (2007).<sup>6</sup> On February 23, 2009, Canada announced that CIDA “will be focusing its efforts in 20 countries (80 percent of bilateral assistance) by concentrating resources, focusing programming and improving coordination.” The list of countries shows an increased focus on Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and a reduction in Africa. Malawi is not one of the 20 countries

---

<sup>6</sup> In 2002 Canada pledged \$1.9 billion for reconstruction and development in Afghanistan over ten years. Canada committed \$555 million over five years (2006-2011) to reconstruction and development efforts in Haiti. In July 2007, Prime Minister Harper announced that “Canada is committed to playing a bigger role in the Americas.”

of focus, but the latest indications are that CIDA will continue to provide bilateral support to the health and education sectors.

**MDGs and Aid Effectiveness** – Canada endorsed the United Nations Millennium Declaration in 2000, which led to the Millennium Development Goals. CIDA’s *Strengthening Aid Effectiveness* policy statement (2002) and Canada’s International Policy Statement (IPS), *A Role of Pride and Influence in the World* (2005) demonstrated Canada’s commitment to the MDGs and the principles of aid effectiveness outlined in the 2005 Paris Declaration, which resulted in international consensus around aid delivery approaches such as results-based management (RBM) and program-based approaches (PBAs). CIDA had adopted results-based approaches more than a decade earlier, had formalized its direction for PBAs in 2002 in *Strengthening Aid Effectiveness*, and published an operational guide to PBAs in 2007. While CIDA is moving towards program and sector approaches at a policy level, most of its procedures and management tools as well as its accountability structures are still focused on the project level. While CIDA has made efforts to manage for results at the program level (through for example the publication of CDPF Guidelines in 2003), the practice of managing for program level results has not been institutionalized within the Agency to date. This is also true for sector level results; there are no established practices in place that require CIDA programs to develop, monitor and report on sector level strategies.

**Aid Delivery Channels** – Over the years, integration between CIDA’s three delivery channels (bilateral, multilateral, and Canadian partnership) has been very limited, mainly due to lack of guidance and also because they are managed by different branches and with different models, mandates, partners and priorities. Efforts have been made to increase integration (e.g., bilateral country desks have been working closely with CPB in recent years to comment on CPB potential initiatives), but there was no joint planning at the country level on how the three channels contribute to CIDA’s objectives, and the lack of integration made it difficult to define the country program boundaries. However, CIDA has recently approved a “whole of CIDA” approach for all CPDF.

**CIDA Structural Transition** – An internal restructuring process, which started in 2006 and ended in 2009, has slowed down or hindered some planning and decision-making processes and has caused some uncertainty among CIDA staff and partners with regard to branch/unit and individual responsibilities.

**Malawi Country Program Context** – The 10-year CIDA Malawi Country Program had three distinct phases. The first phase (1998-2003) was characterized by the excitement of establishing a new program and relationships. The second phase (2004 and 2005) was marked by major changes and transition in management structure, culture, modus operandi, personnel, morale and relationships between CIDA and its partners in Malawi which had marked negative effects on the program’s performance. In the third phase (since 2006), the uncertain status of Malawi within Canada’s overall aid program, modest program investments, and continued personnel turnover had a demoralizing effect on those working in the program and strained relations with Canada’s partners in Malawi.

### 3. Profile of the Malawi Country Program

This profile of the Malawi Country Program includes a brief history of CIDA support to Malawi, the Malawi CPDS, and the program's structure and management.

**Canadian Support to Malawi before 1998** – Canada's support to Malawi began in 1964 following its independence. Over the next 34 years, Canada provided approximately \$250 million through Africa Branch and additional support through Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB) and Multilateral and Global Programs Branch (MGPB). From 1964 to 1997, CIDA's work in Malawi was carried out through regional projects that included Malawi. In September 1997, CIDA's bilateral programming shifted from a regional focus to a country-specific focus, which led to the development of a ten-year strategy for CIDA in Malawi.

**Country Program Development Strategy, 1998-2008** – The goal of CIDA's 1998-2008 Country Program Development Strategy (CPDS) was to help Malawi reduce poverty and better provide for the basic human needs of its people by leveraging resources to enhance its ability to respond to new global challenges. The Malawi CPDS was a bilateral strategy that aimed to assist Malawi in creating a healthy, educated, and productive human resource base as a prerequisite for reducing poverty and attracting investment. It outlined two sector priorities (health and education) and four cross-cutting priorities (gender, governance, HIV/AIDS, and environment). The LFA outlines seven program level outcomes which are described in Appendix I.

**CPDS Priorities and principles:**

- Concentrate at least 80% on *basic education* and *basic health* in areas which particularly impact on girls and women;
- Maximize impact within sectors by synergistic programming, including concentration on *governance* issues within sectors of focus;
- Focus on increasing *women's* capacities and decision-making roles;
- Complement basic human needs programming with responsive mechanisms to improve governance in sectors of programming concentration and which contribute to an improved investment climate (10%) and for other emerging opportunities (10%).

**CIDA Investments in Malawi, 1998-2008** – Between 1998 and 2008, CIDA funded 452 projects in Malawi. According to CIDA's

corporate data, the total ODA disbursements from all investment channels were approximately CAD \$216.6 million. These include:

- Approximately \$100 million (46 percent) channelled through bilateral program to 112 projects, mostly in education and health.
- Approximately \$24 million (11 percent) for 52 Pan-African and sub-regional projects (mostly in health and private sector development), which did not necessarily align their work with the CPDS.
- Approximately \$64 million (30 percent) through MGPB to 146 projects, mostly in health and emergency assistance.<sup>7</sup>
- Approximately \$28 million through CPB (13 percent) to 142 projects, mostly in health, education, democratic governance and private sector development.

---

<sup>7</sup> The total disbursement figures generated from CIDA's corporate database need to be viewed with some caution given that a number of the multilateral and CPB investments do not always accurately reflect the real investment that reached Malawi.

The sectors receiving the greatest CIDA investment were health (45 percent of total disbursement), education (22 percent), and governance (12 percent). Other sectors received a total of 21 percent of disbursements. Exhibit 3.1 shows expenditures by branch and sector.

**Exhibit 3.1 Disbursements by Sector and Branch (in \$CAD million)**

Sector of Focus	CIDA Branch					Total
	Bilateral	Africa Other <sup>8</sup>	Office of Democratic Governance	MGPB	CPB	
Democratic governance	15.7	0.5	0.06	4.2	6.1	26.8
Improving health	34.5	12.2		43.3	7.3	97.4
Private sector development	0.2	7.8		2.0	5.4	15.6
Strengthening basic education	41.4	0.1		0.18	6.3	48.2
Environment	6.3	2.78		0.37	0.49	9.9
Emergency assistance				13.6	0.06	13.6
Peace and security				0.03	0.0004	0.03
Other	1.6	0.8	0.0078	0.054	2.4	5.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>0.074</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>216.6</b>

**CIDA Management, Funding and Oversight in Malawi** – CIDA classifies its investments by delivery channels and investment type (e.g., directive, responsive, and core funding). Recent investments in Malawi were made through Africa Branch, CBP, and MGPB, and include all investment types. Of particular note is the considerable variety in:

- **project management arrangements** ranging from projects managed by GoM, by Directors locally recruited by CIDA or by other bilateral partners;
- **project oversight mechanisms** that included CIDA PTLs in Canada and Malawi, other CIDA officers, other development partners (e.g., DFID), project monitors, periodic and regular audits and evaluations; and
- **project funding arrangements** that included co-funding arrangements (e.g., DFID), bilateral contributions to a bilateral agency (e.g., GTZ – referred to here as a “bi-bi” arrangement), and grants to a multilateral agency (e.g., UNICEF – referred to here as a “multi-bi” arrangement.)

CIDA also invests in **non-project activities** in Malawi (i.e., activities that do not have or require specific project or program approval) that support policy dialogue, donor and sector coordination, and so forth. These are undertaken as part of on-going responsibilities (e.g., by sector specialists and other special advisors in the PSU, project directors and staff, and headquarters staff).

**Program Management Structure** – CIDA’s program management structure in Malawi has involved four main entities: CIDA Headquarters, the Malawi PSU, the Malawi Office of the Canadian High Commission (since 2004), and the Canadian High Commission (CHC) which was located consecutively in Zambia and Malawi over the review period. Responsibility for the Malawi program shifted to

<sup>8</sup> “Africa Other” includes Pan-Africa and BFO sub-regional programming

Mozambique in September 2009. The respective roles and responsibilities of these entities have evolved over time. Key developments and their implications for program management and performance are discussed in section 6.9.3.

## 4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

### 4.1 Evaluation Questions and Issues

The CPE was managed by the CIDA/SPBB Evaluation Directorate. Data gathering and analysis were carried out by the independent evaluation team in close consultation with CIDA/Evaluation Directorate (ED). The CIDA evaluation manager participated in and contributed to the field visit to Malawi in March 2009. The evaluation team's overall approach to the assignment was consultative, participatory, and utilization-focused. The evaluation was carried out in conformity with the principles, standards and practices set out in the CIDA Evaluation Guide (2004), the DAC Principles for evaluations (1991), and the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2007) which are consistent with the Treasury Board Evaluation and Policy Standards.

#### Malawi CPE Foci

- Program Context
- Program Relevance
- Program Effectiveness
- Sustainability of Results
- Program Coherence
- Program Efficiency and Resources Management
- Principles of Aid Effectiveness
- Cross-cutting Issues
- Program Management, Structure and Monitoring and Evaluation
- Delivery Mechanisms
- Lessons Learned and Recommendations

With input from CIDA, the evaluation team developed a detailed methodology and an evaluation framework based on the Terms of Reference (see Appendix II). An abbreviated evaluation framework is provided in Appendix III). A summary of evaluation foci is provided in the sidebar.

As requested by CIDA, the evaluation team applied a scaled rating tool to quantify performance information on projects reviewed in detail. The Malawi CPE team made some changes to the rating criteria in CIDA's generic tool to clarify how criteria would be applied at the country program and project levels. This led to the inclusion of new criteria to: address the cross-cutting issues of governance and HIV/AIDS, assess the realization of planned/actual outputs and outcomes as part of the effectiveness criteria, and reduce potential overlap between the coherence and relevance criteria.

### 4.2 Evaluation Data Gathering

There were three major sources of data for this review: people, documents, and site visits. The evaluation team reviewed numerous documents, consulted 180 stakeholders through semi-structured face-to-face and telephone interviews, and conducted two site visits to Malawi: a one-week scoping mission during the inception phase (November 10-14, 2008) and a two-week data collection mission during the implementation phase (March 9-20, 2009). The list of stakeholders consulted and documents reviewed are presented in Appendices IV and V.

The team used descriptive, content, and comparative analyses to analyze the data for this study and, to the extent possible, ensured validity through data triangulation (confirming data from multiple sources). Based on the data analysis, the evaluation team developed findings, conclusions and recommendations.

**Program level assessment** – Given the lack of program level data and the difficulty in locating program level informants both in Canada and Malawi due to high turnover, the evaluation team made every effort to use proxy data (i.e., data that, while not quite at the program level, were at a higher or more complex level than individual project data). The evaluation team tapped into the corporate memory of CIDA staff

and partner organizations that had implemented CIDA funded initiatives in Malawi, and Malawian institutions that had benefited from a variety of CIDA funded initiatives. Despite these efforts, it proved difficult to obtain the information required.

**Investment Level Assessment –**

The evaluation focused on a sample of 18 projects (see Appendix VI) selected during the work planning stage. These included CIDA bilateral, multilateral and partnership investments (project, program or partner organizations). In addition, the evaluation team reviewed CIDA’s support to the PSU over the period in terms of its contributions to CIDA program management. The initiatives reviewed represented 63% of CIDA’s investment during 1998-2008 (approximately \$135 million out of a total of \$216 million – see sidebar).

**Snapshot of Reviewed CIDA Investments**

9 bilateral projects (including the PSU) representing approximately CAD\$80 million in CIDA investment

9 projects implemented by 5 partner organizations, representing approximately CAD\$ 55 million in CIDA investment

**Of the 18 projects**

- 8 projects, \$ 65.5M (48%) were in the health sector (including Water and Sanitation, HIV/AIDS and Nutrition)
- 4 projects, \$39.2M (29%) were in the education sector
- 2 projects, \$11.4M (9%) were in the governance sector
- 1 project, \$2.9M (2%) was in gender equality
- 2 projects, \$3.2M (2%) were multi sectoral
- CIDA support to the PSU, representing approximately CAD\$13 million (10%) of the sampled CIDA investments

**4.3 Key Challenges and Limitations**

**Basis for measuring program, sector, and thematic performance –** There is no up-to-date performance measurement framework or tool that provides an appropriate basis for assessing the Malawi Country Program’s overall effectiveness. Neither the original program LFA (1999) nor the CPDS outlined program, sector or thematic level results and related indicators that would have been suitable to guide the evaluation. The evaluation team focussed on actual achievements and progress towards implicit results, even if these were not necessarily outlined in the original LFA or the CPDS. In our view, using the LFA or CPDS as the sole basis for assessment would not allow telling the full ‘performance story’ of the Malawi program.

**Availability of program-level information –** It was difficult to obtain information that captured CIDA’s program-level performance in Malawi over the 10-year period due to considerable staff turnover and documentation that related only to individual projects. In several instances the evaluation team had to rely on information provided in existing project documents such as progress reports and evaluations, and some ratings are based on the team’s interpretation of the available data. Readers should therefore consider the project ratings as indicative rather than definitive.

**Reviewing strengths and weaknesses of delivery mechanisms –** The evaluation team assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the mix of delivery mechanisms used in the Malawi Program. However, since CIDA’s portfolio in Malawi included only one example of a program-based approach project (its contributions to the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund), the evaluation team could not make a comparison with other PBAs or make conclusive statements about the strengths and weaknesses of this and other delivery methods.



## 5. Sector Overview

This section provides a summary of information by sector. More detailed information can be found in Chapter 2 (Context) and Chapter 6 (Findings by Evaluation Criteria).

### 5.1 Health

CIDA programming in the health sector has focused on two rather different sub-sectors: HIV/AIDS and Water and Sanitation (WATSAN). In both areas programming has been closely aligned with sub-sector GoM priorities and development needs.

Despite some slow improvements in recent years, health data in Malawi depict a relatively bleak situation. Malawi has one of the world's highest maternal mortality ratios. HIV prevalence has been and remains high, with severe consequences for the country's public health system and the overall productivity and social fabric of the nation. In the last 10 years, HIV/AIDS has been the major health burden for Malawi. CIDA was 3<sup>rd</sup> of nine donors in the HIV/AIDS pooled fund (tied with NORAD and SIDA).<sup>9</sup>

Severe drought has led to famines and food shortages in Malawi, and access to safe water remains a serious and highly relevant challenge. In the mid-90s the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development (MoIWD) engaged in a renewed effort to provide access to water and sanitation, aiming at rehabilitating the once relatively well performing Malawi water schemes, building new ones, and introducing new approaches to ensure increased sustainability (e.g., community-based management and demand-driven approaches). However, Malawi had very limited capacity in water management policy and governance, and in the development and management of infrastructure – at all levels (national, district and community). Water and Sanitation remain a priority of the GoM development strategies (e.g., PRSP 2002). In 2006, irrigation and water development were identified as one of the six priority areas in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS). In 2007/08, Canada ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of eight donors in Malawi that supported the water sector.

### 5.2 Education

CIDA programming in the education sector has included the supply of quality textbooks and teaching and learning materials to the primary school system and the development of a distance education model to train secondary teachers. Since 2007, CIDA has been investing in improving primary education through the Initial Primary Teacher Education (IPTE) and Improving the Quality of Primary Education (IQPE) projects.

Malawi's aim is to provide education for all and improve the quality of teaching. With the introduction of free primary education in 1994 and subsequent increase in enrolment,<sup>10</sup> providing sufficient quantities of teaching/learning materials has been a major challenge for the Malawian government. In 1998, procurement capacity within the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) and other local bodies was basically non-existent. Increased enrolment rates at the primary level led to growing demand for secondary education and for teachers qualified to teach at this level. As noted in the 2008 joint education sector review, secondary teacher training continues to be a priority for the GoM. In 2007/08, Canada ranked 9<sup>th</sup> among Malawi's 13 donors in the education sector.

---

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund in Malawi (as in most places) is dominated by the contributions of the Global Fund, which provides 66% of the resources. CIDA as well as the GoM and SIDA/NORAD each contributed \$10 million or 5% to the Pooled Fund.

<sup>10</sup> From 1.6 million to over 3 million enrolled students. Source:  
[http://www.newsfromafrica.org/newsfromafrica/articles/art\\_902.html](http://www.newsfromafrica.org/newsfromafrica/articles/art_902.html)

### 5.3 Governance

CIDA programming in the governance sector has included two major bilateral investments: the Governance Assistance Project (GAP) and the Project for Economic Governance (PEG). Together, these two projects focused on strengthening the roles and practices of parliamentarians, civil society, and the GoM.

Malawi is a young democracy and its fragile political systems still need strengthening. This was recognized in the enactment of the second republican Constitution in 1994, followed by the severance of the Parliamentary Service from the Civil Service through the promulgation of the Parliamentary Service Act of 1998. The ongoing need for enhanced governance is recognized by Malawi's political leaders who have introduced a number of reforms and other initiatives over the past decade. Canada was one of a very few donors to support improved governance in Malawi a decade ago, with a particular focus on the strengthening the National Assembly, the public service, and the role played by civil society in Malawi. Other donors, including DFID, are now active players in the sector.

In 1998, GoM processes, systems, and structures were weak (if existent). While some progress has been made through various efforts, consulted stakeholders widely agree that the GoM remains generally weak and understaffed. The lack of qualified staff and high turnover rates (due to competition with donor projects/private sector jobs, and health issues – especially HIV/AIDS), pose ongoing challenges to the work of government units, and underline the need for continued support for more effective management within government. In 1998, civil society played a relatively passive role in Malawi, reflecting decades of repression during the Banda era. In 2007/08, CIDA ranked 9<sup>th</sup> among Malawi's 11 donors in the governance sector.

### 5.4 Gender Equality

CIDA programming in the gender equality sector has focused on the GESP initiative. This fund was designed “to strengthen the capacity of selected government and civil society organizations in Malawi to promote gender equalities in the areas of education (promotion of girl's education), water and sanitation, health (reproductive health and HIV/AIDS) and governance (promotion of women in decision-making processes) as well as to support a reduction in gender based violence (violence against women)”.

Persistent gender inequalities pose a major challenge to women and men in Malawi and are among the factors hampering Malawi's development. Inequalities are present in the political, social, and economic spheres and at all levels from communities to Parliament and the government.

The importance of gender equality in the Malawian context is explicitly acknowledged in both the Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (MPRSP) and MGDS, and is emphasized as a core principle that guides the GoM in education sector plans and strategies such as the 2001 Policy Investment Framework (PIF) and 2008 National Education Sector Plan (NESP). Malawi developed a national gender policy in 2000 (revised in 2008) and a national gender program in 2004. Nonetheless, technical and organizational capacities in the area of gender are very low in both the government and civil society in Malawi. In 2007/08, Canada ranked 5<sup>th</sup> out of Malawi's eight donors that supported gender equality.

## 6. Findings by Evaluation Criteria

### 6.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the evaluation findings on program relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, coherence, efficiency, principles of aid effectiveness, cross-cutting issues, program management (including strategic management, structure, and M&E), and delivery and funding mechanisms. These findings draw upon analysis of bilateral projects funded by the Malawi Program over the decade, and comparisons of their performance across criteria (see project ratings in Appendix VII).<sup>11</sup>

Overall, within the contextual challenges in Malawi, CIDA's program in Malawi between 1998 and 2008 was very relevant to the developmental needs of Malawi. It realized and exceeded most of the developmental objectives as defined in the CPDS. However, the sustainability of results has varied among projects. CIDA's development approach in Malawi has been generally congruent with the principles of aid effectiveness outlined in the Paris Declaration. It has realized greatest success at the program level in relation to the gender equality as a cross-cutting issue; its success in other cross-cutting priorities is modest. CIDA has been more successful in striving for coherence with other development partners than it has been within the Agency and across delivery channels. CIDA's potential efficiency and effectiveness has been limited by the lack of program-level and sector strategies and monitoring mechanisms as well as its shrinking investment portfolio since 2006.

### 6.2 Relevance

**Relevance** refers to the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities, and the policies of partners and donors (OECD DAC). This section reviews the extent to which CIDA's Malawi Country Program has been and has remained aligned with the needs and/or priorities expressed by the governments of Malawi and Canada/CIDA.

**Finding 1: CIDA's Malawi Country Program was relevant to the development and poverty reduction priorities of the GoM, to Malawian priorities, to the evolving priorities of the Canadian government and sectors of CIDA focus, and was complementary to the work of other donors.**

Relevance was rated as very satisfactory in most of the projects reviewed for this evaluation (see Appendix VII). Out of the eight criteria assessed, relevance received the second highest average rating across all projects.

---

<sup>11</sup> The main findings of the evaluation are based on a review of a sample of 18 projects for a total value of approximately \$135 million (or 63% of CIDA investments during the period). Of the 18 projects reviewed, 11 have been reviewed in detail according to the criteria in the rating tool. The PSU projects (four phases) were reviewed with a focus on their implications for overall program management issues (i.e., they were not reviewed against the same criteria used for the other projects, given that PSU projects are operational rather than developmental in nature). However, only seven bilateral projects (including the PBA in HIV/AIDS) are included in the rating grid for a total value of approximately \$69 million (or 32% of CIDA investments during the period), as two of the projects were too new to apply the tool and because for the others the information from documents and/or stakeholders was not detailed enough to permit a defensible quantitative judgement.

## Relevance to Malawi's development priorities

Consulted stakeholders indicated that the CPDS' focus on helping Malawi develop a "healthy, educated and productive human resource base" has remained highly relevant, given Malawi's continued severe capacity gaps across sectors and at all levels (see sidebar).

The CIDA Malawi Country Program remained relevant to the priorities of the GoM as outlined in the *Malawi Vision 2020* (2000), the *Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (MPRSP, 2002)*, and to two of the six priorities outlined in the *Malawi Growth and Development Strategy 2006-2011 (MGDS, 2006)*.

"Working with Malawi to develop an educated, healthy and productive human resource base meshes directly with objectives of access to quality health and education for all, and the development of the human resources necessary to create a manufacturing-led economy. The focus on governance, and the overall thrust of the program contributes in a long-term and more indirect way to the creation of a democratically mature nation with a fair and equitable distribution of wealth, and sustainable growth and development." (CPDS, 1998)

The country program objectives directly addressed two of the four pillars of the MPRSP (2002) – good governance and human capital development – and CIDA's multilateral programming activities in disaster/emergency response addressed a third MPRSP pillar (improving quality of life for the most vulnerable). Both the MPRSP and the CIDA country program highlighted the relevance of HIV/AIDS and gender as cross-cutting priorities. The country program was relevant to two of the six priorities outlined in the MGDS (2006) – HIV/AIDS, and water and irrigation – but did not reflect the GOM's recent shift in priorities to stimulate economic growth by putting more emphasis on 'hard' issues such as agriculture and food security, transport and infrastructure, irrigation and water development, and energy.

## Relevance to Sectors

**Health** – CIDA programming in the health sector was closely aligned with GoM priorities and with development needs in two sub-sectors: HIV/AIDS and Water and Sanitation. CIDA's contributions to establishing the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund and strengthening its capacity, and its efforts to encourage donor coordination through the HIV/AIDS Pooled Fund and program-based approaches (one of the GoM's expressed preferences

### In 2007/08 in Malawi, CIDA ranked

- 3<sup>rd</sup> out of 9 donors in HIV/AIDS pooled fund (tied with a joint contribution made by NORAD and SIDA)
- 7<sup>th</sup> out of 8 donors in the water sector
- 9<sup>th</sup> out of 13 donors investing in the education sector
- 9<sup>th</sup> out of 11 donors investing in economic governance
- 4<sup>th</sup> out of 5 donors investing in public administration
- 5<sup>th</sup> out of 8 donors investing in gender, youth development and sports issues

Sources: Malawi Aid Atlas 2007-08, GOM 2009

for aid delivery) are seen as highly relevant and have led to progress in the sector. While the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development (MoIWD) has made efforts to provide access to water and sanitation, Malawi had very limited capacity in water management policy, governance, and the development and management of infrastructure at all levels (national, district and community). Water and sanitation have remained a GoM priority, and CIDA's interventions were planned in response to these priorities and needs. To respond to the need for increased donor coordination in the WATSAN sector, CIDA played an instrumental role in fostering donor dialogue through the Water and Sanitation Development Partners group and contributed to initial discussions and planning for a Water and Sanitation SWAp.

**Education** – CIDA programming has addressed some key priorities outlined in the 2001 Malawi Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) for the education sector and in the 2008 National Education Sector Plan (NESP). Most noteworthy are CIDA’s support for the development of teaching/learning materials, the improved procurement capacity of the MoEST, and the development of effective and cost efficient secondary teacher training, which are considered highly relevant to Malawi’s aim to provide education for all and improve quality of teaching. CIDA addressed existing gaps and collaborated with other donors working in the same sub-sector to coordinate and align approaches.

**Governance** – Malawi is a young democracy and its fragile political systems still need strengthening. Malawi’s political leaders recognize the ongoing need for enhanced governance and have introduced a number of reforms and initiatives over the past decade. While some progress has been made, consulted stakeholders agree that the GoM remains generally weak and understaffed. CIDA’s efforts in strengthening the National Assembly, the public service, and the role of civil society in government oversight (e.g., the budget review process) have responded to needs that remain important in Malawi. Canada was one of a very few donors to support improved governance in Malawi a decade ago. Other donors, including DFID are now active players in the sector. Finally, when CIDA’s Malawi Country Program began, civil society played a relatively passive role in Malawi. CIDA’s deliberate focus on strengthening civil society’s role in government oversight is well recognized.

**Gender Equality** – As noted in the CPDS, persistent gender inequalities pose a major challenge to women and men in Malawi and are among the factors hampering Malawi’s development. The importance of gender equality is explicitly acknowledged in all of Malawi’s development plans and strategies, as well as in its national gender policy and program. Nevertheless, capacities in the area of gender are very low in both the government and civil society and CIDA’s focus on gender-related capacity building, awareness-raising, and technical assistance (through gender-focused initiatives and mainstreaming of gender in the program’s overall operations) has been very relevant. CIDA’s contributions corresponded to four of the six themes outlined in the Malawi 2000 National Gender Policy (education and training; reproductive health, food and nutrition security; governance; and human rights). The two themes that were not addressed are natural resources and environmental management, and poverty eradication and economic empowerment. These thematic priorities were up-dated in Malawi National Gender program in 2005 and subsequently in its revised Gender Policy (2008) to include HIV/AIDS and Gender Violence. CIDA gender-equality related programming focuses on both additional themes. In keeping with Paris Declaration principles, CIDA also played an important role in creating a common framework for development partners to improve sector programming through the Development Assistance Group on Gender (DAGG).

### Relevance to Canada

Overall, the Malawi Country Program and individual CIDA-funded projects have been well aligned and congruent with the development priorities of the Government of Canada (GoC) and CIDA. These include: contributions to poverty reduction (the main purpose of Canadian ODA); CIDA’s thematic focus on social development, including health and nutrition, HIV/AIDS, basic education, and child protection, with gender equality as an integral part of all of these priority areas; and Canada’s support for strengthening democracy and good governance. Environment was identified as a cross-cutting issue in the program design, at a time when the emphasis was to “do no harm.” While CIDA policies evolved over the decade to encourage more proactive efforts to address environmental concerns, the Malawi program design was never changed nor was the program managed to reflect this new approach.

The relevance of Malawi as a development partner for Canada has varied considerably in the last ten years. Malawi was considered highly relevant in 1997 when the country program was established and in 2005/06 when it was put on the list of CIDA priority countries. However, in 2006 priorities shifted as a result of Canada’s strong engagement in Afghanistan and new priorities and growing interest in the

Americas. In February 2009, Malawi was removed from the list of ‘countries of focus’ and is now considered a country ‘of modest presence.’

### Complementarity with other donors

CIDA’s work in all four sectors has been complementary to that of other donors. CIDA has addressed areas that at the time had not been supported by other donors, while also collaborating to varying degrees with other donors working in the same sub-sectors to coordinate and align approaches, engage in donor dialogue, and encourage others to pool resources in support of GoM objectives.

## 6.3 Effectiveness/Results

**Effectiveness** refers to the extent to which a development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance (OECD DAC). This section discusses the effectiveness of the Malawi Program.

### Effectiveness in Priority Sectors

**Finding 2: There is considerable evidence of positive achievements in all of CIDA’s explicit and implicit priority sectors in Malawi. However, overall effects tend to be project- rather than sector-oriented, reflecting CIDA program management practices in Malawi.**

The Malawi Country Program had two explicit priority sectors as outlined in the CPDS (basic health and education) and two implicit priority sectors (governance and gender equality) that were originally cast as cross-cutting priorities. There is considerable evidence of positive achievements in these sectors at both the project and sub-sector levels that correspond to, and in some cases exceed (e.g., HIV/AIDS), the overall program objectives outlined in the CPDS. However, the program has not always maximized opportunities for leveraging its investments and building on its own successes, for example in relation to education (secondary teacher training, development of an education SWAp). Moreover, as demonstrated below in the sector-focused findings, results tend to be project oriented, or at most sub-sector, rather than sector-oriented. This reflects how CIDA has managed its investments in Malawi (see section 6.10).

**Finding 3: In the health sector, the CIDA Malawi Program has made considerable contributions at both the project and the sub-sector levels in the areas of HIV/AIDS and water and sanitation. Given its focus on these sub-sectors, CIDA’s impact on the Malawi health sector as a whole has been modest.**

The Malawi Country Program did not define program-level results in the health sector. Its initiatives in HIV/AIDS and Water and Sanitation sub-sectors were not linked by an overarching health sector strategy, and there has been little synergy between investments. However,

#### Malawi Program LFA health-related outcomes

Improved health and hygienic conditions resulting from expanded safe water supplies within an overall development strategy

Improved access to quality family planning, reproductive health and safe motherhood, and STD treatment

CIDA’s programming in HIV/AIDS and Water and Sanitation contributed to tangible changes at the community level and to creating a more conducive environment in the health sector through its efforts to improve the capacities of the GoM and local partners, policy development, and donor coordination.

### Contributions/Achievements in the HIV/AIDS sub-sector

CIDA helped to address severe capacity gaps in the Malawian National AIDS Secretariat (NAS) and the subsequent National AIDS Commission (NAC), primarily through its involvement in establishing the HIV/AIDS SWAp, the first program-based approach established in Malawi. It also provided

approximately CAD\$15 million to the GoM for the implementation of the National Strategic Framework (NSF) on HIV/AIDS.

Consulted stakeholders noted that CIDA was instrumental in getting the HIV/AIDS pooled fund off the ground and bringing other donors on board. This has contributed to the increased capacity and improved effectiveness of the NAC in coordinating Malawi's national response to HIV/AIDS. In addition, many noted that CIDA's HIV/AIDS Program Advisor played a crucial role in providing technical assistance and advice to the NAC.

CIDA supported the development of a resource database of HIV/AIDS activities in Malawi to identify gaps and plan interventions more effectively. The pooled funding mechanism ensured a higher degree of predictability and reliability in the generation and transfer of government and donor funds to the national AIDS program, reduced the transaction costs incurred by the NAC, and provided learning opportunities for the GoM, CIDA, and other donors on program-based approaches. Several stakeholders expressed concern about the future of the SWAp if and when CIDA's support and leadership ceases.

CIDA's work on HIV/AIDS was complemented by other CIDA investments through CPB, MGPPB, and Africa Branch, and there is considerable evidence that these initiatives strengthened the capacities of grassroots/community initiatives and organizations and contributed to regional learning and exchange.

### **Achievements in the Water and Sanitation sub-sector**

CIDA's main investment in this area was the Community Water, Sanitation and Health Project (COMWASH). At the institutional level, CIDA supported the development of the MoIWD strategic plan (2005) through GAP as well as the development of the National Sanitation Policy (2008). Further, CIDA was actively engaged in sector-wide donor coordination through the Secretariat of the Water and Sanitation Development Partners Group.

#### **CIDA's contributions to HIV/AIDS**

CIDA supported an organizational study of the NAS that resulted in its transformation into a semi-autonomous entity (NAC) to address problems of government bureaucracy.

CIDA's involvement was crucial in the establishment of the Pooled Fund and related support to the evolving National AIDS Commission.

CIDA supported the development of a resource database of HIV/AIDS activities in Malawi to identify gaps and plan interventions more effectively.

#### **Key achievements in HIV/AIDS that the pooled fund under the NAC helped to bring about**

- increased number of patients receiving antiretroviral therapy
- improved care and support of people living with HIV/AIDS
- dramatic increase in the number of HIV testing sites (from 14 in 2001 to more than 400), and increased numbers of people being tested
- improved services for HIV-positive pregnant women to prevent mother-to-child transmission

#### **CIDA'S Key achievements in water and sanitation**

**Increased access to safe water and sanitation** in the districts of Thyolo and Phalombe: 2000 water points were constructed, reaching a rural population of over 250 000; significant increase in the number of villages meeting MoIWD water access standards; consulted beneficiaries noted reduced time in water collection and fewer cases of water-related diseases

**Increased capacity for community-based water management** (16,000 individuals trained in targeted communities, including almost 50% women; stakeholders expressed a strong sense of ownership and pride)

**Improved GoM policies and practices** in the development of the Malawi Sanitation Policy (2008), the National Water Development Program, the Training Manual for Water Users Associations, and in the emerging Water and Sanitation SWAp

**Enhanced donor dialogue and coordination** through the Water and Sanitation Development Partners group and initial planning for a Water and Sanitation SWAp

In targeted communities, CIDA-supported projects also contributed to positive changes related to health issues including: reductions in under-five malnutrition and mortality rates, reduced incidence of disease and micronutrient deficiency disorders, improved early childhood development, and increases in trained health workers at the community level in 10 districts. (The CPE team was informed of these changes, but was not in a position to quantify these results.)

**Finding 4: In the education sector, CIDA has made significant contributions, particularly in the areas of textbook supply and procurement and in secondary teacher education.**

CIDA’s contributions to education in Malawi have been aligned with GoM education sector priorities and have filled gaps not covered by other donors and helped to leverage others’ support— facts frequently noted and valued by consulted stakeholders. This in turn allowed Canada to influence reforms to the national curriculum. CIDA

supported the supply of quality textbooks and teaching and learning materials, built the procurement capacity of MoEST (which, in turn, led to the implementation of Malawi’s first National Public Procurement Act), developed a distance education model to train secondary teachers, and brought together GoM and donor representatives to discuss and prepare for establishing an education SWAp. CIDA’s ongoing support and advice to the GoM, the MoEST, and other education stakeholders in Malawi is highly respected and valued.

CIDA engages in significant policy dialogue in education. CIDA is highly respected by the GoM as a result of its expertise and capacity to work effectively and mediate solutions between stakeholders. CIDA continues to exercise strong influence in matters related to curriculum reform, teacher training, and textbook policies and public procurement. CIDA participates in the annual Joint Sector Review for Education, chaired the Donor Partners for Education Group in 2006 and 2007; belongs to five education-specific technical working groups; and is a member of the Ministry’s Program for Curriculum Assessment and Reform steering committee and technical working group.

Since 2007, CIDA has been investing in improving primary education through the Initial Primary Teacher Education (IPTE) and Improving the Quality of Primary Education (IQPE) projects. While it is premature to assess the contribution of these investments to results in the education sector, project reports provide evidence of preliminary progress that is likely to support the achievement of

**Malawi Program LFA outcomes related to education**

Growth of community schools providing equal opportunity and increased participation of communities in the education process

Improved quality of teaching and teaching/learning environment in Community Day Secondary Schools (CDSS)

Improved MoEST capabilities to supply quality gender-sensitive teaching/learning materials to schools

**CIDA’s key achievements in education**

**Strengthened procurement capacity in MoEST:** CIDA helped to establish a central procurement unit and database that allow MoEST to determine textbook requirements; strengthened the capacity of the Malawi Institute for Education to design and prepare print-ready copies of textbooks.

**Improved cost-effective access to textbooks:** CIDA improved the supply of textbooks and teaching materials, supported the development of gender-sensitive textbooks for primary schools, and provided special needs teaching/learning materials.

Procurement and distribution costs of textbooks are now one of the lowest in all of Africa (an average of \$0.50 CAN per book). CIDA has provided 18.9 million units of teaching materials (including textbooks) through the GSES II project.

CIDA contributed to GoM policy on textbooks; textbook to pupil ratio, which was 1:24, is now 1:1

**Increased number of qualified teachers working in secondary schools:** Between 2003 and 2006, almost 800 teachers graduated from the CIDA-supported distance education program, which now receives government funding.



expected results. These recent education projects are connected and support various components of the National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) of the GoM, and at a broader level are linked by the Education for All objectives and the MDGs. However, due to the lack of an overall CIDA education strategy and sector objectives in Malawi, the projects reviewed for the CPE appear somewhat fragmented and it is not clear whether or how they are linked to and/or build on each other.

**Finding 5: In the governance sector, CIDA helped to strengthen the roles played by civil society, the National Assembly, and individual Members of Parliament in the national budget-making process in Malawi. CIDA support has had modest effects on targeted Malawi government departments.**

While the CPDS identified the importance of governance issues and included one outcome and indicator that referred to governance (see sidebar), the Malawi Program did not define specific governance issues that it was intended to address, nor did it formalize a strategy, results, and/or indicators to guide its governance investments. Over the decade, the Malawi Program made two major bilateral investments within the governance portfolio: the Malawi Governance Assistance Project (GAP) and the Project for Economic Governance (PEG).<sup>12</sup> Aside from these two projects, CIDA made few other investments in governance through bilateral or other CIDA funding channels. The program relied on assigned CIDA project officers and to personnel of bilateral projects for governance expertise when required; the PSU did not employ any governance specialists. CIDA did not engage in non-project activities (such as policy dialogue) in the governance sector.

**Governance outcome and performance indicators (1999 LFA)**

Outcome: Effective policies, mechanisms and systems for sustaining governance, social and economic reforms, and addressing poverty

Performance Indicator: Productivity, living standards, economic indicators, confidence of citizens, and investors in democratic importance

While there was some interaction between the PEG and GAP projects and some other projects (e.g., GESp), the Malawi Program did not have a formal strategy to guide its governance investments and there is more evidence of project achievements than sector-level achievements. The expected sustainability of their results (particularly GAP) is quite limited.

Together, these two projects focused on strengthening the roles and practices of parliamentarians, civil society, and the GoM. The key outputs and achievements of these two projects are summarized below.

Increased capacity and role of civil society in monitoring government

PEG support for civil society (CS) included awareness raising; training workshops; development of a pool of trainers; facilitation of linkages among networks, Members of Parliament (MPs) and government

**Some PEG Results – Key Achievements**

Enhanced collaboration between the National Assembly and CS; public participation in pre-budget consultations

CS sector networks increased knowledge and skills in budget scrutiny

GoM is more receptive to input from the public and CS

More than 120 Malawian reporters and editors trained in public finance and reporting on economic governance (Department of Journalism, University of Malawi); development of an economic journalism handbook for the Malawi media (2008)

Creation of a Civil Society/ Parliamentary task force to enhance CS engagement on Parliamentary reforms, oversight and consultation

<sup>12</sup> While some Malawi Country Program staff refer to GESp as a governance project, we have treated it in this report as a gender project.

ministries; and some institutional support.

Increased capacity of the National Assembly

PEG provided financial and technical support to Parliament, including: the cost of training for MPs, committees and staff related to the budget process, budget scrutiny, oversight, and monitoring; support for MP field trips related to their budget implementation oversight role; and support for evidence-based research, equipment, and logistical support.

**Some PEG Results – Key Achievements**

Parliamentary Committees scrutinize poverty and social protection issues; increased quality of MP budget debates

Resources allocated to support Parliamentary Committees oversight

Parliamentary Committees meet regularly and conduct public hearings; MPs see civil society as a source of valuable budget analysis; increased public interest in such issues

The National Assembly developed a strategic plan 2006-2009; the Parliamentary Reforms Committee reviewed the National Assembly's performance against this plan in early 2009

PEG has supported steps to conceptualize a Parliamentary Budget Office to enhance Parliament's research and analytical capacity on economic policy and budgetary matters (initiative is in early stage).

Increased capacity in targeted GoM ministries

GAP was designed in 2001 as a responsive project to support capacity building within the Malawian public service. Following a mid-term performance review that identified several limitations, it was redesigned in 2006 and extended to January 2009. The project focused on strategic planning for GoM ministries, policy development for the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC), and leadership training for the Department of Human Resource Management and Development (DHRMD). GAP contributed to a large number of outputs but had modest success in realizing planned outcomes, particularly at the organizational and institutional levels.

**Some selected GAP outputs**

Training course on Strategic Implementation Plans (SIPs) housed within the Malawi Staff Development Institute (SDI); it is not clear if SDI has the capacity and resources to deliver and update this training on an ongoing basis.

SIPs for 21 ministries and 11 departments (including Domasi College of Education and the Ministry of Water Development); however, due to leadership turnover, many of these plans are not being used by ministries.

Deliverables related to GoM policy-making and decision-making systems: Guide to Executive Decision-Making Processes, training in policy development

Leadership development outputs: Leadership Competency Model, Leadership Facilitators' Guide, leadership training for 400 senior GoM managers, a Leadership Development Framework (SDI will own the framework and provide the training if it receives funding)

Gender budget guidelines, checklist, and training materials; training and orientation for government and civil society representatives (due to budgetary constraints in the GoM, the guidelines were never used for budgeting purposes).

**Finding 6: In the gender equality sector, CIDA's contributions in Malawi are widely regarded as remarkable, both in terms of project outputs and in CIDA's role as a leader and advocate for gender equality in Malawi.**

The CPDS describes a number of gender objectives, including: i) to increase, through policy dialogue and specific project initiatives, the GoM's awareness of the importance of incorporating gender analysis into economic and policy decision-

LFA outcome: "Increased women's capacities and their decision making roles."

making processes; ii) to strengthen the capacity of Malawian women as full participants and decision-makers in development; iii) to strengthen the capacity of targeted Malawian institutions and organizations to integrate gender-equality considerations into their policies and programs, and to promote specific gender-equality interventions; and iv) to integrate gender-equality considerations systematically into all bilateral projects and programs.

The Malawi Country Program’s contributions to gender equality as a priority sector are the result of the GESP project (as an investment solely focused on gender issues), CIDA’s active involvement in the Development Assistance Group on Gender (DAGG), and the work of the Malawi-based CIDA gender specialists who provided technical backstopping and policy advice to the GoM and other partners in Malawi. CIDA’s efforts to mainstream gender as a cross-cutting issue are discussed in section 6.8.

The vast majority of consulted stakeholders acknowledged that CIDA’s contributions to gender equality in Malawi have been remarkable both in terms of concrete achievements as well as its role in continuously encouraging its partners to address gender issues in their own work. CIDA is widely seen as the lead donor for gender in Malawi, not because of its relatively modest financial contributions, but because of its active involvement in the DAGG, its field presence through GESP, its full-time Gender Equality Specialist, and its ongoing support to the GoM and other stakeholders. According to consulted donors, NGOs, and GoM representatives, its work on gender has increased CIDA’s visibility and reputation in Malawi.

One of CIDA’s main strengths in the gender sector is its multi-pronged and multi-level approach. Through the work of GESP and the Malawi-based gender advisors in the PSU, CIDA has been able to engage at different levels simultaneously (grassroots community work, lobbying, and policy development) and with different types of partners (NGOs, MPs, GoM) on a number of thematic issues (e.g., GBV, readmission, maternal health). This approach brought community issues to the policy level and supported policy roll out and implementation at the community level. Consulted development partners highly value the dedication, responsiveness, and skill of CIDA staff members (both GESP staff and the PSU gender advisor).

**CIDA’s Key achievements in gender equality**

**Increased capacities of government departments, district assemblies, and NGOs and CSOs working on gender issues:**

CIDA provided support in technical areas and in organizational capacities; NGOs noted their improved capacities to implement projects and leverage donor resources (70% of NGOs supported by GESP have obtained funding from other development partners); creation of CSO networks and strengthened lobbying capacities; creation of the National Task Force on Gender Advocacy Initiatives (NATAFOGAI)

**Results at the community level:** increase in the number of gender-based violence cases reported to police, increase in the number of teen mothers readmitted to school, improved access to maternal health practices, greater awareness of women’s rights; most changes were facilitated by the involvement of local leaders, teachers, and police.

**More conducive legal and political environment for gender equality:** CIDA provided support for the National Gender Policy and Program, the Prevention of Domestic Violence Bill (2005), the Re-admission Policy for Teen Parents in Schools, and the Roadmap on Maternal Health.

**Gender mainstreaming:** CIDA supported the Ministry of Women and Child Development (MoWCD) and other ministries in the development of gender mainstreaming guidelines and strategic planning, the gender aspects of the Malawi PRSP, gender analysis of the budget and gender-responsive budgeting, and the National HIV/AIDS Policy Strategic Framework and Strategic Plan.

**Improved donor coordination:** CIDA supported and re-invigorated the DAGG, which has made progress in participation, communication, and clarification of roles and responsibilities of governments, donors, and NGOs; a results framework is under development. The DAGG’s effectiveness is still limited by reliance on development partner assistance, the limited capacity of some ministries, and the limited involvement of some donors.

CIDA's main challenges in gender programming in Malawi were due to the weak capacities of key partners (both the GoM and CSOs), limited political will with regard to promoting reforms on gender issues, and a parliamentary impasse that slowed the approval of gender-sensitive bills. Other limitations, however, were related to CIDA's own approach. Several stakeholders were of the opinion that CIDA was trying to do too much with relatively limited financial resources.

**Finding 7: While the CIDA Malawi Program established a positive Canadian reputation among a broad range of stakeholders in the country over the past decade, since 2006 the uncertainty related to the future of the program has negatively affected Canada's reputation.**

Many of the positive achievements of the Malawi Program across different sectors were due to the fact that the program had established and maintained a positive Canadian reputation as a flexible, trusted, and responsive donor among Malawian and international stakeholders. CIDA was also very successful in leveraging resources of other donors to support Malawi's development priorities. Canada is recognized for its proactive contributions to donor coordination and its commitment to the principles of aid effectiveness.

Since 2006, the uncertainty of the Malawi Program's future has negatively affected Canada's reputation. In the last three years, CIDA bilateral has made only three significant new investments in Malawi through initiatives led by multilateral partners (UNICEF and UNDP) and bilateral partners (GTZ). The program team in Malawi and Canada has continued to participate in events and initiatives (e.g., SWAp developments in various sectors, development of sector-specific plans), but CIDA's bilateral contribution has been limited to providing technical expertise through the Head of Cooperation and PSU sector specialists. Interviewed development partners noted their concerns about CIDA's financial commitments beyond these (valued) in-kind contributions and beyond the end of the CPDS.

## 6.4 Sustainability

**Sustainability** refers to the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed; the probability of continued long-term benefits; and/or the resilience to risk of the net benefit over time (OECD DAC).

**Finding 8: While CIDA support has contributed to an impressive number of results in Malawi since 1998, the likelihood that these will be sustained is quite mixed and modest overall. This reflects Malawi's challenging context as well as the varied suitability of CIDA practices in managing for sustainable results.**

CIDA's programming results in Malawi are most likely to be sustained at the individual level – in the increased knowledge and skills of planners, managers, and beneficiaries who participated in the design and delivery of specific investments. At the organizational and institutional levels, the likely sustainability of achievements is varied. A number of results appear to have a strong likelihood of being continued and/or locally adapted according to evolving contexts (e.g., capacities of institutions such as the NAC, MoEST, Domasi College; capacities of NGOs and other partners involved in GESP and PEG). In other instances sustainability of results is doubtful (e.g., support provided to ministries and institutions as part of GAP, and some of the support provided to the National Assembly by PEG).

**Factors that affect sustainability** – Malawi is heavily dependent on donors for financial resources, a situation which may worsen given the global recession, and on external technical expertise and resources due to the capacity constraints of the GoM and CSOs. Despite this challenging context, the evaluation revealed some good practices that are likely to have helped support the sustainability of results. These include:

- **Institutionalization:** of the specialized MoEST procurement unit, the distance education model for secondary teacher training, and gender policies developed with CIDA assistance (e.g., readmission of teen mothers to school, Bill and Plan of Action on Prevention of Domestic Violence).
- **Organizational capacity development:** Trained MoEST procurement unit staff; strengthened capacity of the NAC to lead the national response to HIV/AIDS; strengthened community capacities to manage their own water schemes; strengthened capacities of NGOs (in areas such as proposal writing and RBM), networks of CSOs, and stronger connections between government and civil society.
- **Ownership:** Interventions based on local needs and/or built on local ideas and plans (e.g., secondary teacher training built on ideas developed by Domasi College; gender initiatives based on local NGO suggestions and designs) contributed to local ownership and increase the likelihood that Malawian stakeholders will defend and expand these achievements over time.
- **Diversifying Funding Sources:** The HIV/AIDS SWAp assisted the GoM in diversifying sources of funds; PEG areas of investment (civil society, media, government) attracted funding from other agencies including UNDP, DFID, Trocaire, Oxfam, Irish Aid, EU, and others.

The evaluation also identified some approaches and limitations that hindered the sustainability of results. These include:

- **Absence of explicit sustainability strategies** at both program and project levels (including the absence of comprehensive capacity development strategies) – In many of the reviewed projects, questions of sustainability were raised too late, as the project was closing (e.g., GAP).
- **Catalytic but short-term investments and lack of follow-up/scaling-up strategies:** Several CIDA-supported projects (PEG, GESP, and GAP) supported a large number of interesting short-term initiatives that are not likely to be further developed or sustained without longer-term support.
- **Lack of institutional ownership of projects:** In some instances, CIDA projects lacked clearly identified local partners/counterparts. This was particularly evident in GAP in regard to strategic plans. While the Chief Secretary of the Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC) identified individual ministries as recipients of GAP's strategic planning support, these ministries were not active partners whose institutions owned and directed the strategic planning processes (and their results) in their ministries.
- **Project versus sector approach:** While the Malawi government became more receptive to sector approaches, CIDA lacked the resources to respond except by means of policy dialogue in sectors such as education and water. Sector approaches (e.g., HIV/AIDS) could have helped build local ownership and sustainable structures and systems.

## 6.5 Program and Project Coherence

For the purpose of this evaluation we referred to the definitions of coherence provided in the Merriam Webster Dictionary: a) *systematic or logical connection or consistency*; and b) *the integration of diverse elements, relationships, or values*. Both imply the existence of a describable larger 'whole' – an overarching common purpose or goal that individual elements can contribute or belong to.

**Finding 9:** While CIDA's country program managers made some efforts to build coherence across bilateral projects in Malawi, connections between bilateral projects have been largely accidental. Some efforts have also been made to link bilateral priorities with CPB and MGPB projects. This reflects the fact that the CPDS was a not a truly corporate document that was binding on non-bilateral channels and that coherence among CIDA

**program investments was not an over-riding CIDA priority during the period under review.**

**Program coherence** – CIDA has not defined expectations and guidelines for country program coherence, or strategies to ensure coherence within and across sectors, or within and across delivery channels. Thus, the limited coherence within the bilateral program reflects more on the Agency than on the Malawi Program. The question of whether investments of different CIDA branches in a particular country can or should be aligned has not been resolved or addressed by policy guidance. CIDA staff report that the Agency's new data architecture (which should be rolled out by 2011) is expected to support greater coherence among the branches. In the meantime, the Aid Effectiveness and Country Program Unit (AECPU) group within CPB is working on this challenge.

**Coherence among bilateral projects within and across sectors** – Overall, the bilateral program was characterized by a 'silo approach' in which projects in different sub-sectors worked mostly in isolation. In education, the GSES and SSTEP projects had some limited linkages in terms of their objectives/goals, and recently approved education investments implemented by GTZ and UNICEF are linked under the NESP. However, these are not clearly linked to an overall CIDA program or strategy for education and do not build on previous CIDA-funded projects. In health, CIDA's work on the HIV/AIDS pooled fund and the COMWASH project addressed different issues. Projects in the governance sector targeted complementary groups of stakeholders, but did not work systematically towards explicit sector goals.

**Coherence among delivery channels** – The Malawi Program team and CPB made some notable efforts to inform each other about planned and ongoing initiatives in Malawi, and MGPB had some consultations with the Malawi Program and bilateral program specialists (Africa Branch). Synergies between bilateral and CPB, or MGPB initiatives in Malawi were mostly accidental. This reflects the fact that there was no policy requirement for CPB and MGPB investments to be aligned with bilateral initiatives during the period under review. One notable exception was the complementary relationship among CPB, MGPB, and regional CIDA initiatives on HIV/AIDS.

**Project coherence** – At the project level, the evaluation team examined coherence in terms of the extent to which projects planned for complementary associations with other investments in Malawi, carried on a regular exchange of information, and identified opportunities for synergy during implementation. There was a significant variation across reviewed projects. The CPDS and project-level documents show the clear intention to ensure ongoing connections among bilateral investments, but these were implemented to different degrees and with mixed results. The longest-serving managers in the Malawi Program encouraged regular information exchange among the staff of different bilateral projects, and while consulted CIDA/project staff found this exchange informative, there is little evidence that this led to the identification of opportunities for synergy among projects.

As noted previously, the Malawi Country Program lacked sector or thematic strategies. In this context, the capacity of individual projects to identify and utilize synergies and collaborative opportunities with other projects largely depended on the individuals involved and on contextual issues.

## **6.6 Efficiency and Resource Management**

### **6.6.1 Introduction**

**Efficiency** is a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results (OECD DAC).

This section has two purposes. The first is to assess the efficiency of the Malawi Country Program in terms of: a) the extent to which projects were managed efficiently; b) the extent to which the Malawi Program had and used effective systems and procedures to manage the aid program; and c) the overall cost of delivering the aid program in Malawi, how it has changed over time, and how it compares to other CIDA programs.

Programs require a combination of resources – human, financial, and technological – to translate goals and objectives into results. A second purpose is to assess how Malawi Program resources have been utilized to realize goals and objectives.

### 6.6.2 Program Efficiency

#### **Finding 10: Bilateral projects within the Malawi Country Program have a mix of efficiency ratings.**

From a cross-cutting perspective, most bilateral projects were completed within budget and on time (with a few extensions). The Malawi Country Program leveraged funding from other donors, notably in the HIV/AIDS SWAp, but also at the project level (e.g., PEG and GESP were co-funded by DFID, and CIDA supported the basic education project with GTZ). Donor pooling practices created efficiencies for Canada, in sharing the relatively fixed management costs of large projects, and also created some efficiency for Malawi by reducing the number of projects with different sets of funding criteria and processes.

Reviews of a sample of bilateral projects that received Malawi Program funding suggest a mix of ratings – from highly satisfactory to unsatisfactory. Of all the projects reviewed, GSES II, which will end in September 2010, has managed its budget efficiently and has exceeded expected results by using savings from procurement activities to support unplanned initiatives. Unfortunately, evaluations of many CIDA projects in Malawi did not assess project efficiency even though it is a CIDA requirement to do so; this made analysis more difficult. In some instances, the evaluation team had to rely on the management costs allocated within project budgets (which excluded in-kind support provided by CIDA for locally-managed projects); in other cases, the evaluation team could not provide a rating because information was not available or was outdated.

#### **Finding 11: According to established CIDA proxy measures for program efficiency, the Malawi Program is relatively efficient.**

The efficiency of Malawi program management in the last 10 years varied over time, as shown below.

**1998-2004** – Between 1998 and 2004, the PSU was central to all CIDA activities in Malawi and, according to those interviewed, efficiently utilized.

**2004-2006** – High CIDA staff turnover reduced the time and attention that managers could give to strategic matters, including efficient program management. Due to the lack of clearly defined roles, procedures, and systems, program managers had to rely on ad hoc information for decision-making; and the limited support provided by DFAIT for the Mission in Malawi meant that those responsible for managing the program were at times consumed by others' responsibilities. Following an internal CIDA review in 2005, considerable efforts were made by the program to address these shortcomings.

**After 2006** – In 2007 and 2008, the Malawi operations and management (O&M<sup>13</sup>) costs were relatively modest (6.5% and 8.5% respectively), as were the costs of other CIDA programs that it was compared to (see Exhibit 6.1).

The Malawi Program's uncertain status since 2006 has contributed to some efficiency concerns, most notably the cost of maintaining a mid-sized PSU while the program was shrinking in size, and the significant time Malawi program managers and staff spent on developing plans, strategies and scenarios to inform the future of the Malawi Program. Due to lengthy decision-approval processes and the review of the aid policy, activities such as this evaluation (initially planned for 2007) as well as other evaluations have been delayed, and thus were received too late to properly inform CIDA programming.

---

<sup>13</sup> CIDA has used this ratio for many years as a proxy measurement for assessing a program's efficiency.

**Exhibit 6.1 Comparison of O&M Costs to ODA for Selected CIDA Programs (2006/07 and 2007/08)**

Year/Variable	CIDA Bilateral Program			
	Malawi	South Africa	Kenya	Burkina Faso
<b>2007</b>				
ODA	13.248M	6.097M	14.160M	11.129M
O&M	.340M	.606M	.320M	.546M
O&M/ODA	6.58%	12.25%	4.42%	6.19%
<b>2008</b>				
ODA	11.076M	8.877M	11.076M	15.534M
O&M	.319M	.743M	.482M	.627M
O&M/ODA	8.46%	10.37%	6.48%	5.13%

**Finding 12: The proxy indicator used by CIDA excludes some program-related costs, which may under-state the real costs of program management.**

The O&M formula used by CIDA excludes a number of other costs that could be considered as management costs (e.g., PSU operating costs, costs associated with DFAIT support for programs, the costs of the CIDA HQ Program Director, Project Assistant, and CIDA HQ staff benefits and office support costs). Including such expenses would increase the effective cost of managing CIDA programs.

### 6.6.3 Resource Management

**Finding 13: Despite the CPDS’ stated emphasis on sectors and themes, most of the Malawi Program’s resources have been allocated to project needs. This has limited the potential for strategic management, synergy, and learning within the program.**

A review of human resource allocations (among CIDA staff, PSU specialists, external monitors and evaluators engaged by the Malawi Program) suggests that resources have been allocated to respond to project rather than sector or thematic needs and requirements. CIDA has devoted little formal attention to defining thematic or sector strategies, monitoring progress in these areas, or to CIDA learning across a sector or theme, which has limited the potential for synergy.

For example:

- Projects that might have shared cross-cutting objectives related to governance (e.g., PEG, GESP, GAP) were not necessarily managed or overseen by the same CIDA officer.
- PSU-contracted sector specialists with expertise in gender and water were available to support CIDA (or project) needs if/as requested to do so. However, they did not have any authority to provide guidance to projects, and did not have oversight responsibilities even if they were responsible for a cross-cutting issue such as gender. (Note: No PSU advisory support was available for governance or HIV/AIDS.)
- In most cases, external monitors were allocated by project rather than thematic priorities. The external monitors for GESP (gender) and for two governance projects did not have any responsibilities to examine the rest of CIDA’s portfolio in Malawi in relation to gender or governance, even though these were crosscutting themes.



**Finding 14: Until 2004, CIDA managers fostered cooperation and coordination among all stakeholders involved in the Malawi Program to build the program. Since 2006, a significant amount of staff time has been used to manage existing investments and generate requested information to inform the program’s future.**

**Between 1998 and 2004** – CIDA managers fostered close cooperation and coordination among CIDA bilateral projects, among CIDA and other donors, and between CIDA and the GoM. The common shared vision and values and close relationships of this period are evident in project documents and in CIDA’s leadership role and active participation in coordination committees.

**Between 2004 and 2005** – Following changes at the Post and PSU in Malawi leadership took a more rigid management approach and discouraged sharing of knowledge and information among project teams. This contributed directly to high staff turnover and created tensions between CIDA and some of its partners in Malawi. This situation abated by 2005.

**From 2006-2008** – In a context of limited resources, CIDA representatives in Malawi continued to manage previously approved projects. They focused on rebuilding previously strained relationships and continued to coordinate with donors, the GoM, and with Canadian partners in Malawi. They also invested significant resources to address the needs of management for information that might determine the future of the Malawi Program.

**Finding 15: Canada’s initial investment in establishing a PSU greatly facilitated the start up of its aid program in Malawi in 1998. The relative and potential added value of this investment has declined since 2006.**

The creation of the PSU in 1998 was an important ingredient in the successful launch of the Malawi program and PSU specialists helped to enhance program performance and Canada’s reputation in education, water, and gender equality up to 2004. In 2005, given the expected growth of the program, the new PSU Director was given some additional responsibility to assist in new program development. However, with the new program context following 2006, CIDA no longer needed this type of support from the PSU and the PSU infrastructure started to exceed the program’s needs. The future of the program was unknown and dependent on policy decisions beyond the program managers’ control, and, while the PSU experts continued to provide their expertise and analysis, their involvement in new programming was limited given the context. This situation contributed to certain inefficiencies.

**Finding 16: After 2004, DFAIT provided some administrative support services to CIDA in Malawi, but the lack of a formal and well understood agreement caused tensions and over time contributed to some inefficiency in the program.**

Prior to 2004, CIDA relied on the PSU for administrative support in Malawi. In 2004, a decision was made to establish a CIDA mission in Lilongwe that would be staffed with one Canadian based staff (CBS) and two Locally Engaged Staff (LES). In a series of email correspondence which started in 2003, CIDA and DFAIT began to discuss an arrangement whereby DFAIT would provide “minimal support” to the mission in Lilongwe with the help of the Canadian High Commission (CHC) in Lusaka, Zambia. According to those interviewed in CIDA and DFAIT, the minimal support arrangement was intended to provide CIDA with access to a very narrow array of common services. It was quite distinct from the

**DFAIT Support for Operations and Missions Abroad**

DFAIT has the mandate to manage the procurement of goods, services and real property at missions abroad. These common services are mandatory for departments to use when required to support Canada’s diplomatic and consular missions abroad. These services are optional for departments to use when required for purposes other than in support of diplomatic and consular missions abroad (*Inter-departmental Memorandum of Understanding on Operations and Support at Missions Abroad* p. 1 April 2004).

larger package of services typically provided to larger missions; however, the details of this package were never formalized in terms of an agreement.

In 2005, the CIDA representative in Malawi and the DFAIT representative in Lusaka started to negotiate an agreement. The arrangement was neither completed nor signed, in part due to larger decisions related to Malawi (i.e., the transfer of responsibility for Malawi from Zambia to Mozambique, and the closing of the mission in Malawi in 2009). A final observation relates to the expectations of the CBS based in Malawi at the time, who indicate that they were not aware of the previous informal agreement between their departments about the “smaller package” of services. This information gap created some tension among individuals in both departments, who evidently did not share the same understanding of the “arrangement”.

Between 2004 and 2008, the administrative requirements of the mission in Malawi increased significantly for several reasons:

- Given the need for enhanced security in missions abroad, it was decided that the mission in Lilongwe required upgrading. While DFAIT was responsible for managing the construction project, it had no representative based in Lilongwe for oversight purposes. As a consequence, those physically present in Lilongwe (particularly the CBS) took on some responsibilities with adverse effects on their workloads. Final activities related to this project were completed in the summer of 2009 following the decision to close the mission.
- In 2005, CIDA decided that it required a second CBS in Lilongwe to support its programming in Malawi, although the actual posting was deferred until 2007. This had implications for the amount of office space, housing, and other support required by mission personnel.
- Over the period there were some consular cases and diplomatic visitors that required some short-term support by Canada’s representatives in Malawi.

During this period of considerable change, CIDA program staff in Malawi became increasingly involved in administrative activities that they felt needed to be addressed and that in other larger missions would normally have been the responsibility of DFAIT. CIDA officers reported they felt that they were spending excessive amounts of their time on DFAIT responsibilities,<sup>14</sup> while DFAIT officers were under the impression that they were only to provide minimal support. The lack of a formal agreement contributed to tensions between CIDA and DFAIT. During the period, there was considerable turnover in staff responsible for the Malawi program at CIDA in Gatineau and in Lilongwe. The combination of the informal arrangement with DFAIT, the absence of a signed agreement, and the turnover in staff likely contributed to a loss in corporate memory of the original implicit agreement between CIDA and DFAIT.

A review of CIDA files indicates that significant and frequent efforts were made by CIDA and DFAIT to identify, discuss and address CIDA’s evolving needs. One notable effort to improve the situation was the development of *An Action Plan: To improve administration at CHC Malawi*. This Action Plan was created in 2007 and identified key issues to be resolved as well as the individuals responsible for the various tasks. Considerable time was spent trying to clarify responsibilities, correct mistakes and resolve oversight issues, which led to some improvements in areas such as financial management. However, one central element was the establishment of a Service Standards Agreement between Lilongwe and Lusaka that was never finalized.

In February 2009, DFAIT issued a new Inter-departmental Memorandum of Understanding on Operations and Support at Missions. Persons interviewed for this evaluation indicate that many of the changes made in the 2009 agreement were influenced by the lessons learned in Malawi (as well as other countries where DFAIT has provided “special” common services to missions abroad). One important clause in the 2009

---

<sup>14</sup> For example, between 2005 and 2007, the sole CBS reported that she spent from 60-80% of her time on DFAIT responsibilities.

agreement is the need for any unique operating arrangement or partner-specific program issues to be described in a partner-specific annex. Such a measure should go a long way in preventing a recurrence of the challenges noted above.

## 6.7 Principles of Aid Effectiveness

**Finding 17: CIDA’s development approach in Malawi has been generally congruent with the principles of aid effectiveness outlined in the Paris Declaration at the project level but less so at the program level.**

While the design of CIDA’s program in Malawi predated the principles of aid effectiveness outlined in the Paris Declaration (2005), there is evidence that the program has been managed in keeping with those principles at the project level, and to a lesser extent at the program level.

The majority of reviewed projects had highly satisfactory ratings in terms of ownership, alignment and harmonization. At the program level, there were some positive achievements, such as the CPDS design process, CIDA’s active role in donor coordination and harmonization, and so forth.

CIDA’s generally positive record has been negatively affected over the past three years due to the lack of timely official communication with the GoM and donors, who had not anticipated CIDA’s program decision. According to the Joint Donor Evaluation on Managing Aid Exit and Transformation “Good partners keep each other well informed of their respective intentions and plans.”

There was some dissonance between CIDA management approaches in Malawi and several of the principles of the Paris Declaration (particularly ownership, harmonization, and mutual accountability).

**Ownership:** During the CPDS design stage, CIDA conducted broad consultations with stakeholders in Malawi and sought GoM ownership during the design of individual projects. CIDA supported projects that focused on capacity development of GoM departments and entities (e.g., GSES II, COMWASH, HIV/AIDS support), supported SWAp and other pooled fund arrangements that could be led by the GoM, and encouraged the active involvement of Malawi government ministries in project oversight (e.g., the MoWCD). Several GoM stakeholders noted that CIDA’s plans were not always congruent with its practices (e.g., the use of external consultants and/or Canadian executing agencies rather than GoM resources). However, this reflects the practices common at the time of program design, which preceded these principles.

**Alignment:** The evidence suggests that the CPDS was aligned to the priorities identified by the GoM in its main development strategies. The CIDA Malawi Program and individual projects were designed on the basis of reviews of existing national strategies, priorities, and needs, using extensive consultations with GoM and other local and international stakeholders. Some projects were directly related to specific Malawi strategies for water and sanitation (COMWASH) and gender (GESp).

**Harmonization:** CIDA played an active role in donor coordination and harmonization in Malawi (e.g., HIV/AIDS SWAp and preparation for other possible SWAp) and in developing sector coordination groups. Other donors have recognized CIDA’s neutrality and consider it predictable and trustworthy. CIDA’s positive record in donor coordination and harmonization has been weakened in recent years by its limited financial commitments for SWAp. Interviewed stakeholders noted a disconnect between CIDA’s ability to generate good ideas and provide the resources required to put them into operation.

**Results:** All CIDA partners in Malawi acknowledge the Agency’s focus on results, and credited it for having supported RBM capacity building among its partners (e.g., through GESp, within the DAGG). However, CIDA has been more effective at utilizing these approaches at the project level, rather than sector, thematic or program levels. Additional details are found in Section 6.9.4.

**Mutual Accountability:** At the project level, CIDA shared project reports and evaluations with the relevant ministries and other key stakeholders. At the program level, CIDA reported regularly to the GoM

on financial expenditures but not on developmental results at the program, sector, or thematic levels on a formal, regular basis. CIDA’s limited investments in Malawi after 2006 combined with its limited consultations and communications to determine the future of the program in Malawi raised concerns among its partners about its future assistance plans. Lessons from other donors highlight the importance of open dialogue and a respectful process that recognizes mutual accountabilities. Following the recent decision on geographic focus, the Malawi Program has been having discussions with the GoM regarding programming plans.

## 6.8 Cross-cutting Issues

This section examines how effectively the Malawi program has integrated CIDA’s cross-cutting themes of gender equality and environment, as well the cross-cutting themes of HIV/AIDS and governance (that were established as priorities in the CPDS) into program management practices in Malawi over the decade.

### **Finding 18: At the project level, CIDA management paid most attention to gender equality; other cross-cutting issues received mixed levels of attention.**

In individual projects and initiatives, CIDA made efforts to address the four cross-cutting issues identified in the CPDS: environment, governance, gender, and HIV/AIDS.

The extent to which these were addressed at the project level has varied

**Gender** – Consulted stakeholders commended CIDA for its attention and commitment to gender mainstreaming, and there is evidence that CIDA-supported projects made significant efforts in this area.

In most projects reviewed, gender was addressed in planning (in defining results, and some projects defined gender-related indicators, strategies/activities, and/or allocated resources to address gender concerns) and in project monitoring and reporting. Key challenges in gender mainstreaming, as reported by consulted staff and stakeholders, include: i) mixed levels of partner capacities, awareness, and commitment to gender equality; some ambiguities regarding the role and authority of CIDA’s gender expert vis-à-vis individual projects; and the limited financial and other support required to operationalize the gender strategy.

**HIV/AIDS** – There is evidence that HIV/AIDS was mainstreamed in some projects, particularly in the education and gender sectors (e.g., GESP project selection criteria included integration of HIV/AIDS; GSES II paid specific attention to how HIV/AIDS was addressed in the Life Skills materials; SSTEP supported the creation of a gender and HIV committee at Domasi College and modules were introduced on gender equality and HIV/AIDS in education curricula). However, these efforts were isolated, and did not take place within an overarching framework for HIV/AIDS mainstreaming and there was no program-level tracking or reporting of progress or results.

**Environment** – When the Malawi CPDS was developed, CIDA ensured that all projects would be subject to an environmental assessment. Since then, more priority has been given to promoting sustainable environmental management and behaviours. The CIDA PSU water sector specialist in Malawi was responsible for assessing all new projects according to the standards of the Canadian Environmental

**Gender Mainstreaming in Malawi Projects**

**SSTEP** – planned for 35% of participants to be women and facilitated their participation; established a gender committee at Domasi College and supported gender sensitization classes

**HIV/AIDS Program Support** – integrated a gender approach in the project MOU and Contribution Agreement; CIDA’s PSU Gender Specialist assisted in integrating gender into annual work plans

**COMWASH** – Aimed for 50% women in scheme committees and training; monitored the number of women participants; trained facilitators to engage villages in identifying gender issues

**PEG** – Formulated a gender strategy to guide project activities; work plans and reports paid attention to gender issues

Assessment Act (CEAA). This mainly concerned COMWASH and Canada Fund projects; other CIDA initiatives in Malawi were “soft” initiatives that were not seen to have a considerable physical impact on the environment. To our knowledge none of the reviewed CIDA projects in Malawi has gone beyond compliance with the CEAA principles (e.g., by initiating proactive measures related to environmental management).

**Governance** – The CPDS planned to complement basic needs programming (at least 80% of resources) with 10% of resources to be spent on responsive mechanisms to improve governance in programming sectors. In all priority sectors CIDA has worked with the respective GoM ministries, usually supporting policy development and/or assisting with capacity building (e.g., COMWASH worked with the Ministry of Water, GESP with the Ministry of Women, SSTEP and GSES with the MoEST, and the HIV/AIDS with NAC). However, none of the reviewed projects (other than those explicitly focused on governance issues) developed governance-related indicators, results, or reporting.

**Finding 19: The CIDA Malawi Program did not establish specific objectives or strategies or allocate resources and responsibilities to systematically address cross-cutting issues at the program level. This makes it difficult to track and assess the program’s overall effectiveness in mainstreaming these issues.**

With the notable exception of gender, the CPDS made no specific mention of program-level strategies and CIDA did not establish frameworks, guidelines, or tools to support the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues at the sector and/or program level. Resources for addressing cross-cutting issues at the program level were quite limited and ad hoc.

**Gender** – The CPDS for Malawi had a strong gender focus and an articulated gender strategy, but this was not accompanied by defined results/expectations or indicators, and the program did not develop a framework to operationalize the strategy. An additional challenge was the absence of clear leadership and accountability for gender mainstreaming (as for other cross-cutting issues). The Malawi program’s focus on health and education was based on the (implicit) belief that these sectors had direct implications for women and girls. The program’s strong gender focus reflected the beliefs and values of the program manager at the time, a gender expert participated in program design and initial roll out, and all CIDA and PSU staff in Malawi received annual training in gender and HIV. CIDA employed a gender-sector specialist in the PSU who provided advice and technical information on gender to CIDA project teams and the DAGG only.

**HIV/AIDS** – The Malawi Program treated HIV/AIDS as a programming sector and never defined an explicit strategy to address this as a cross-cutting issue across investments. A PSU specialist was responsible for both gender and HIV from 2000 to 2004, but no one assumed responsibility for HIV/AIDS after her departure. CIDA staff frequently called upon the Malawi-based Program Advisor for the HIV/AIDS project to provide advice on HIV/AIDS-related issues, but his role did not include responsibility for mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in the Malawi Country Program.

**Governance** – The CIDA Malawi Program never defined a program-wide strategy for mainstreaming governance across individual investments, nor did it allocate dedicated resources (such as a governance-sector specialist) to mainstream governance in its programming. There are no established tools or practices to track or report on governance results across the program, and accountability for mainstreaming governance in the program is not defined.

**Environment** – In the CPDS, environment was mentioned as a cross-cutting issue in a short sidebar. Former CIDA staff members were surprised to hear that environment was a cross-cutting program issue; given the program’s focus on social development, environment was not an obvious concern.

## 6.9 Program Management, Structure, and Monitoring and Evaluation

### 6.9.1 Overview

This section examines how the CIDA Malawi program was managed. It considers the strategy used to manage the program, how the program was structured, how results were tracked and how risks were managed.

### 6.9.2 Strategic Management

Strategy typically considers how the overall vision, objectives, and program direction align with the internal and external context and resource allocations. In the case of Malawi, the 1998 CPDS outlined the strategic program directions for the period 1998-2008.

**Finding 20: To launch a country program in Malawi in 1997-1998, CIDA crafted a focused, distinct, innovative, and bold development strategy that was carefully designed to maximize the impact of Canada’s relatively modest resources.**

In September 1997, following a decision to shift from regional to country-specific support to Malawi, CIDA initiated a process to develop a country program development strategy (CPDS) to guide its bilateral programming investments in Malawi. It identified two clear priorities (health and education) which were congruent with the Malawi Vision 2020, four cross-cutting priorities (gender, governance, HIV/AIDS, and environment) and promised a 10-year commitment to Malawi. For a donor that was re-entering Malawi, this strategy was rather bold, innovative, and risk-taking.

#### CPDS Priorities and Principles

Concentrate at least 80% of investments in basic education and basic health

Maximize impact within sectors by synergistic programming, including concentration on governance issues within sectors of focus

Focus on increasing women’s capacities and decision-making roles

Complement basic human needs programming with responsive mechanisms to improve governance in sectors of programming concentration and that contribute to an improved investment climate (10%) and for other emerging opportunities (10%)

The CPDS also defined a list of project selection criteria that CIDA would use to maximize the use of its limited financial resources. These included identifying opportunities for leverage and synergy with other projects and donors, and close donor coordination/cooperation. It also highlighted the need to go beyond projects and support policy dialogue in Malawi. These strategies resulted in positive impacts for several Malawian organizations that benefited from leveraged Canadian resources, and for Canada’s reputation in Malawi, particularly among donors.

**Finding 21: The 1998 CPDS guided CIDA’s bilateral investment decisions in Malawi up to 2004. Since 2004, it has had less influence over the program’s investment decisions and directions, particularly since there were limited resources for new programming.**

Like most CIDA country program strategies, the Malawi strategy focused only on bilateral investments. Between 1998 and 2004, the CPDS clearly guided CIDA investment decision-making in Malawi. The CPE team found that the majority of CIDA’s bilateral investments over the period were congruent with CPDS priorities and principles. Those managing the program paid considerable attention to the cross cutting priorities and project selection criteria identified in the CPDS.

- Deliberate efforts were made to ensure that cross-cutting priorities (in particular gender) were well integrated in each project design (e.g., gender in COMWASH and PEG) and/or efforts were made to encourage project staff involved in one project to interact with those involved in other projects (e.g., GAP, PEG, and GESP as well as GESP and COMWASH).
- Canada played an active role in donor and GoM coordination in several areas including gender, education, HIV/AIDS, and water, and involved sector specialists when appropriate. CIDA also played a leading role in governance; the creation of the media group and the Parliamentary Task Force are examples. PEG was the Secretariat for the Parliamentary Task Force until 2008.
- Canada was successful in generating support for its initiatives from other donors.

Thus, there is considerable evidence that the CPDS informed CIDA's bilateral decision-making in Malawi until 2004. However, since 2004, the CPDS has had limited influence on CIDA's investments and actions in Malawi. This is due to a variety of factors inside and outside the CIDA Malawi Program.

- In 2004, a number of changes occurred in the Malawi Program context including turnover of several individuals who had played key roles in both defining and managing the program until then. In addition, CIDA experienced considerable challenges with the introduction and staffing of old and new program positions in Canada and Malawi after 2004. During this period, CIDA staff focused their energies on managing existing investments and responding to internal challenges and crises. After 2004, the bilateral program made relatively few new investments in Malawi. Thus, there was limited need to use the CPDS.
- A mid-term review of the Malawi Country Program in 2004<sup>15</sup> flagged the need for some refinements to the CPDS but these were never addressed due to the program context identified above, which created some questions about the continued relevance of the CPDS. Between 2006 and 2008, the uncertain status of the program further diminished the relevance of the CPDS. There was little clarity on priorities (explicit or implicit), which limited the scope of program managers to make decisions including about new program investments.

In conclusion, the CPDS has not been used as a guiding instrument by CIDA for the Malawi Program since 2004, nor has it been used to measure the program's performance

**Finding 22: The Malawi Country Program LFA has had limited utility as a basis for capturing and measuring the program's expected performance beyond the project level.**

The Malawi program LFA (1999) was intended to provide the basis for guiding its investments and reporting its progress over the next decade but was of limited utility for measuring program performance:

- While the program had clearly defined sector priorities (health and education) and cross-cutting priorities, the expected program outcomes in the LFA are defined more broadly and are difficult to measure (e.g., increased women's capacities and their decision-making role).
- In some cases, there is a one-to-one alignment between program outcomes and the outcomes of individual project investments. While this helped to ensure that project investments were tied to overall program outcomes, it was less effective in capturing intended sector-level outcomes that went beyond any one project.
- The LFA sometimes includes multiple outcomes for one sector (e.g., three of the seven identified outcomes were related to education).

---

<sup>15</sup> "Mid-Term Country Program Review of the CIDA Malawi Program, 1999-2009". Michael Miner for CIDA (November 2004)

The LFA outcomes did not provide the best basis for guiding or measuring the success of the program at the sector or thematic levels or overall. The 2004 mid-term evaluation noted various limitations with the LFA, and recommended a number of revisions. This led to a revised draft LFA that was never approved or used, largely as a consequence of program upheaval after 2004.

**Sector and thematic levels** – The Malawi Program lacked sector- and thematic-level monitoring and reporting systems and information that could be used to assess its effectiveness at such levels. However, this information was never required by CIDA, so the limitation lies with the system itself, rather than with those managing the Malawi Program.

While the Malawi Program defined several sector and cross-cutting thematic priorities in the CPDS, the distinction among sectors and themes varied considerably over time. Similarly, the frameworks, strategies, and processes it used to monitor progress at these levels were fragmented and less systematically defined. For example:

- The program lacked defined strategies to guide and monitor sector and thematic priorities, although the CPDS did include a section entitled “gender strategy.”
- Initially, the program formally identified education and health as its two key sectors. While these foci were never formally modified, education, governance, HIV/AIDS, water, and gender equality evolved as the “de facto” foci for program staff. Moreover, the sector ‘home’ for projects was not always commonly shared or understood (e.g., some viewed GESP as a governance project while others saw it as a gender project).
- The program engaged technical specialists in the PSU for some priority areas (gender, education, and water<sup>16</sup>) but not others (governance, HIV/AIDS). The implicit and explicit roles and responsibilities of technical specialists in the PSU varied considerably in terms of monitoring at sector or thematic levels.
- External monitors reported on projects rather than sectors.

**Country program level** – There are no established results-tracking systems in place in CIDA that require country program managers to track and report on the developmental and operational performance of programs on a regular periodic basis.<sup>17</sup> While CIDA program managers prepare annual reports that are consolidated into CIDA’s Annual Report to Parliament, the report format is generic and Agency-wide and is not intended to report on a country program’s planned/actual performance. Interviewed country managers and directors indicate that they kept track of the Malawi Program’s performance through informal means including periodic discussions with staff. While such measures are essential for day-to-day program management, they are less helpful in tracking and documenting program performance and lessons learned.

### 2004 Mid-Term Review

**Objectives:** to review results achievement and sustainability of results in the context of the CPDS and the program LFA, the relevance of the program and its effectiveness in leveraging resources, an analysis of the complementarity of CIDA assistance with that of other donors, and the quality of CIDA partnerships with program stakeholders.

**Conclusions:** The review concluded that a combination of astute management and a well-integrated program focused in four sectors resulted in a well-positioned and well-regarded CIDA program in Malawi. It recommended that the program should be maintained in its present form and identified nine areas for improvement.

---

<sup>16</sup> The water specialist also advised the program on environmental matters as required.

<sup>17</sup> This is distinct from other corporate reviews such as CPE and program audits that are commissioned by others.



At the program level, CIDA commissioned two external program evaluations of the CPDS over the past decade: the Mid-Term Evaluation in 2003/04 and this evaluation in 2008/09. An analysis of the recommendations of the 2004 mid-term review (see Appendix VIII) indicates that seven of the nine recommendations were partially, mostly, or fully addressed. The recommendation to create a new position in the Malawi program was not addressed, largely due to the uncertain status of the program. The recommendation that the program establish and maintain an appropriate program LFA so that *the consultant who conducts the review at the end of Year nine of this ten-year CPDS will be able to establish whether the Malawi Country Program has achieved all its planned outputs and several of its outcomes* was marginally addressed: the LFA was updated but was never formally approved.

### 6.9.3 Program Management Structure and Leadership

Programs, like organizations, require structures to transform investments (human, financial, or other) into plans and actions. Management structures for programs are typically designed with three objectives in mind: to clarify key roles and responsibilities; to clarify reporting, oversight, authority, and accountability relationships; and to clarify communication and coordination responsibilities for the key units or actors responsible for managing the program. Effective program management also requires leadership and guidance – be it through individuals or teams/units.

Over the past decade, the program management structure for the CIDA Malawi Country Program spanned five countries (Malawi, Canada, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and most recently, Mozambique) and multiple management units, and its leadership has changed hands numerous times. Prior to 1998, CIDA's support to Malawi was managed out of CIDA Headquarters with field representatives in Zambia (1964-1991) and in Zimbabwe (1991-1998).

**Finding 23: The CIDA Malawi Program's somewhat atypical management structure allowed the program to become operational quickly. However, the approach was not sustainable and created some lasting management difficulties and risks.**

**Program management 1998-2004** – A program manager at the CIDA Malawi Desk managed the program, supported by the PSU and the PSU Director (a CIDA officer with significant diplomatic experience who acted as the de facto Head of Cooperation). Staff employed by the PSU had dual reporting relationships to the country program manager in Canada and to the local PSU director.

The country program team was small and easy to manage and, individuals interviewed for this study report that the streamlined management structure worked and had several positive effects on the CIDA Malawi Program: it became operational very quickly, and within two years, six large bilateral projects were up and running; it was flexible and responded quickly to new opportunities.

However, the program's management structure in this period was not typical of CIDA practice at the time, particularly in regard to roles, reporting, and accountability. In practice, PSU advisors assumed different roles over time due to their skills/abilities and experience. During this period, some established CIDA practices related to contracting and delegated authorities were not followed.

**Program management 2004-2006** – In 2004, Canada established an Office of the Canadian High Commission in Malawi, a Head of Cooperation (HoC) was appointed, and CIDA initiated several changes to the Malawi Country Program structure and engaged new individuals in Malawi. The culture that had made the atypical structure work was gone, and the implications, difficulties, and risks resulting from the ambiguities in the roles and responsibilities, accountabilities, and reporting relationships among the Desk, Post, PSU, and others became quite apparent. In 2005, CIDA commissioned an internal review to identify needed changes and most of the recommendations were subsequently addressed. During this period, there was also a high turnover of several individuals in leadership positions in Canada and Malawi.

**Program management 2006-present** – The Canadian High Commissioner to Malawi (resident in Zambia) departed in June 2007 and the HoC in Malawi was invited to serve as Acting High Commissioner in August 2007. The office of the CHC in Malawi had two Canadian and two local staff and the Malawi Program was supported by the PSU. This situation had lasting effects on the management of the CIDA Malawi Program. Those interviewed for the evaluation say that there are continued ambiguities about the role and authority of the PSU, the role of PSU sector specialists, and the role of project team leaders (PTLs) in the implementation of projects managed locally in Malawi (which poses some potential risks due to the possible perception of conflict of interest).

On 31 August 2009, the office of the CHC in Malawi was permanently closed and the GoC decided to relocate responsibility for the Malawi Program to Mozambique. A modest in-country PSU will remain in Malawi while a CIDA officer stationed in Mozambique will conduct monitoring visits to Malawi. This “hub and spoke” approach will maintain required accountability for Canada’s investments in Malawi.

**Finding 24: A vacuum in CIDA leadership in 2004/05 negatively affected the overall performance of CIDA’s Malawi Program. This situation may be an anomaly, or it may be indicative of problems faced by other small and less-visible CIDA country programs.**

Due to the management challenges described above, the high turnover, and the long delays in filling some positions, there was a leadership vacuum in the Malawi program and attention was focused on the practical needs of getting things done as opposed to more strategic considerations. The situation required some senior-level analysis and diagnosis as well as strong leadership and decisive actions – none of which was forthcoming. This had immediate and long-term negative effects on program performance including its effectiveness and efficiency.

This situation in Malawi may be an anomaly, or it may be indicative of problems faced by other small and less-visible CIDA country programs. CIDA should be vigilant to avoid similar situations in the future.

### **6.9.4 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Risk Management**

**Finding 25: CIDA’s RBM and risk management principles have been widely respected at the project level, but less so at the program and sector levels.**

**Project level** – The Malawi Program invested considerable time and money in project-level reporting, monitoring, and evaluation over the past decade. All projects have dedicated significant attention to RBM and risk management – they have applied RBM principles and tools, and have put in place appropriate project management systems and resources and risk identification and mitigation processes..

All reviewed projects earned highly satisfactory ratings of their RBM and M&E practices. All projects were required to submit regular financial and narrative reports; most bilateral projects had assigned external project monitors; the majority of bilateral projects were subjected to mid-term or final evaluations; and Annual Project Performance Reports (APPRs) or their equivalents were prepared for bilateral projects. Consulted stakeholders indicate that monitoring reports, operational reviews, and evaluations have been used to address implementation challenges and steer selected projects in new directions (e.g., GAP) or to define new project phases to address important gaps (e.g. building sustainable capacities in the Ministry of Education for textbook procurement). An unintended but positive benefit was that the use of external monitors (who typically served long terms) provided continuity and corporate memory during times of staff turnover. Moreover at least one project (GESp) also developed their partners’ capacities in RBM.

**Risk management** – CIDA had various mechanisms in place, including the use of external monitors, to identify risks at the project level. At the program level, however, its risk management had several deficiencies in planning, reporting, and accountability. The program’s LFA did not identify assumptions and potential risks in relation to the Canadian government, CIDA, or the Malawi program – all of which posed risks and ultimately had implications for the program. Most of the reviewed Program Performance Reports for Malawi did not include risks and assumptions (see sidebar for one notable exception) and it was not clear who was managing risks within the program, particularly in 2004/05. Due to turnover and gaps in leadership and accountability, checks and balances were not in place or were not used.

**Risk Analysis – Education Sector**

In the education sector, a joint process was undertaken in which all major donors involved in primary and basic education participated. Canada’s responsibility was for the production of the *Malawi Education Sector Integrated Risk Assessment*, May 2007. This identified the risks, prerequisites, recommendations and the next steps in a variety of areas.

## 6.10 Program Implementation and Delivery Mechanisms

CIDA implemented and delivered the Malawi Program over the past decade using a variety of investment types, management mechanisms, delivery channels, and oversight mechanisms. While important experiences have been gained, the CPE review sample was too small to permit the evaluation team to make general conclusive statements about the strengths and weaknesses of the various delivery methods. CIDA has been involved in only one functional PBA in Malawi to date, and the evaluation sample included only one project implemented by a Canadian Facilitation Agency. The analysis of delivery models provided in Appendix IX summarizes information from consultations with stakeholders, document review, and our perceptions of the particular strengths and weaknesses of the delivery models.

**Finding 26: The Malawi government’s limited experience with program-based approaches, combined with CIDA’s limited financial resources for new programming after 2006 warranted CIDA’s use of a mix of program implementation and delivery mechanisms in Malawi.**

The investment in the HIV/AIDS SWAp was the lone PBA in Malawi. Although donors and developing countries are paying increased attention to program-based approaches, which are in keeping with the principles of the Paris Declaration, the evaluation found that the Malawi program’s mix of approaches was very appropriate in the Malawi context during the period.

**PBAs** – Given Malawi’s considerable human resource and organizational capacity constraints in 1998, it had limited capacity to enter into PBA-like arrangements. CIDA was instrumental in supporting one of the first successful PBA mechanisms in Malawi, the HIV/AIDs pooled fund. (In 2008, a mid-term review of the only other SWAp in Malawi, the Health SWAp, raised some concerns about the GOM’s ability to honour its financial commitments and about the Ministry of Health’s ability to negotiate with donors.<sup>18</sup>) Although CIDA had limited resources to entertain new investments in SWAps after 2004, it helped lay the groundwork for two new SWAps in education and water in Malawi.

**Mix of approaches** – Most consulted stakeholders expressed the continued need for a mix of different delivery and funding mechanisms to provide complementary types of assistance and to spread investment risks in Malawi. When PBAs are not possible, donors can still have positive influence in a sector through individual projects, and a mix of short-term and long-term funding mechanisms can help donors respond to the absorptive capacities of partners.

---

<sup>18</sup> Malawi Health SWAp Mid Term Review Summary Report, NORAD, January 2008

## 7. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Corporate Considerations and Recommendation

### 7.1 Conclusions

The findings of this evaluation need to be understood within the context of the Malawi Program's evolution over the past decade. Between 1998 and 2004, the program went through a “**golden period**” characterized by the excitement associated with the establishment, growth, and development of a new program. The period was marked by a focused Country Program Development Strategy, high program capacity to absorb and access financial resources for programming, strong Canadian leadership, close collaboration with development partners in Malawi, staff continuity, as well as a very positive Canadian profile and reputation.

The next phase (2004 and 2005) was one of **transition and transformation**. It encompassed changes in the structure of Canada's presence in Malawi (with the opening of a Canadian High Commission), high turnover of several individuals in leadership positions in Canada and Malawi, increased formalization of program policies and procedures, limited growth in programming, as well as staff morale concerns and turnover.

The final phase (2006-09) was distinguished by **uncertainty regarding the future** of Canada's program in Malawi. Faced with a shrinking bilateral program portfolio, the program staff managed existing investments and devoted significant time to generate information to inform the program's future. Canada's positive reputation and high profile diminished with the GoM and among its development peers in Malawi. At the time of writing, the Malawi Program is going through a major transition and the latest indications are that CIDA will continue to provide bilateral support to the health and education sectors.

### CIDA's Program Performance in Malawi

The Malawi Country Program has performed well in terms of results and the relevance of its financial investments and technical expertise in health, education, governance, and gender equality. It was very successful in leveraging resources of other donors to support Malawi's development priorities. It gained considerable respect from the Malawi government and other donors and partners for its leadership in gender equality and HIV/AIDS and for its role in encouraging and supporting donor coordination.

Over the period, CIDA was a consistent and strong advocate for increased donor harmonization, effectiveness, and accountability and was respected by the GoM for its expertise and capacity to work effectively and mediate solutions between stakeholders. CIDA was an early proponent of PBAs in Malawi, and has provided funding and technical advice in the development of PBAs in HIV/AIDS, education, and water and sanitation. It has led thematic coordination groups on water, HIV/AIDS, gender equality, and education, and has engaged in significant policy dialogue.

The main shortcomings of CIDA's Malawi Program relate to the lack of program-level and sector strategies to plan, manage, monitor and report on its performance and manage risks and the sustainability of some project results.

### Future Directions

As a program in a country of modest presence, the future Malawi program will likely have a smaller budget and a smaller infrastructure in Canada and abroad. It may want to consider whether some established practices for countries of focus (such as the development of a detailed CPDS) are still necessary. It will be important for managers to identify efficient ways to manage the transition from a core program to one of modest presence.

## 7.2 Lessons Learned

The key lessons learned are summarized below.

### Concerning country program design and management:

- To be effectively managed, programs require deliberate strategies, accountabilities, mechanisms, and resources for planning, monitoring, and reporting at both program and sector levels.

### Concerning managing for sustainable results:

- The sustainability of project results is more likely when sustainability is addressed at the project design stage and considered throughout implementation, not in the last year(s) of a project.
- Project managers are more likely to pay continued attention to sustainability of results if this is identified and managed as a priority in project and program management practices.

### Concerning program transition:

- Early warning and clear communication with key stakeholders are necessary ingredients in respecting good partnership principles and fostering a smooth transition when there is a major change in program status.

### Concerning CPE design and management:

- A CPE can assess only those dimensions and concepts in a meaningful way that have actually been relevant for and have been used by (or could have been used by) the respective program (e.g., the concepts of program coherence and efficiency).
- Carrying out several CPEs at the same time can create opportunities for synergy, as it is likely that all evaluations will be struggling with similar issues. Opportunities for synergy can be lost however if: i) scheduling does not allow time for systematic exchange between evaluation teams, and ii) commonalities between different CPEs are merely assumed in prescriptive methodological guidelines, but are not backed up by empirical evidence or actual experiences gained during the evaluation process.
- A CPE is most valuable when conducted at a point in time where the findings and recommendations can actually be used to inform planning and decision-making regarding the program's future.

## 7.3 Corporate Considerations

The overall good achievements of the Malawi Program notwithstanding, the evaluation identified areas where improvements can be made to enhance this performance. Some of these pertain to broader Agency-level improvements, such as the issue of whole-of-Agency approach, the strengthening of performance management processes and the guidance on managing country program transitions. Considering that the Agency has taken decisions on these aspects, and actions are underway to address them, they will not be the subject of specific recommendations. Actions being taken by the Agency includes:

- As indicated in CIDA's Management Response to the Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG), the Agency has agreed on the need for better whole-of-Agency alignment and coherence through the different channels and established a new CDPF process through which that can be addressed. Regarding implementation and monitoring, discussions are underway to determine the most effective and efficient approach.
- Also, as indicated in CIDA's Management Response to the Office of the OAG, the Agency has taken steps to strengthen its performance management process: The Country Development Programming Framework (CDPF) requirements for countries of modest presence would be

lighter than for countries of focus, and the CDPF guidelines have been modified to reflect this. The CDPFs also lay the ground for better managing a program for results. Expected results, indicators and targets related to priority sectors mapped to CIDA's thematic priorities are identified in CDPFs and are monitored and reported on as part of the program performance management process.

- CIDA's Aid Effectiveness Action Plan consolidates the Government priorities of focus, efficiency and accountability with our international commitments on aid effectiveness under the Paris Declaration (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008). Each program develops specific targets and actions that are reflected in C/RDPFs and Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs). Discussions are underway to provide further guidance on managing country program transitions.

### **7.4 Recommendation**

Given uncertainties about the status of CIDA's future program in Malawi at the time of the evaluation, the TORs for the Malawi CPE excluded an analysis of CIDA future programming directions in the country. For this reason, the Evaluation Team does not provide any recommendations to the Malawi Program related to its future strategic direction.

One recommendation is addressed to the program on management issues. – The Malawi Program remains in transition from a core program to one of modest presence. It is generally expected that the program budget will be much smaller than before, with a smaller program infrastructure in Canada and abroad.

Recommendation 1 : The managers of the CIDA Malawi Program should identify efficient ways to deliver this modest presence country program.

## Appendix I LFA (1999)

Narrative Summary	Expected Results		Assumptions/Risk indicators
<p><b>Program Goal:</b> To help Malawi to reduce poverty and to better provide for the basic human needs of its people by leveraging resources to enhance its ability to respond to new global challenges</p>	<p>Impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Reduced poverty and more balanced distribution of wealth in areas of GOM-CIDA cooperative initiatives</li> <li>(2) More simplified and transparent political, business and investment environment</li> <li>(3) Significantly more women as decision-makers in, and beneficiaries of political and economic society</li> </ul> <p>Improved health care, particularly for women and girls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(4) Equitable access and equality of opportunity for boys and girls to quality education</li> <li>(5) Stronger capacity to balance environmental protection and economic growth</li> </ul>	<p>Performance Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Statistical indicators of poverty, wealth and income distribution</li> <li>(2) Stability and openness of political and investment environment</li> <li>(3) Number of women in positions of influence and actively participating in society and government</li> <li>(4) Health, population statistics, demographic data, hygienic conditions, quality, availability of safe water</li> <li>(5) Education statistics, tracer studies, economic indicators (disaggregated)</li> <li>(6) Economic and environmental indicators, statistics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political environment remains open to further strengthening of key democratic institutions</li> <li>• Economic performance, growth remain positive; - GOM remains committed to poverty alleviation</li> <li>• GOM and CIDA priorities and commitment to economic and social development continue to be complimentary</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Democratic foundation is fragile and business environment is not predictable</li> <li>• Barriers to women's participation and progress are not easily overcome</li> <li>• HIV/AIDS will seriously impact on economic productivity and GOM social programs</li> </ul>
<p><b>Program Purpose:</b> To assist Malawi to create a healthy, educated and productive human resource base</p>	<p><b>Outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Effective policies, mechanisms and systems for sustaining governance, social and economic reforms and addressing poverty</li> <li>(2) Increased women's capacities and their decision-making roles</li> <li>(3) Increased access to quality family planning, reproductive health and safe motherhood and to STD treatment</li> </ul>	<p><b>Performance Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Productivity, living standards, economic indicators, confidence of citizens, investors in democratic process</li> <li>(2) Change in number, levels of women in decision-making positions and degree of active participation in national and community activities</li> <li>(3) Health statistics, mortality, conception, fertility rates, STD statistics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GOM remains open to gender equality and implementation of equality initiatives</li> <li>• Developmental efforts of international agencies will be carried out in partnership with GOM</li> <li>• CIDA's initiatives with GOM will be integrated into GOM structure and procedures</li> <li>• Working with communities and districts will promote, contribute to sustainability of results</li> </ul>

Narrative Summary	Expected Results		Assumptions/Risk indicators
<p><b>Program Purpose:</b> (cont'd)</p>	<p>(4) Improved health and hygienic conditions resulting from expanded safe water supplies within an overall development strategy (5) Growth of community schools providing equal opportunity and increased participation of communities in the education process (6) Improved quality of teaching and teaching/learning environment in CDSSs (7) Improved MOE capabilities to supply quality gender sensitive teaching/learning materials to schools</p>	<p>(4) Health statistics for areas where safe water supplies were installed; dev't plan progress (5) Quality, quantity, appropriate location of community schools, equality, breadth and gender balance of community participation (6, 7) Feedback from students, educators, results on exams, monitoring of schools, assessment of quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CIDA and Malawi CP priority sectors continue to be health, education, water, good governance</li> </ul> <p><b>Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management, technical capacity and resources are limited</li> <li>• Prevalence of HIV/AIDS will seriously affect the ability of Malawi organizations, personnel to fully participate and sustain results achieved</li> </ul>
<p><b>Resources:</b> Management and administrative services PSU services Malawi CP IPF : \$48.5 million for the period 99/00 to 2002/2003 Contribution of GOM and its Ministries and agencies Malawi's inputs, staff involvement as partners</p>	<p><b>Outputs:</b> Projects/initiatives to meet targets of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of resources dedicated to creation of a healthy, educated and productive HR base</li> <li>• 10% of resources to improved investment climate - 10% of resources to emerging opportunities</li> <li>• Measurable progress and results achieved from projects and initiatives according to annual work plans</li> </ul>	<p><b>Performance Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress towards obtaining percentage objectives carried out semi-annually</li> <li>• Quality and quantity of results obtained in each area - Amount of resources invested</li> <li>• Number of initiatives completed and measurement of results obtained</li> <li>• Number and % of new initiatives planned and/or undertaken</li> <li>• Relationship of initiatives to Malawi's and CIDA's priorities</li> <li>• Relationship of training completed to that planned - Quantity, quality of training results</li> <li>• Applicability of training to roles and responsibilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GOM has capacity to sustain the results of GOM-CIDA initiatives</li> <li>• Coordination agreements and mechanisms are in place to support Country Program Delivery Strategy</li> <li>• Planning and implementation have to consider the effect of limited resources and absorptive capacity of GOM</li> </ul>



## Appendix II Abbreviated Terms of Reference

### CIDA Malawi Country Program Evaluation – Abbreviated Terms of Reference

#### Introduction

In October 2008, CIDA contracted Universal Management Group to conduct an external evaluation of its Malawi country program. The evaluation will pursue three major objectives:

- 1) A summative review of the Malawi Program investments during the 1998-2008 period
- 2) An assessment of the performance of different investment types (i.e. different ‘delivery mechanisms’) including various projects, as well as the Canadian contribution to the Government of Malawi Program Based Approach (PBA) in HIV/AIDS.
- 3) An analysis of overarching findings and lessons.

The evaluation will cover the ten-year implementation period of the Country Program Development Strategy CPDS from 1998/99 to 2007/08 (see also sidebar).

The proposed approach to the evaluation has been developed during an evaluation design phase (September – December 2008) that included a Scoping Mission to

Malawi (November 10-14, 2008). During the design phase, a broad number of CIDA staff and development partners in Malawi were consulted to inform the evaluation methodology.

**CIDA’s 1998-2008 Country Program Development Strategy** (CPDS) outlines the agency’s overarching objectives for its support to Malawi over the period 1998-2008. According to the CPDS, the goal of CIDA assistance to Malawi was to help Malawi to reduce poverty and to better provide for the basic human needs of its people by leveraging resources to enhance its ability to respond to new global challenges. Over the last 10 years, CIDA’s bilateral program aimed to concentrate on assisting Malawi to develop its human resource base as one of the prerequisites for reducing poverty and attracting investment.

#### Methodology

Overall approach: The evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the principles, standards and practices set out in the CIDA Evaluation Guide (2004), the DAC guidelines for evaluations (1991), the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2007) and, to the extent possible, the Government of Malawi’s specified ‘code of conduct’. Stakeholder participation will be an integral component of planning; information collection; the development of findings; evaluation reporting; and results dissemination.

Investment Sample: Reviewing the performance of individual CIDA investments in Malawi will be an important source of information for the country program evaluation. Given that the evaluation timeframe and resources would not allow an in depth review of all of CIDA’s investments, the evaluation will focus on a carefully selected sample. 18 projects covering a spectrum of different sectors, delivery and management mechanisms were selected based on a set of criteria. These projects cover bilateral investments, as well as those of CIDA’s Canadian Partnership and Multilateral and Global Programs Branch.

Evaluation Framework: Based on the review of the evaluation TORs, project background documents, and consultations with CIDA and program stakeholders in Malawi and Canada, we have developed a draft evaluation framework. According to the evaluation purpose and objectives, it conceptualizes the assignment into the following dimensions:

i) *Context*, ii) *Relevance*, iii) *Effectiveness/Results*, iv) *Sustainability*, v) *Coherence*, vi) *Efficiency*, vii) *Management Principles*, viii) *Cross cutting issues* (gender equality, environment, HIV/AIDS and governance), ix) *Monitoring and Evaluation*, x) *Strengths and Weaknesses of different Delivery Mechanisms*, and xi) *Lessons learned and Recommendations*.

Universalia has developed a detailed evaluation matrix that elaborates key evaluation questions to be addressed under each of these areas at program and project levels, as well as indicators and data sources.

Data sources: The evaluation will use three main sources of data: People, Documents, and Observations during the evaluation field mission (March 9-20, 2009). Key data collection methods involving *people* (e.g. representatives of the Government of Malawi, of other donor organizations working in Malawi, of NGOs, as well as staff in CIDA HQ and Post in Malawi) will be: Individual interviews, small group interviews, Focus groups, and E-mail consultations.

Data Collection Tools: Semi structured interview protocols will be used to guide data collection through interviews. These protocols can be shared with the respective stakeholders in advance. Findings deriving from document review will be captured using project summary sheets structured along the same questions as outlined in the evaluation matrix.

Data Analysis will incorporate descriptive, content, and quantitative analysis approaches. In all these methods, reliability will be ensured through data triangulation (using convergence of multiple data sources), the use of standardized instruments and compliance with standard practices in evaluation.

Reporting: The evaluation team will share first impressions and observations with CIDA Malawi at the end of the field mission in an informal debrief. Within eight weeks of returning from the field mission, the evaluation team will submit a draft evaluation report for review by CIDA. Within two (2) weeks of receiving CIDA's comments on the draft report, the consultants will submit a final evaluation report including an abstract/executive summary. CIDA will share the evaluation findings with program stakeholders.

## Appendix III Abbreviated Program Evaluation Matrix and Project Rating Tool

### Program Level Matrix

The following table provides a summary of the key evaluation questions used to assess the performance of the Malawi Program. It is based on the approved detailed Evaluation Matrix found in Appendix II of the Technical Report.

Evaluation Dimension	Program Level Evaluation Questions
0. Context	<p>What have been key developments/changes in the program's external context (global, in Canada, in Africa, in Malawi)?</p> <p>What have been key developments/changes in the program's internal context?</p> <p>How have these changes affected program performance?</p>
1. Relevance	<p>Has the program been and remained relevant in relation to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government of Malawi (GoM) Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) and its predecessors?</li> <li>• Malawi national sector priorities and strategies?</li> <li>• CIDA's objectives and strategy in Malawi (CPDS)?</li> <li>• CIDA's corporate poverty reduction and sustainable development objectives?</li> <li>• The Millennium Development Goals?</li> </ul>
2. Effectiveness Results Achievement	<p>Does the overall Country Program have sufficiently clear objectives?</p> <p><b>Overall Progress</b></p> <p>What progress was made towards the achievement of expected results (at output, outcome, impact levels) as outlined in the program LFA and the CPDS?</p> <p>What were the main factors influencing the achievement or non achievement of results?</p> <p>Is there evidence of the program having contributed to poverty reduction in Malawi?</p> <p>What changes in key Malawian partner institutions has the program contributed to?</p> <p>What unintended results (positive or negative) has the Malawi program generated?</p>
3. Sustainability	<p>To what extent are program results sustainable and/or present a good potential for sustainability?</p> <p>Did/do the local institutions have the human and financial capacity to sustain and continue the progress/the results achieved in the key sectors addressed by the program?</p>
4. Coherence	<p>How effective has CIDA been in ensuring program coherence?</p> <p>What have been the key factors affecting program coherence?</p> <p>What processes were put in place at CIDA HQ and in Malawi to ensure the overall coherence of the program? How did the program manage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The internal coherence of the program (between individual projects/ between sectors)?</li> <li>• The complementarity of delivery channels (multilateral, bilateral, partnership)?</li> <li>• The complementarity with other donors?</li> <li>• Program coherence with Canadian objectives abroad.</li> </ul> <p>To what extent were potentials for synergies identified and used effectively? What, if any, opportunities for synergy were lost?</p> <p>To what extent have different investments aiming to support/strengthen the same Malawian institution (e.g. the NAC) been coherent?</p>

Evaluation Dimension	Program Level Evaluation Questions
5. Efficiency	<p>At the program level, have existing human, technical and financial resources been used efficiently?</p> <p>How do the administrative costs of the Malawi program compare with those of other similar CIDA programs?</p> <p>To what extent has the program taken measures to enhance overall program efficiency (e.g. in planning, managing, monitoring, evaluating program investments)</p> <p>How does CIDA efficiency compare with other 'benchmark' donors in Malawi?</p>
6. Management	<p><b>Overall use of management principles at the program level</b></p> <p>To what extent were CIDA management principles of local ownership, harmonization, alignment, result-based management and risks management applied at the program level?</p> <p>To what extent were program activities undertaken within the perspective of the Paris Declaration?</p> <p>To what extent were program management systems and resources appropriate, timely and effective in view of managing the program for results?</p> <p>What have been key challenges in view of program management? What have been strengths/supportive factors?</p> <p>How appropriate was the structure/design of the Malawi country program? Have the resources put into investment design been used effectively?</p>
7. Cross Cutting Issues	<p>How effectively has the Malawi program integrated CIDA's cross-cutting gender and environment themes?</p> <p>To what extent were gender and environment themes taken into account during/in view of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• preliminary analysis?</li> <li>• policy dialogue?</li> <li>• the implementation process ?</li> <li>• monitoring and evaluation of results achievement?</li> </ul> <p>To what extent have program level objectives in cross cutting areas as described in the CPDS been achieved?</p>
8. Result management / Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>What systems and procedures for monitoring, evaluation, and reporting at the program level were put into place? To what extent were they used? Were they appropriate and sufficient?</p> <p>To what extent did CIDA engage in joint monitoring activities with other donors? How effective and appropriate were these?</p> <p>To what extent where RBM principles applied effectively and in meaningful ways at the program level?</p> <p>To what extent were recommendations of the program mid-term review relevant, appropriate and to what extent have they been addressed?</p> <p>To what extent were the findings of project level monitoring and/or evaluations/reviews used to inform program management?</p> <p>What processes were put into place to identify and manage program risks?</p>
9. Strengths and Weaknesses of different Delivery Mechanisms	<p>What types of delivery mechanisms (funding and management mechanisms) has CIDA used in Malawi? (Including PBA)</p> <p>To what extent were delivery mechanisms selected based on a clear and appropriate rationale?</p> <p>What have been strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the different delivery mechanisms utilized?</p> <p>To what extent were adequate resources (human, financial, technical, other) in place to adequately select, set-up, manage, monitor and report on each delivery mechanism?</p>

Evaluation Dimension	Program Level Evaluation Questions
10. Lessons Learned and Future	<p><b>Lessons Learned</b></p> <p>What lessons can be learned with regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program design, management and reporting</li> <li>• The coherence of different CIDA investments at the country level</li> <li>• The strengths and weaknesses of different delivery mechanisms/ complementarity between delivery mechanisms</li> <li>• The key strengths and weaknesses of CIDA's program/overall engagement in Malawi</li> <li>• Leadership, influence and leverage of the Canadian cooperation in Malawi.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Future/Recommendations</b></p> <p>What changes to present strategies, priorities and practices are recommended?</p> <p>What are the main challenges that should be considered in future programming?</p> <p>How can the strengths and weaknesses of the current programming be used to improve the program's overall performance?</p> <p>How to better assess the impact of Canadian-assisted projects and programs in Malawi in the future?</p>

### Project Rating Tool

**Generic Project Rating Tool:** For the CPE exercise, CIDA developed a generic rating tool to help standardize the processes used to rate CIDA projects across CPE teams.

**Revisions to the Project Rating Tool:** During the preparation of CPE workplans, some CPE teams (including the Malawi team) proposed changes to the generic rating tool; these were aimed at clarifying or finessing the rating criteria proposed in the generic tool. Proposed changes were reviewed and approved by CIDA before they were used by the CPE team during the evaluation process. As a consequence, there is some variation in the criteria used across CPE teams. For the Malawi CPE, the main substantive changes are as follows:

- The number of criteria for most dimensions was increased from 3 to 4, to reflect missing elements (e.g. relevance to the work of other donors was added as an additional criterion to the relevance dimension).
- The effectiveness criteria were revised to focus on the realization of planned outputs and outcomes (rather than the effectiveness of a project in relation to poverty reduction, sector/thematic objectives and gender equality).
- Cost-effectiveness was excluded as a criterion for analyzing effectiveness as the required data to carry out such an assessment was not available.
- The sustainability criteria were revised to include evidence of measures taken by project proponents to address sustainability of results and evidence of stakeholder ownership of key results.
- The coherence criteria were revised to reduce potential overlap with the relevance criteria and to accentuate demonstrated actions taken to encourage synergies and complementarities among relevant projects within the portfolio.
- Criteria were developed for each of the four cross-cutting issues to increase the specificity of the guidance in the generic tool and to complement what was provided in that tool (e.g. to clarify criteria used for governance and HIV/AIDS).
- Criteria for the efficiency dimension were revised to increase the specificity of the guidance in the generic tool.

**Rating criterion:** Ratings for most dimensions (relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and cross-cutting issues) are based on four criteria. The exceptions are coherence, efficiency and CIDA management principles and RBM/Monitoring and Evaluation, which are based on three criteria.

**Rating scale:** Ratings for dimensions are based on either a four or five point scale ranging from **0 (very unsatisfactory) to 4 (highly satisfactory)** as indicated on the following page. In cases where the assessment dimension is not applicable, the review team gave the rating **NA= not applicable**. When the reviewers did not have sufficient information to make a judgment, the review team indicated **not rated=NR**.

**Application:** The rating tool was applied to the reviewed bilateral investments included in the evaluation sample (including the PSU projects). Available information on CPB and multilateral investments was not detailed enough to permit assessment.

### Rating Criteria

Dimension	Assessment Criteria	Rating	Rating Criteria
<b>1. Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevance in relation to Government of Malawi's (GoM) sectoral needs and priorities as expressed in documents such as the Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) and its predecessors, as well as in respective national sector priorities and strategies (if they exist).</li> <li>Relevance in relation to CIDA's objectives and country strategy in Malawi (CPDS)</li> <li>Relevance in relation to CIDA's corporate poverty reduction and sustainable development objectives</li> <li>Relevance in relation to the work of other donors (e.g. project sought complementarities, avoided duplication)</li> </ul>	4 Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If all four criteria apply</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If three criteria apply (must include relevance in view of GoM's needs and priorities)</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If two criteria apply (must include relevance in view of GoM's needs and priorities)</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If one criterion applies</li> </ul>
		0 Very unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If none applies</li> </ul>
<b>2. Effectiveness/ Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress towards envisaged outputs</li> <li>Progress towards envisaged outcomes.</li> <li>Exceeding expected results at output level</li> <li>Exceeding expected results at outcome level.</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has achieved or has exceeded most/all of its outputs and most or all of its outcomes.</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has achieved or has exceeded most/all of its outputs. There is considerable evidence of progress towards some outcomes.</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has achieved most/all of its outputs. There is moderate evidence of progress towards some outcomes.</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project has achieved some results at the output level. There is no evidence of progress towards outcome level results.</li> </ul>
		0 Very unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence of progress towards the projects envisaged results at output or outcome levels</li> </ul>
<b>3.Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of the project having deliberately worked towards ensuring sustainability of results. (E.g. existence of sustainability strategy, deliberate choice of strategies to foster sustainability, regular identification and</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If all four criteria apply</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If three criteria apply</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If two criteria apply</li> </ul>

Dimension	Assessment Criteria	Rating	Rating Criteria
	mitigation of risks to sustainability). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Malawian units/organizations/institutions express/demonstrate ownership of key results.</li> <li>• Individuals or teams in Malawian partner organizations/institutions have the required knowledge and skills to sustain and dynamically adapt results.</li> <li>• Malawian partner organizations/institutions have resources and adequate processes/practices/structures in place that support the potential sustainability of results.</li> </ul>	1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If one criterion applies</li> </ul>
		0 Very unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If none applies</li> </ul>
<b>4. Coherence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project design and/or workplanning documents make explicit reference to complementarities with other relevant CIDA investments in Malawi.</li> <li>• Evidence of relevant information exchange occurring on regular basis between this and other relevant CIDA investments in Malawi.</li> <li>• Evidence of project identifying and using opportunities for synergies with other relevant CIDA funded projects during its implementation.</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If all three criteria apply</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If two criteria apply</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If one criterion applies</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If none applies</li> </ul>
<b>5. Cross-cutting issues</b>			
<b>5.1 Gender</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender equality issues were satisfactorily addressed during preliminary analysis conducted in preparation of the project.</li> <li>• Gender equality issues were satisfactorily addressed when engaging in policy dialogue with Malawian partners.</li> <li>• Gender equality issues were satisfactorily addressed during the project implementation process.</li> <li>• Gender equality issues were satisfactorily addressed in the monitoring and evaluation of project results achievement.</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender equality issues have been satisfactorily addressed during all project phases AND there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for gender equality on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender equality issues have been satisfactorily addressed during <i>all</i> project phases (project planning/preparation, implementation, monitoring and reporting/evaluation OR there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for gender equality on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender equality issues have been satisfactorily addressed in some of the project phases.</li> </ul>



Dimension	Assessment Criteria	Rating	Rating Criteria
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender equality issues have been satisfactorily addressed in one project phase only (e.g. during planning, but not during implementation).</li> </ul>
		0 Very unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence of gender equality issues having been satisfactorily addressed at any stage of the project.</li> </ul>
<b>5.2 Environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment issues were satisfactorily addressed during preliminary analysis conducted in preparation of the project.</li> <li>Environment issues were satisfactorily addressed when engaging in policy dialogue with Malawian partners.</li> <li>Environment issues were satisfactorily addressed during the project implementation process.</li> <li>Environment issues were satisfactorily addressed in the monitoring and evaluation of project results achievement.</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment issues have been satisfactorily addressed during all project phases AND there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for environment issues on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment issues have been satisfactorily addressed during <i>all</i> project phases (project planning/preparation, implementation, monitoring and reporting/evaluation OR: there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for environment issues on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment issues have been satisfactorily addressed in some of the project phases.</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment issues have been satisfactorily addressed in one project phase only (e.g. during planning, but not during implementation).</li> </ul>
		0 Very unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence of Environment issues having been satisfactorily addressed at any stage of the project.</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 HIV/AIDS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HIV/AIDS issues were satisfactorily addressed during preliminary analysis conducted in preparation of the project.</li> <li>HIV/AIDS issues were satisfactorily addressed when</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HIV/AIDS issues have been satisfactorily addressed during all project phases AND there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for HIV/AIDS issues on a regular basis.</li> </ul>

Dimension	Assessment Criteria	Rating	Rating Criteria
	engaging in policy dialogue with Malawian partners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HIV/AIDS issues were satisfactorily addressed during the project implementation process.</li> <li>• HIV/AIDS issues were satisfactorily addressed in the monitoring and evaluation of project results achievement.</li> </ul>	3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HIV/AIDS issues have been satisfactorily addressed during all project phases OR there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for HIV/AIDS issues on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HIV/AIDS issues have been satisfactorily addressed in some of the project phases.</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HIV/AIDS issues have been satisfactorily addressed in one project phase only (e.g. during planning, but not during implementation).</li> </ul>
		0 Very unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence of HIV/AIDS issues having been satisfactorily addressed at any stage of the project.</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 Governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance issues were satisfactorily addressed during preliminary analysis conducted in preparation of the project.</li> <li>• Governance issues were satisfactorily addressed when engaging in policy dialogue with Malawian partners.</li> <li>• Governance issues were satisfactorily addressed during the project implementation process.</li> <li>• Governance issues were satisfactorily addressed in the monitoring and evaluation of project results achievement.</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance issues have been satisfactorily addressed during all project phases AND there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for good governance on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance issues have been satisfactorily addressed during all project phases (project planning/preparation, implementation, monitoring and reporting/evaluation OR there is evidence of project staff actively advocating for good governance on a regular basis.</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance issues have been satisfactorily addressed in some of the project phases.</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance issues have been satisfactorily addressed in one project phase only (e.g. during planning, but not during implementation).</li> </ul>
		0 Very unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence of Governance issues having been satisfactorily addressed at any stage of the project.</li> </ul>

Dimension	Assessment Criteria	Rating	Rating Criteria
<b>6. Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial and human resources managed efficiently. This can be demonstrated – for example – through:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Number and qualification of project staff adequate.</li> <li>– Adequate ratio of program administrative costs to program costs over time</li> <li>– Evidence of measures taken/strategies/processes used to ensure project efficiency.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4 Very satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If project reports and/or consultations with stakeholders provided considerable evidence of attention to and efforts in realizing project efficiencies.</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If project reports and/or consultations with stakeholders provided some evidence of attention to and efforts in realizing project efficiencies.</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If project reports and/or consultations with stakeholders provided a few examples of attention to and efforts in realizing project efficiencies.</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If project reports and/or consultations with stakeholders provided no evidence of attention to and efforts in realizing project efficiencies.</li> </ul>
<b>7. CIDA Management Principles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Design and implementation have furthered country ownership of development results (e.g. by making explicit links to national sector strategies/plans).</li> <li>• Project design and implementation have allowed for alignment with Malawian partner systems (e.g. planning, financial, procurement).</li> <li>• Project design and implementation have demonstrated will for harmonization of development support with other donors (e.g. sharing information or resources, using common systems or approaches).</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If all three criteria apply</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If two criteria apply</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If one criterion applies</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If none applies</li> </ul>
<b>8. RBM/ Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate management systems and resources developed for managing the project for results according to CIDA guidelines.</li> <li>• Project has applied RBM principles and tools (including SMART results indicators) in meaningful ways throughout the project cycle.</li> <li>• Appropriate processes put into place and used to identify and mitigate project risks.</li> </ul>	4. Highly satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If all three criteria apply</li> </ul>
		3 Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If two criteria apply</li> </ul>
		2 Moderately Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If one criterion applies</li> </ul>
		1 Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If none applies</li> </ul>

## Appendix IV Stakeholders Consulted

Name	Position	Method of Consultation
<b>CIDA Malawi Program (Bilateral) – CIDA HQ</b>		
Banwell, Anne	Project Team Leader, Malawi Program, Geographic Programs Branch, CIDA	Interview
Cudmore, Carolyn	Former Program Manager, Malawi Program, Africa Branch, CIDA	Phone Interview
Dowswell, Sarah	Former Program Manager, Malawi Program, Africa Branch, CIDA	Interview
Edmunds, Amanda	Analyst, Integrated Planning and Accountability Division, HRSDC, formerly Project Team Leader, Malawi Program, Africa Branch CIDA	Interview
Miloff, Maury	Former Program Manager, Malawi Program, Africa Branch, CIDA	Interview
Paquette, Stefan	Senior Development Officer, Malawi Program, Geographic Programs Branch, CIDA	Interviews
Parsons, James	Program Manager, Malawi Program, Geographic Programs Branch, CIDA	Interviews
<b>CIDA Malawi Program – Malawi Office of the CHC, PSU and Malawi-based</b>		
Foote, Robert	PSU Director (since 2006), Malawi PSU	Interviews, group meetings
Jere, McPherson	CIDA Education Specialist, Malawi PSU	Interview
Kacheche, Brenda	Project Co-Manager, Gender Equality Support Project (GESP), Malawi-based.	Group interviews, Site visits
Kampala, Robert	Former Water & Sanitation Specialist, Malawi PSU (now Country Director, WaterAid)	Interview
Killick, Peter	Aid Liaison Officer, PSU	Interview
Kumwenda, Wilson	Project Field Manager, Government Assistance Project (GAP), Malawi Based	Interview (in November 2008 only)
Lebede, Johannes	Former Project Advisor, HIV/AIDS Project, , Malawi based	Interview
Liwewe, Olivia Mchaju	Former CIDA Gender Advisor, Malawi PSU, DAGG Member	Interview
Malumelo, Roman	Project Co-Manager, Gender Equality Support Project (GESP), Malawi Based	Interview
Mambulu, James	Water and Environment Specialist, Malawi PSU	Interview, site visits
Nyirenda, Michael	Project Director. Project on Economic Governance (PEG), Malawi based,	Interview
Polepole, McLloyd Mwayi	Project Field Manager, GSES II, Malawi based.	Interview
Roome, Roger	First Secretary (Development), O/CHC	Individual and group interviews

Name	Position	Method of Consultation
Sanjeni, Wictor	Former Gender Specialist, Malawi PSU	Interview
Young, Valerie	Acting High Commissioner and Head of Cooperation, Canadian High Commission in Malawi, O/CHC	Interviews
Zulu, Dorothy	Former GESP Director, Malawi based	Interview
<b>Other staff in CIDA HQ</b>		
Beaulieu, Rémy	Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Directorate, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch, CIDA	Ongoing consultations
Clement, Louise	Director General, Southern and Eastern Africa Directorate, Geographic Programs Branch, CIDA	Interview
Cmoc, Nataalka	Team Leader - Results Based Management, Performance Management Directorate, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch, CIDA	Interview
Dicum, Julia	Senior Analyst, Health and Education Directorate, Sectors and Global Partnerships Branch, CIDA	Interview
Fortin, Marie Eve	Development Officer, Senegal Program, formerly Performance Review Officer, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch, CIDA	Consultations
Fournier, Suzanne	Project Manager, Multilateral and Global Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Galvin, Melanie	Acting Manager, Global Initiatives Directorate, Multilateral and Global Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Guthrie, Tina	Manager, Food Aid Unit, Multilateral and Global Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Hébert, Maryse	Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Directorate, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch, CIDA	Ongoing consultations
Kostiuk, Nadia	Director General Canadian International Development Agency Southern and Eastern Africa Directorate (BFO) Geographic Programs Branch	Interview
MacCormack, Julie	Senior Program Officer, Food Aid Unit, Multilateral and Global Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Malenfant, Brigitte	Senior Analyst, Sectors and Global Partnerships Branch, CIDA	Group meetings
Manirabonara, Richard	Program Policy Analyst, Canadian Partnership Branch, CIDA	Group meetings
McLean, Erin	Project Manager, Multilateral and Global Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Mundle, Carol	Acting Manager, Volunteer Cooperation, Canadian Partnership Branch, CIDA	Email and phone consultation
Neufeld, Ken	Director, Mozambique Program, Geographic Programs Branch, CIDA	Interview
Oke, David	International Development Project Advisor, Canadian Partnership Branch, CIDA	Email consultation

Name	Position	Method of Consultation
Payne, Leslie	Project Manager, Multilateral and Global Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Porter, Ken	Project Manager, Multilateral and Global Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Semeluk, Loree	Development Officer, Pan Africa Program, Geographic Programs Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
Singh, Goberdhan	Director, Evaluation Directorate, CIDA	Ongoing consultations
Thériault, Larry	Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Directorate, CIDA	Ongoing consultations
Turmel, Rémi	Advisor, International Projects, Canadian Partnership Branch, CIDA	Email consultation
<b>High Commission/Embassy</b>		
Deyell, John	(Retired). Head of Mission in Zambia, 2004-2007	Phone interview
<b>Project Monitors/Evaluators<sup>19</sup></b>		
Lalonde, Helene	Monitor, GESP	Interview
Ogilvie, Keith	Project Monitor on Governance, and Transitional Director, PEG (3 months in 2006)	Phone Interview
Ramsay, Ted	Monitor, GAP and GSES	Interview
<b>Canadian/International Implementing Partners</b>		
Donaldson, Joan	Project Director, GAP, Agriteam Canada	Interview and email consultation
Loga, Tiwonge	Country Program Manager, CPHA (SAT Implementing Agency)	Interview
Mapemba, Jacob P.	Country Director/Agriculture and Rural Dev Specialist, WUSC (CFA for GSES II <sup>20</sup> & CPB partner)	Interview
Miller, Anna	Director of Programs, PSU, CPAR (CPB and MGPB partner)	Email consultations
Munyao, Kioko	World Vision Canada	Email consultation
Nychyperovych, Tatyana	CARE Canada (CFA for GSES II & CPB partner)	Interview
Paterson, Richard	CARE Canada (CFA for GSES II & CPB partner)	Interview
Sandström, Anita	Executive Director, CPHA (SAT Implementing Agency)	Email consultation
Syme, Hilary	Former Program Officer, Malawi Program Africa Branch, CIDA	Email consultation

<sup>19</sup> Michael Miner was also contacted for an interview but the interview never transpired.

<sup>20</sup> CARE and WUSC are part of a consortium facilitating the implementation of GSES II. The consortium initially included GDG (Global Development Group) which has now been dissolved.

<b>Cross Sectoral (e.g. re Program level information, overall donor 'landscape in Malawi, SWAps)</b>		
Chabwana, Bridget	Director of Policy and Programs, National AIDS Commission, Government of Malawi	Interview
Dr. Ngwira, Naomi	Director, Debt and Aid Division, Ministry of Finance, Government of Malawi	Interview
Dr. Phoya, Anna	Ministry of Health, Government of Malawi	Interview
Dr. Sangela,	Former Principal Secretary Health, Ministry of Health, Government of Malawi	Interview
Nkhata, Stan	Ministry of Finance, Government of Malawi	Interview
Schouten, Erik and Director	Ministry of Health, Government of Malawi	Interview
Kamlongera, Dr. Augustine	Director of Planning, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government of Malawi	Interview
Zimpita, Patricia	Director, Planning, OPC	Interview
<b>Education Sector</b>		
Agabu, Rafael	Deputy Director, Education Methods & Advisory Services, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Banda, Charles	Chief Procurement Officer, Procurement and Supplies Unit, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Botha, Anne	Chairperson PCAR CC and Assistant Statistician, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Chazema, Mrs. Jacqueline	Gender and HIV Coordinator, Domasi College	Individual Interview
Chipungu, Alex	Supplies Unit, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Chitimbe, Moffat	Principal Secretary, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Chakwera, Dr. Elias	Current Director, Domasi College	Individual Interviews
Goertler, Dr. Wilfried	Former GTZ representative in Malawi, Education Donor Coordination Group	Individual interview
Dr Hau, Simeon	Former Director, Domasi College	Individual Interviews
Susewele, Dr. William	Deputy Director, Malawi Institute of Education	Individual interview
Fris, Jorgen	GTZ, Basic Education Program	Individual interview
Gunsaru, Charles	Director, Malawi Institute of Education	Individual interview
Iphani,Max	Assistant Director, Malawi Institute of Education	Individual
Kaambakadzanja, Dave	PICAR coordination committee	Interview
Kalanda, McKnight	Director Basic Education, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Kamlongera, Augustine	Director of Planning, Ministry of Science and Technology (MoEST), Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Kaperemera, Nelson	Former Acting Director, MIE and former Director Domasi College	Individual Interviews

Khombe, Mrs.	Gender Desk Officer, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Kulima, Mercy	Procurement Officer, Procurement and Supplies Unit, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Magreta, Lonely	Director of Secondary Education, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Mardes, Gorge	GTZ Basic Education Program	Individual Interview
Matale, Enock	Assistant Statistician, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Mhango, Dr. Martin	Coordinator for Centre for Distance Learning, Domasi College	Individual Interview
Mphisa, Simon	UNICEF, Chief Education and youth Development, Education Donor Coordination Group	Individual interview
Nyirenda, Stanley	Consultant under GSES II	Individual Interview
Phiri, Amin	Principal Procurement Officer, Procurement and Supplies Unit, MoEST, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Polepole, McLloyd Mwayi	Project Field Manager, GSES II	Interview
Tsokonombwe, Sylvester	Consultant under GSES II	Individual Interview
<b>Gender Equality</b>		
Chikakheni, Olivia	Principal Secretary – Gender, Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of Malawi	Individual Interview
Kaliya, Ema	Chair, Malawi NGO Gender network	Individual Interview
Kassonga, Franck	NATAFOGAI representative	Group Interview
Matemba J., Marika	NATAFOGAI representative	Group Interview
Mihowa, Linga	Program and Policy Manager, OXFAM Malawi and DAGG member	Group Interview
Phiri, Sekaame	NATAFOGAI representative	Group Interview
Puwaruwa, Jessi	NATAFOGAI representative	Group Interview
Salima, Naile	Gender Advisor, OXFAM Malawi (also provides technical assistance to DAGG)	Group Interview
Chiwambe	Program Officer – Thyolo District (manager of GESP’s subproject), OXFAM Malawi	Group Interview
Malawi Broadcasting Corporation Management Group	Director of Engineering, Control of Program, Control of Research, Control of Administration	Group Interview
<b>Health/ HIV/AIDS</b>		
Banda, Derio	Associate Director, Ministry Quality Assurance World Vision, Malawi	Group Interview
Barnhart, Matt	In charge of HIV/AIDS, USAID Malawi	Interview
Cameron, Alisa	Head of Health Department, USAID Malawi	Interview
Chabwana, Bridget	Director of Policy and Programs, World Vision Malawi	Group interview



Chipimo, Miriam	Manager, Reproductive Health, HIV/AIDS, UNICEF	Interview
Chitekwe, Stanley	Project Officer, Nutrition, UNICEF	Interview
de Cleene, Anna	(Ex) DFID HIV AIDS Advisor	Interview
Dorothy Namate	Global Fund Local Agent, Price Waterhouse Cooper	Interview
Dr. Loga, Tiwonge	Malawi Country Programme Manager for AIDS Trust Southern Africa, SAT Malawi	Interview
Dr. Mwale, Biziwick	Executive Director, National AIDS Commission	Group & individual Interviews
Johns, Desmond	Country Coordinator, UNAIDS	Interview
Kaimvi, Washington	Director, Finances and Administration, National AIDS Commission	Group & individual Interviews
Kalepa, Humphrey J.	World Vision Malawi	Group Interview
Kapyepye, Ethel	Head of HIV/AIDS, World Vision Malawi	Group Interview
Lane, Jason	Team Leader – Health and HIV/AIDS, DFID Malawi	Interview
Lazaro, Dorothy	National Programme Officer, UNFPA	Interview
Matonya, Sarah	HIV/AIDS Advisor, DFID Malawi	Interview
Namarika, Rose	Senior Manager Health and Nutrition, World vision Malawi	Group Interview
Nyambose, Madalo	Assistant Director, Debt and Aid Division, Ministry of Finance, Government of Malawi. Chair of the of HIV/AIDS pool and chair of the Finance committee of the health SWAp	Interview
Seip, Ragnhild	Second Secretary – Development, Royal Norwegian Embassy	Interview
Thole, Tchaka	Director Finance and Administration/Acting Country Director, CPAR Malawi	Interview
Yilla, Mamadi	Country Coordinator for the US Government AIDS Program, PEPFAR	Interview
Zimba, Joseph	Programme Manager, CPAR Malawi	Interview
<b>Water and Sanitation</b>		
Gondwe, Boniface N.C.	Director, Water Supply and Sanitation, Ministry of Water and Irrigation Development, Government of Malawi	Interview
Kazombo, Joseph	COMWASH Project Coordinator, Ministry of Water and Irrigation Development, Government of Malawi	Group interview
Limphangwe Water Scheme Management Committee	COMWASH beneficiary communities	Site visit/ Group Interviews
Malunga, Grain	Former Principal Secretary, Water, Ministry of Water and Irrigation Development, Government of Malawi	Interview
Mamba, Jeffrey	Ministry of Water and Irrigation Development, Government of Malawi	Group Interview

Migowi Water Scheme Management Committee (2 representatives)	COMWASH beneficiary communities	Site visit/ Group Interviews
Members of the Water and Sanitation Development Partners Group	Representatives from AFDB, JICA, UNICEF	Group Interview and meeting observation
Namizunga, George	Former COMWASH Project Coordinator, COMWASH Malawi	Individual interview
Crispin	Former Phalombe District Water Management Officer (now Community Based Management Resp., MoIWD Regional Office, Blantyre)	Individual Interview
<b>Governance</b>		
Bamusi, Mavuto	Civil Society-Human Rights Consultative Committee/Malawi Economic Justice Network	Focus Group/ Group Interview
Chikoko, Mulle	DFID	Group interview
Chunga, Dixon	Director, Planning, DHRMD	Interview
Forster, Stuart	DFID	Group interview
Hon. Chimango, Louis	Member of Parliament, Government of Malawi	Group Interview
Kawaye, Jimmy	Governance Advisor, DFID	Group interview
Kumbatira, Andrew	Civil Society-Malawi Economic Justice Network	Focus Group/ Group Interview
Kwataine, Martha	Civil Society-Malawi Health Equity Network	Focus Group/ Group Interview
Magalasi, Collins	Civil Society-Malawi Economic Justice Network	Focus Group/ Group Interview
Mazengera, Hennox	Civil Society-Society of Accountants in Malawi	Focus Group/ Group Interview
Mhoni, Victor	Civil Society-Civil Society Agriculture Network	Focus Group/ Group Interview
Mwanyungwe, Abel	Media – Polytechnic	Focus Group/Group Interview
Njolomole, Henry	Member of Parliament, Government of Malawi	Group Interview
Sempere, Patrick	Media-TransWorld Radio	Focus Group/Group Interview

## Appendix V Documents Reviewed

### CIDA Documents Program or Agency Level

- “Malawi Country Profile”. CIDA (2008)
- “Canada-Malawi Relations”. DFAIT (2009)
- “Malawi Development Trends”. CIDA (2006)
- “Malawi Country Program Delivery Strategy 1998-2008”. CIDA (1997)“
- “Revised Malawi Logical Framework”. CIDA (2003)
- “Program Performance Report 2006-2007”. CIDA (2007)
- “Program Performance Report 2005-2006”. CIDA (2006)
- “Malawi Donor Ranking”. CIDA (April 2007)
- “Mid-Term Country Program Review of the CIDA Malawi Program, 1999-2009”. Michael Miner for CIDA (November 2004)
- “Report on Plans and Priorities 2006-2007 (DRAFT)”. CIDA, 2006
- “Report on CIDA’s Social Development Priorities for Malawi”. CIDA (2006)
- “Results Based Management Policy Statement”. CIDA (2008)
- “CIDA’s Policy on Gender Equality”. CIDA (1999)
- “Draft Guide for Preparing a Country Program Development Framework”. CIDA (2002)

### Government of Malawi

- “Malawi Vision 2020”. Malawi Sustainable Development Network Program, Government of Malawi (2003-2005) < <http://www.sdn.org.mw/~esaia/ettah/vision-2020/> >
- “Malawi Growth and Development Strategy 2006-2011”. Ministry of Finance, Government of Malawi (2005)
- “Malawi Growth and Development Strategy: Annual Review 2006/07 Year, Synthesis Report”. Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Government of Malawi (2007)
- “Implementing the Development Assistance Strategy (DAS): Institutionalizing Sector Coordinating Groups”. Ministry of Finance, Government of Malawi (2008)
- “MGDS Annual Review 2006-2007: Synthesis Report on Progress Made in Implementing the MDGs”. Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Government of Malawi (2008)
- “Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy”. Government of Malawi (August 2006)
- “Effective Technical Cooperation for Capacity Development – Malawi Country Case Study”. United Nations Development Programme and Office of the President, Government of Malawi (2008)
- “Drivers of Change and Development in Malawi – Working Paper”. David Booth et al., Overseas Development Institute (January 2006)
- “Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy: Third Annual Progress Report and Joint IDA–IMF Staff Advisory Note”. International Development Association and International Monetary Fund (2006)

## Other Donors Evaluations/Documents

- “Country Brief and Data Profile: Malawi”. World Bank (2009)
- “Country Brief and Data Profile: Malawi”. UNESCO Institute of Statistics (2006)
- “Human Development Indices”. *Human Development Report 2007/08*. World Bank (2008)
- “Malawi Millennium Development Goals Report 2008”. United Nations Development Programme (2008)
- “Joint Evaluation of the undg Contribution to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness”. IFAD, UNAIDS, UNECA, UNIFEM, UNFPA, UNDP (2008)
- “Development Assistance Strategy: Malawi”. United Nations Development Programme (2006)
- “Aid Architecture: An overview of the main trends in Official Development Assistance flows”. International Development Association (February 2007)
- “Harmonizing Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery, Vol. 2: Budget Support, SWaps and Capacity Development in Public Finance Management”. OECD-DAC (2006)
- “Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management”. OECD-DAC (2002)
- “Malawi Country Program”. Oneworld.net (March 2008)
- “Report: Experts Meeting on Vertical Funds”. Eurodad (June 2008)
- “Effective Aid by 2010? What it will take: Vol. 2 Country Chapters, Malawi”. *2008 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration*. 3rd High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (September 2-4, 2008, Accra, Ghana)
- “Evaluation of Dfid’s Country Programmes: Malawi 2000-2005”. Chris Barnett et al., Department for International Development (Dfid) (April 2006)
- “From Projects to SWAPs: An evaluation of British Aid to primary schooling 1988-2001”. Dfid (September 2002).
- “Evaluation of General Budget Support – Malawi Country Report 1994-2004”. Jens Claussen et al., University of Birmingham (April 2006)
- “General Budget Support and Sector Program Assistance in Malawi”. United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (November 2004)
- “What Conditions favour the success of General Budget Support and Sector Program Assistance? Malawi Country Case Study”. USAID (2004)
- “Malawi Country Assistance Evaluation”. World Bank (July 2006)
- “Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Debt Initiative: Completion Point Document, Malawi” World Bank (August 2006)
- “African Economic Outlook: Malawi”, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2005)
- “Canadian Volunteer Engagement Program 2002-2005: Interim Narrative and Financial Report”. World University Service of Canada (WUSC) (September 2003)
- “Project/Program Performance Report: WUSC 2002-2004 Development Program”. Donna M. Shawartzburg for WUSC (2004)
- “Canadian Volunteer Engagement Program 2001-2002: Semi-Annual Report, April-September”. WUSC (November 2003)

- “Joint Donor Evaluation. Managing Aid Exit and Transformation .Malawi Country Case Study”. AAVV (May 2008).
- “Joint Donor Evaluation. Managing Aid Exit and Transformation. Lessons from Botswana, Eritrea, India, Malawi and South Africa. Synthesis Report”. Slob & Jerve (May 2008)
- “Managing aid – Practices of DAC member countries”. OECD-DAC (June, 2009)

### Literature on PBAs

- “Chapter 3: Sector Wide Approaches.” *Harmonizing Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery*. OECD (2006)
- “Primer on Project Based Approaches”. Policy Branch, CIDA (August 2003)
- “Capacity Development under PBAs”. Results from the LENPA Forum (April 2005)
- Survey results on SWAPs and SWAp like Initiatives in CIDA – Case of HIV/AIDS in Malawi
- “Gender equality in Program Based Approaches: Experiences, Lessons learned and Good practices”. CIDA (2005)
- “Chapter 7: Core Funding, Section 7.4: Program Based Approaches”. *Business Process Roadmap*. CIDA CIDA’s Business RoadMap (2009)
- “Accountability Issues in Program Based Approaches”. L.M. Edelsward for the Portfolio Initiative (2003)
- “Operational Guide on Direct Budget Support and Pooled Funding to Recipient Countries”. Human Resources and Corporate Services Division, CIDA (May 2005)

### Documents on specific CIDA Projects and on respective Sectors

#### Education

- “Malawi Education Sector Integrated Risk Assessment”. Geneviève Brown et al. for CIDA (May 2007)
- “National Education Sector Plan, 2008-2017”. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government of Malawi (2008)
- “Education Sector Policy and Investment Framework 2000-2015”. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Government of Malawi (2002)
- “Improving the Quality of Primary Education in Malawi: Project Approval Document”. CIDA (2007)
- “Enhancing the Quality of Primary Education in Malawi: Final Annual Report”. UNICEF (March 2008)
- **GSES II:**
  - Project Approval Document
  - Project Implementation Plan
  - Memorandum of Understanding
  - Annual Workplans
  - Semi-Annual Reports
  - Mid Term Review Report (2008)

- **SSTEP:**
  - Impact Evaluation Final Report (2008) and Terms of Reference
  - Final project report (2007)
- **GTZ:**
  - Administrative Arrangement between the Government of Canada and GTZ GMBH
  - Email communication between Stefan Paquette and Mades Georg (October 21, 2008)
  - GTZ Website ([www.gtz.de](http://www.gtz.de))

### Health including HIV/AIDS

- “Malawi National HIV/AIDS Policy”. Government of Malawi (2003)
- Implementation of the Malawi HIV&AIDS Strategic Management Plan (2003 – 2008)/ Mid-term evaluation (December 2006)
- “Malawi’s HIV/AIDS Mini-SWAp: A case study of risk management and capacity building under the program approach”. (2002)
- “Malawi Health SWAp, Mid Term Review Summary Report”, NORAD, (January 2008)
- “Malawi Micronutrient and Health (MICAH) Program Phase II Final Report (Including FY 06): November 2002-October 2005”. World Vision Malawi (2005)
- “Improving Nutrition of Women and Children: The MICAH Program, Final Program Report”. World Vision (2006)
- “MICAH FY 04 Annual Report: October 2003-September 2004”, p. 42. World Vision Canada (January 2005)
- “MICAH Malawi End of Phase I Report”. World Vision Malawi
- “Annex A: Preventing and Mitigating the Impacts of HIV/AIDS in Malawi, Canadian Volunteer Engagement Program 2001-2002: Final Report”. World University Service of Canada (February 2003)
- **HIV Pooled Fund:**
  - Project Approval Document
  - Memorandum of Understanding
  - High Commission letters
  - “HIV/AIDS Action Framework 2007-2001: PAD for Pooled Donors”
  - Pooled Funding Partner meeting documents
  - HIV/AIDS Development Partner Group meeting documents
  - National AIDS Commission related documents
  - Annual and weekly reports
  - Project Performance Reports (04/05 - 07/08)
  - Assessment of impact of national response
  - Implementation of the Malawi HIV&AIDS strategic management plan (2003 – 2008) Mid-term evaluation
  - HIV/AIDS Baseline Sector Survey.
- **SAT:**
  - Mid-Term Performance Review

- Completion report
- Annual reports
- “SAT’s work with the ‘Three Ones’, Malawi’s experience”

### **CPAR:**

- Project Implementation Plan
- Semi-Annual reports
- End of Project reports
- Email communication between Eric Bellows and Sarah Dowswell (April 15, 2002)
- Program Evaluation of CPAR’s ‘Moving Beyond Hunger’ and ‘Reducing the Burden of HIV/AIDS in Rural Malawi’ programs

### Water and Sanitation

- “Sector Financing: Water Supply and Sanitation in Malawi”. Malawi Economic Justice Network and Water Aid (2006)
- **COMWASH:**
  - Preliminary Project Design & Project Management Strategy
  - Project Implementation Plan
  - Project Approval Document
  - Memoranda of Understanding
  - Quarterly and annual reports
  - Monitoring reports
  - Completion Report
  - Mid Term Evaluation

### Governance

- **GAP:**
  - Memorandum for the Minister
  - Project Implementation Plan
  - Project Approval Document
  - Memorandum of Understanding
  - Mid Term Evaluation
  - Annual workplans
  - Quarterly, semi-annual and annual reports and stakeholder comments
  - Annual Output to Purpose Review
  - Monitoring Reports and monitoring mission debrief summary
- **PEG:**
  - Project Implementation Plan
  - Project Approval Document
  - Annual workplans
  - Quarterly and annual reports
  - Monitoring reports and monitoring mission debrief summary
  - Job Descriptions
  - Project Advisory Meeting minutes

- Sample of Sub-project Approval documents
- Sample of Terms of Reference
- Sample of special studies.
- **PEG & GESP:**
  - Memorandum of Understanding with DfID
  - Annual reports to DfID.

### Gender

- “Gender Needs Assessment of the MGDS”. Olivia Liwewe, Dr. Naomi Ngwira, Bright Sibale (July 2006)
- “Revised Gender Policy”, Government of Malawi (2008)
- “National Gender Program 2004-2009”. Ministry of Gender, Child Welfare and Community Services, Malawi.
- “Managing Human resources within the Government of Malawi – Guidelines on Gender Mainstreaming”. Government of Malawi (2007)
- **GESP:**
  - Concept Paper
  - Project Approval Document
  - Project Implementation Plan
  - Memorandum of Understanding
  - Project Advisory Committee minutes
  - Quarterly and annual Reports
  - Monitoring Reports
  - Final Evaluation report
  - Annual Workplans
  - Research report on “Women and Men in Decision Making Positions” (2008)

### PSU

- **PSU**
  - Project Approval Document
  - Memoranda of Understanding
  - Annual Workplans
  - Semi-annual and annual reports
  - Audit reports
  - Sector Specialist Job descriptions

### **Other Documents**

- “Bank Crisis Impact Limited in Africa – AfDB Economist”. Reuters Interview (October 2008)
- “Free Primary Education Backfires”. Brian Ligometa, News From Africa (2002)
- *Evaluation Methods for Studying Policies and Programs*. Carol Weiss, Prentice Hall (1998)



## Appendix VI Projects Reviewed

Project Number	Title	Total Budget (in Millions)	Sector
<b>Bilateral Investments</b>			
A030418001	HIV/AIDS Program Support (HIV AIDS)	\$14.8	Health
A020397001	Community Water, Sanitation & Health (COMWASH)	\$12.7	Health
A031403001	Grant Support to the Education Sector Phase II (GSES II)	\$20.0	Education
A020401001	Secondary School Teacher Education Project (SSTEP)	\$6.7	Education
A030571001	Project for Economic Governance (PEG)	\$3.6	Governance
A020392001	Government Assistance Project (GAP)	\$7.8	Governance
A030927001	Gender Equality Support Project (GESP)	\$2.9	Gender Equality
*A020576001 *A031056001 *A031484001 *A033764-001	Program Support Unit (PSU) <sup>21</sup> Program Support Unit Phase II Program Support Unit Phase III Program Support Unit Phase IV	\$12.7	
<b>Multi-Bi and Bi-Bi Projects</b>			
A030608-001	Improving the Quality of Primary Education Project (UNICEF)	\$7.5	Education
A033400-001	Initial Primary Teacher Education (GTZ)	\$5.0	Education
<b>CPB and Multilateral Investments</b>			
S062092001 (CPB)	CPAR-CAW HIV/AIDS Project-Malawi 2002-05	\$1.3	Health
M003861003 (Multilateral)	CPAR – MALAWI	\$1.6	Health
S061235PRG (CPB)	WUSC – Program Support For 2001/2002	\$1.3	Multi-sector
S061999 (CPB)	WUSC 2002 - 2004 Development Program	\$1.9	Multi-sector
M003861002 (Multilateral)	World Vision Canada – Malawi	\$1.4	Health
M003544 and M011053 (Multilateral)	AFRICA/SUB-SAHARA/MICRONUT/HEALTH Micronutrients and Health MICA Ph 1 & II, World Vision	\$17.0 <sup>22</sup>	Health

<sup>21</sup> These four projects were reviewed with a focus on their implications for overall program management issues (i.e., they were not reviewed against the same criteria used for the other projects).

<sup>22</sup> This is a multi-country project and 37% of its budget went to Malawi.

Project Number	Title	Total Budget (in Millions)	Sector
M003979 (Multilateral)	Contribution to the World Food Program for the Women's Health and Micronutrient Facility (WHMF) in Zambia and Malawi <sup>23</sup>	\$10.7 <sup>24</sup>	Health
<b>Africa Branch – Regional</b>			
A018903001	Developing Community Competence for HIV/AIDS in Southern Arica, Ph3 , , Canadian Public Health Association (CPHA)	\$6.0 <sup>25</sup>	Health
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$135.2</b>	

---

<sup>23</sup> While this project was included in the originally envisaged sample we were unable to review it due to lack of documents or contact persons who could have provided information on the initiative.

<sup>24</sup> This is a multi-country project and 71% of its budget went to Malawi.

<sup>25</sup> This is a regional project and 20% of its budget went to Malawi.

## Appendix VII Malawi CPE Project Ratings

The table below compares reviewed projects across criteria (see Annex I of the Technical Report for detailed project ratings). This information is reflected throughout section 6 of the report. Highlights of the analysis are summarized below

The table provides a summary of the average ratings of the projects reviewed for the Malawi CPE and shows some interesting trends:

- Projects were generally assessed as satisfactory to highly satisfactory in relation to Project Relevance, CIDA Management Principles, and RBM/M&E – regardless of the sector.
- In every sector but governance, projects were generally assessed as quite effective in realizing their results.
- Most projects did very well in addressing gender equality issues, but were much less successful in addressing other cross cutting issues.
- Projects had mixed ratings across sectors in relation to sustainability and coherence.

Dimension	HIV/AIDS	COMWASH	GSES II	SSTEP	PEG	GAP	GESP	Average Rating by Criteria
Relevance	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	3.9
Effectiveness	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	3.4
Sustainability	Satisfactory (3)	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	2.57
Coherence	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory (3)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (3)	2.4
Cross <sup>26</sup> Cutting Issues	2	1.8	2.5	2.5	4	3.5	2	2.6

<sup>26</sup> This was calculated by adding the average scores for each of the 4 cross-cutting issues divided by the total number of cross-cutting issues rated.

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	<b>COMWASH</b>	<b>GSES II</b>	<b>SSTEP</b>	<b>PEG</b>	<b>GAP</b>	<b>GESP</b>	<b>Average Rating by Criteria</b>
<i>Cross Cutting Issues: Gender</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (4)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (2)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (4)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (4)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (4)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (4)</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	3.7
<i>Cross Cutting Issues: Environment</i>	<i>Highly Unsatisfactory (0)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (2)</i>	<i>Highly Unsatisfactory (0)</i>	<i>Highly Unsatisfactory (0)</i>	<i>Not Rated</i>	<i>Not Rated</i>	<i>Highly Unsatisfactory (0)</i>	.4
<i>Cross Cutting Issues: HIV/AIDS</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (3)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (3)</i>	<i>Not Rated</i>	<i>Satisfactory (3)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (3)</i>	2.6
<i>Cross Cutting Issues: Governance</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (2)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (2)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (3)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (3)</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	<i>Satisfactory (3)</i>	2.6
Efficiency	Not Rated	Between Moderately Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory (1.5)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Not Rated	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	Not Rated	Satisfactory (3)	2.6
CIDA Mgmt Principles	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Moderately Satisfactory (2)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	3.4
RBM/M&E	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	Highly Satisfactory (4)	4
<b>Average Rating by Project</b>	3.3	2.4	3.6	3.6	3.4	2.5	3.3	

## Appendix VIII Status of the Recommendations of the Malawi Country Program Mid-term Review (2004)

Recommendation	Status
<b>Program Level</b>	
<p><b>1. Maintain Focus and Maximize Leadership:</b> CIDA should continue to be proactive as a strategic donor in its selected niches and maintain its present four core programming areas and focus on cross cutting themes.</p>	<p>Partially (50%) addressed</p> <p>Until 2004, CIDA is reported to have an influential and highly respected role in Malawi for both its financial and non-financial support. CIDA made very few new investments after 2004.</p> <p>The Malawi Program did its best to maintain its leadership in several sectors, within a very difficult context (prolonged uncertainty about the future of the program and no new money). For example, CIDA's leadership role in Gender was kept high by its engagement in the DAGG (no major investment but technical support). In 2009 CIDA was still viewed as a leader in GE, via GESP and its GE advisor in PSU. CIDA was also viewed as a strategic donor in the Water sector which benefited from its involvement in Sector coordination and the Planning Phase of the Water and Sanitation SWAp (including as coordinating agency for the sector). CIDA in Malawi played a lead role in HIV-AIDS right up to 2008, despite that it provided no new funding.</p> <p>Despite this recognition, CIDA's reputation started to wane following 2006 due to its limited ability to invest in areas it deemed important.</p>
<p><b>2. Concentrated Focus of Projects:</b> Bilateral projects need to be in areas of concentration. Each present bilateral project should be completed and evaluated to ascertain return on investment.</p>	<p><b>Mostly (75%) addressed</b></p> <p>As mentioned above, CIDA made very few new investments after 2004. In 2008, CIDA approved two new education sector projects (the \$ 5 million "Initial Primary Teacher Education" Project and the \$7.5 million "Improving the Quality of Primary Education" project).</p> <p>Most of CIDA's bilateral projects were completed by the end of 2008. Some of them received no cost extensions and are currently in the process of being completed. The last ones should be closed by 2010.</p> <p>Most CIDA bilateral projects were evaluated at mid term or at completion. However, limited attention was generally paid in these evaluation to the return on investment</p>

Recommendation	Status
<p><b>3. Maintain Alignment with Priorities:</b> The CIDA Malawi Program needs to continue to consolidate its achievements and monitor how well it remains aligned to contextual changes within Malawi, CIDA, and internationally.</p>	<p><b>Partially addressed (50%)</b> Between 2004 and 2006, those responsible for the Malawi program were focused on keeping the program operational in the context of internal challenges (see main report Sections 3 and 9). Considerable attention was paid to ensuring that individual projects continued to be relevant, and changes were made to increase their relevance and/or appropriateness as required. For example, GAP was entirely revised and restructured in 2006 and COMWASH was refocused in 2005 following a very critical Midterm evaluation. In 2007, PEG was revised to become more responsive upon collapse of its main civil society partner (and as a result four organisations are now much stronger). Finally, GESP was refocused to move efforts from the social change level up to policy reform.</p> <p>The situation was a bit different at the country program level. The CPDS was not updated to reflect changes in GoM or CIDA priorities. The need for doing so had reduced importance after 2006, due to changing CIDA needs and priorities. Between 2005 and 2008 the program team developed a number of plans and strategies that were not implemented because of the uncertainty related to the future of the program.</p> <p>As noted in Section 9, there was little formal consolidation, monitoring and reporting at the program level.</p>
<p><b>4. Strategic Leveraging of Resources:</b> CIDA must remain a strategic player involved in the PRSP, SWAps, mini-SWAps, sectoral donor/government committees and well positioned in donor coordination groups.</p>	<p><b>Fully Addressed 100%</b> CIDA was actively involved with the Government and other interested donors in sector committees and donor coordination groups (e.g. the DAGG). It was further actively engaged in planning and preparing for the emerging SWAps in Water and Sanitation, and Education.</p> <p>In all sectors stakeholders acknowledged CIDA's technical contributions to these processes, yet also noted that CIDA's inability to commit financial resources (e.g. to SWAps) had widely been noted with disappointment.</p>
<p><b>5. Gender Equality Lens:</b> Gender should be maintained as the key lens, and gender mainstreaming should be emphasized in the next five years.</p>	<p><b>Mostly addressed 75%</b> Those outside of CIDA (e.g. donors) lauded CIDA's role as a key player in relation to gender concerns. GE remained a core analytic point for some projects, such as PEG and GAP, and to some extent HIV-AIDS. Interviewed staff and project managers closer to the program indicate that attention to gender across individual investments became less systematic following the inception of the program and to some extent "optional" in some projects.</p>
<b>Management Level</b>	
<p><b>6. Revise Program LFA and PMF:</b> The personnel in the CIDA HQ and PSU Teams should meet to continue the process of revising the Program level LFA and PMF and use these instruments as part of the process of measuring success on an ongoing basis. This is particularly important considering high staff turnover.</p>	<p><b>Marginally addressed 25%</b> While a revised version of the LFA was being developed, this document was never formally approved or used by program staff.</p>
<p><b>7. Consistency in Human Resources at the PSU:</b> To prevent misperceptions and misunderstandings, improve morale and reduce the likelihood of staff turnover, consistency is essential in PSU human resources and conducting performance appraisals.</p>	<p><b>Mostly addressed 75%</b> After 2005, various steps were taken to standardize HR processes in the PSU.</p>

Recommendation	Status
<p><b>8. Improve Cross-cultural and Cross-sectoral Communications:</b>                      Communication needs to increase through monthly meetings including cultural content, sharing new initiatives openly to enhance leveraging opportunities, and establishing a clearinghouse of information.</p>	<p><b>Mostly addressed 75%</b>                      At least since 2006 all PSU and High Commission staff met regularly (biweekly) for information meetings. Individuals reported that these meetings were most useful for information sharing purposes and – in a few cases - for identifying possible synergies on specific activities. Those interviewed felt that the meetings could have been used more productively.</p>
<p><b>9. Staffing and Monitoring of the Malawi Program:</b> Another desk officer should be added to the program to allow officers to share administrative work and spend more time supporting the field. Considering the likelihood that CIDA staffing will not be increased and resources will decrease, proactive project monitoring is essential.</p>	<p><b>Not addressed 0%</b>                      No new positions were created. Moreover, there was considerable staff turnover in the program after 2004.</p>

## Appendix IX Strengths and Weaknesses of Delivery Models

Type/Example	Strengths	Weaknesses	Comments/Observations
<b>Projects</b>			
General	<p>Flexible response mechanism, moderate preparation or negotiation time (6-12 months)</p> <p>Responds to specific needs in a particular sector</p> <p>Provides donors with high level of control over inputs – positive in view of need for accountability to home constituencies</p> <p>Not reliant on local capacities and resources – therefore able to work faster, effectively and efficiently</p>	<p>Potential for disjointed and/or overlapping donor investments</p> <p>Frequently donor rather than locally led, controlled, owned</p> <p>In case of exit or phasing out by a donor , projects can pose more problems in terms of continuity: other donors will tend to be reluctant to move in, mainly because they have already committed most of their funds to other purposes.</p>	Well known, familiar model
<b>Directive versus Responsive projects</b>			
Directive projects	Can focus on areas that in which CIDA has experience and expertise	Potentially in conflict with Paris Declaration principle of local ownership	How responsive a project is varies considerably depending on the staff involved in managing it, and the actual implementation approaches taken. (e.g., a formally 'directive' project can be implemented in a highly participatory manner, while the opposite can be the case in a formally 'responsive' one.
Responsive projects	In line with Paris Declaration Enhance likelihood of local ownership		
<b>Differences in Project Management</b>			
CEA led projects (e.g. GAP, COMWASH, SSTEP)	<p>Tend to manage effectively and efficiently</p> <p>Likely to produce deliverables such as workplans and report on time and in acceptable format</p> <p>Allows more direct interaction between Canadian Executing Agency (CEA) and CIDA HQ</p>	<p>May be very concerned about timely completion of outlined activities – can negatively influence willingness to take risks, engage in processes that require time (e.g. capacity development)</p> <p>Less likely to build local capacity in project management</p>	Consulted stakeholders noted considerable differences in the quality of work delivered by different CEAs. Being Canadian alone is not a guarantee for delivering good work.
CFA led projects	Puts emphasis on capacity development both in thematic areas addressed and with	Time and work intensive for both CIDA and	The only example in our sample (GSESII) was a positive experience. Consulted



Type/Example	Strengths	Weaknesses	Comments/Observations
(GSES II)	<p>regard to project management and accountability</p> <p>Can enhance likelihood of creating local ownership as key decisions are taken by local government (or other local players)</p>	<p>CFA</p> <p>Can be risky for CFA as it is accountable for results but not in a position to make decisions crucial for project progress (only advises/recommends to local partners)</p>	<p>stakeholders pointed out however that the success of the project was largely due to exceptional staff both in Canada and Malawi, and also to the willingness and ability of CFA and CIDA officers to take risks and try out new approaches/trust local partners to make decisions.</p>
<p>Projects managed by local staff (e.g. PEG, GESB)</p>	<p>In-depth knowledge of local context and stakeholders/players in the sector(s)</p> <p>Contributes to local capacity/leadership development</p> <p>Symbolic value of indicating CIDA's willingness to trust local leadership (In some cases) lower management costs due to lower staff costs (see comment).</p>	<p>In relatively small country like Malawi with limited numbers of skilled individuals in different sectors where everyone tends to know everyone else, it can be challenging for local staff members to represent a Canadian funded project. In many cases staff have to consider their future beyond the project – and thus need to think about keeping connections/networks with local organizations/players intact.</p> <p>In some cases, having local managers may require upfront capacity development and guidance from CIDA.</p> <p>Unless managed carefully, there is the potential for perceived conflict of interest if the same PTL oversees and guides the implementation of such projects.</p>	<p>Management costs not always lower – in Malawi good people are sought after and are highly paid.</p> <p>The in-kind support of PTLs needs to be taken into account.</p>
<p>Funds (e.g. GESB)</p>	<p>Flexible</p> <p>Can support/work with a variety of local organizations/beneficiaries and their respective areas of focus. Broad thematic spread.</p> <p>Demand and needs driven – based on skills, priorities of local organizations/partners</p> <p>Grants provided based on proposals submitted by local organizations can help build capacity both in thematic area, and related to proposal writing and financial management.</p> <p>Short term agreements can be most appropriate in contexts where organizations have weak capacities and might not be able to commit to or</p>	<p>Short term support for broad variety of stakeholders with limited opportunity for follow up/long term engagement and limited capacity development</p> <p>Fragmentation due to multitude of individual small investments</p> <p>Less targeted on one specific area of intervention – Makes definition of objectives and monitoring of results more difficult</p>	

Type/Example	Strengths	Weaknesses	Comments/Observations
	conceptualize longer term collaboration or strategies		
<b>Program Based Approach</b>			
Malawi HIV/AIDS SWAp	<p>Reduces duplication and overlap between individual investments</p> <p>Focuses donor efforts on sector policies and institutional issues (depends on the capacity of the government; donor partners may focus on implementation)</p> <p>Allows for better coordination and implementation of national response to HIV/AIDS through clearly identified institution (NAC)</p> <p>Can reduce GoM transaction costs in the mid to long term. Increases GoM control. Promotes GoM accountability</p> <p>Increases financial predictability at the sector level</p> <p>Uses country systems and helps to build government capacity critical for sustainability</p> <p>Likely to be able to absorb the exit of one donor if there are many donors contributing to the common basket and if the recipient is in control of the SWAp. Even so, the volume of support being withdrawn does make a difference.</p>	<p>Takes considerable time and investments to prepare/develop until more or less functional</p> <p>Tends to be oriented to central government rather than local entities</p> <p>Still in infancy and lessons being learned; stakeholders and the GoM are still adjusting</p> <p>In the short term, tends to create new transaction costs for GoM and donors (e.g. for building consensus)</p>	<p>Not a panacea.</p> <p>Requires new skills and abilities within GoM and among donors (e.g., donors often need to better understand public financial management and accounting to participate well and support a SWAp)</p> <p>Question what role 'big' players such as the Global Fund are taking on, and what implications their participation in a SWAp has for relevance of other players. In Malawi, the Global Fund provides largest share of overall SWAp, and has imposed numerous accountability mechanisms/procedures on the NAC.</p> <p>Given that the Global Fund is funded by donors (including CIDA), raises the question of why donors decide to also provide bilateral funding to SWAp.</p> <p>The binary distinction 'project versus program' may be misleading. Some project type models (e.g., use of a CFA) share some key characteristics with a PBA – i.e. they give a lot of responsibility and decision making power to local partners. However, in PBAs the degree to which local government partners are free to make decisions about the use of donor resources can differ widely, too. It is not accurate to say that PBAs are always more 'hands off' and less directive than projects.</p>

## Appendix X List of Findings

- Finding 1: CIDA's Malawi Country Program was relevant to the development and poverty reduction priorities of the GoM, to Malawian priorities, to the evolving priorities of the Canadian government and sectors of CIDA focus, and was complementary to the work of other donors.
- Finding 2: There is considerable evidence of positive achievements in all of CIDA's explicit and implicit priority sectors in Malawi. However, overall effects tend to be project- rather than sector-oriented, reflecting CIDA program management practices in Malawi.
- Finding 3: In the health sector, the CIDA Malawi Program has made considerable contributions at both the project and the sub-sector levels in the areas of HIV/AIDS and water and sanitation. Given its focus on these sub-sectors, CIDA's impact on the Malawi health sector as a whole has been modest.
- Finding 4: In the education sector, CIDA has made significant contributions, particularly in the areas of textbook supply and procurement and in secondary teacher education.
- Finding 5: In the governance sector, CIDA helped to strengthen the roles played by civil society, the National Assembly, and individual Members of Parliament in the national budget-making process in Malawi. CIDA support has had modest effects on targeted Malawi government departments.
- Finding 6: In the gender equality sector, CIDA's contributions in Malawi are widely regarded as remarkable, both in terms of project outputs and in CIDA's role as a leader and advocate for gender equality in Malawi.
- Finding 7: While the CIDA Malawi Program established a positive Canadian reputation among a broad range of stakeholders in the country over the past decade, since 2006 the uncertainty related to the future of the program has negatively affected Canada's reputation.
- Finding 8: While CIDA support has contributed to an impressive number of results in Malawi since 1998, the likelihood that these will be sustained is quite mixed and modest overall. This reflects Malawi's challenging context as well as the varied suitability of CIDA practices in managing for sustainable results.
- Finding 9: While CIDA's country program managers made some efforts to build coherence across bilateral projects in Malawi, connections between bilateral projects have been largely accidental. Some efforts have also been made to link bilateral priorities with CPB and MGPB projects. This reflects the fact that the CPDS is a not a truly corporate document that is binding on non-bilateral channels and that coherence among CIDA program investments was not an over-riding CIDA priority during the period under review.
- Finding 10: Bilateral projects within the Malawi Country Program have a mix of efficiency ratings.
- Finding 11: According to established CIDA proxy measures for program efficiency, the Malawi Program is relatively efficient.

- Finding 12: The proxy indicator used by CIDA excludes some program-related costs, which may understate the real costs of program management.
- Finding 13: Despite the CPDS' stated emphasis on sectors and themes, most of the Malawi Program's resources have been allocated to project needs. This has limited the potential for strategic management, synergy, and learning within the program.
- Finding 14: Until 2004, CIDA managers fostered cooperation and coordination among all stakeholders involved in the Malawi Program to build the program. Since 2006, a significant amount of staff time has been used to manage existing investments and generate requested information to inform the program's future.
- Finding 15: Canada's initial investment in establishing a PSU greatly facilitated the start up of its aid program in Malawi in 1998. The relative and potential added value of this investment has declined since 2006.
- Finding 16: After 2004, DFAIT provided some administrative support services to CIDA in Malawi, but the lack of a formal and well understood agreement caused tensions and over time contributed to some inefficiency in the program.
- Finding 17: CIDA's development approach in Malawi has been generally congruent with the principles of aid effectiveness outlined in the Paris Declaration at the project level but less so at the program level.
- Finding 18: At the project level, CIDA management paid most attention to gender equality; other cross-cutting issues received mixed levels of attention.
- Finding 19: The CIDA Malawi Program did not establish specific objectives or strategies or allocate resources and responsibilities to systematically address cross-cutting issues at the program level. This makes it difficult to track and assess the program's overall effectiveness in mainstreaming these issues.
- Finding 20: To launch a country program in Malawi in 1997-1998, CIDA crafted a focused, distinct, innovative, and bold development strategy that was carefully designed to maximize the impact of Canada's relatively modest resources.
- Finding 21: The 1998 CPDS guided CIDA's bilateral investment decisions in Malawi up to 2004. Since 2004, it has had less influence over the program's investment decisions and directions, particularly since there were limited resources for new programming.
- Finding 22: The Malawi Country Program LFA has had limited utility as a basis for capturing and measuring the program's expected performance beyond the project level.
- Finding 23: The CIDA Malawi Program's somewhat atypical management structure allowed the program to become operational quickly. However, the approach was not sustainable and created some lasting management difficulties and risks.
- Finding 24: A vacuum in CIDA leadership in 2004/05 negatively affected the overall performance of CIDA's Malawi Program. This situation may be an anomaly, or it may be indicative of problems faced by other small and less-visible CIDA country programs.

Finding 25: CIDA's RBM and risk management principles have been widely respected at the project level, but less so at the program and sector levels.

Finding 26: The Malawi government's limited experience with program-based approaches, combined with CIDA's limited financial resources for new programming after 2006 warranted CIDA's use of a mix of program implementation and delivery mechanisms in Malawi.

The investment in the HIV/AIDS SWAp was the lone PBA in Malawi. Although donors and developing countries are paying increased attention to program-based approaches, which are in keeping with the principles of the Paris Declaration, the evaluation found that the Malawi program's mix of approaches was very appropriate in the Malawi context during the period.

Recommendation 1: The managers of the CIDA Malawi Program should identify efficient ways to deliver this modest presence country program.

## Appendix XI CIDA's Management Response

CIDA Malawi Program Recommendation	Commitments and Action	Responsibility Centre	Planned Completion Date	Progress
<p>1. The managers of the CIDA Malawi Program should identify efficient ways to deliver this modest presence country program.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Malawi Program has reduced the size of its Program Support Unit and is currently examining its structure at CIDA headquarters and in the field to ensure that the program is cost effective and efficient. CIDA will continue to carefully select its development partners in line with the Government of Canada contractual regulations, seeking those who can represent CIDA's development interests in Malawi, while also effectively managing programming.</p>	<p>RDG, Southern and Eastern Africa Directorate</p>	<p>31 Dec. 2010</p>	<p>Projects are currently under development. Alternative management structures will be explored during 2010.</p>