



## UN JOINT 2015 ANNUAL WORK PLAN

Country: MALAWI

**Programme Title:** Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability

**UNDAF Outcome 4.2:** Public institutions are better able to manage, allocate, and utilize resources for effective development and service delivery by 2016.

### UNDAF Action Plan Outputs:

**Output 4.2.2:**

National Institutions utilize Results-Based Management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results.

**Output 4.2.3:**

Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance

**Output 4.2.4:**

National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and MDGs for efficient achievement of development results.

### Programme Summary

The Joint Programme on Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability is the UN response to enhance development effectiveness by improving systems, tools and mechanisms for national policy and strategic planning, management, monitoring, evaluation, reporting and accountability. The programme seeks to entrench the culture of accountability for effective use of resources and achievement of results in public institutions. Key strategic areas of support include: 1) institutionalizing Results-Based Management practices in the public sector; 2) harmonization and alignment of development planning and budgeting tools including the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the Public Sector Investment Programme (PSIP) and the national budget to support implementation of MGDS priorities; and 3) strengthening capacity for development assistance management. Ultimately, the programme will contribute to the improvements in the management, allocation and utilization of public resources for effective development and service delivery.

The Joint Programme has three outputs which are also UNDAF Action Plan outputs. During 2015 DEAP will implement the Outputs presented in Table 1 and these are:

**Output 1:** National Institutions utilize Results-Based Management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results

**Output 2:** National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and MDGs for efficient achievement of development results

**Output 3:** Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance



## Background and context

The Joint Programme on Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability (DEAP) is the UN and EU response to enhance development effectiveness by improving systems, tools and mechanisms for national policy and strategic planning, management, monitoring, evaluation, reporting and accountability. The programme seeks to entrench a culture of accountability for effective use of resources and achievement of results in public institutions. Key strategic areas of support include: 1) National Institutions utilize Results-Based Management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results; 2) National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies for efficient achievement of development results; and 3) Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance.

The Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development (MoFEPD) is the Implementing Partner for the JP and is responsible for the overall planning and management of the programme and achievement of its objectives. The main responsibility for the activities of the JP are with the Monitoring and Evaluation, Economic Planning, Budget and Debt and Aid Divisions in MoFEPD and the Performance Enforcement Division in OPC. The NSO and the MoLGRD also have an active role in the programme and are responsible for individual activities.

In 2015 the programme will continue to focus on establishing coherent, linked systems and tools to plan, monitor and account for development results. The 2015 AWP is geared towards implementation of recommendations of several major studies undertaken with support from the programme in 2014 including the reviews of State of M&E and SWGs. During 2015 changes and reforms prompted by these reports and by Government guidelines on RBM, district planning, Programme Based Budgeting and the new Development Cooperation Strategy will be consolidated in government functions. To this effect the programme will work with expanded number of districts and line ministries and with non-stake actors. The focus will be on mainstreaming the systems and tools established in previous years and maintaining the momentum for change. Another major area of intervention in 2015 is the support for the review, analysis and formulation of a new national development plan.

The 2015 AWP has defined more than 12 deliverables across the three Outputs supported by the programme. Below are the key areas of support for 2015:

- Strengthened RBM capacity and practice
- Support to the National Statistics System
- Strengthened M&E systems at all levels ( central, line ministries and district councils) – implementation of the recommendations of the M&E Study
- MGDS and MDG reviews and 3 Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys
- Organizational performance assessments in institutions (PED/OPC)
- Shift to Programme Based Budgeting
- Operationalization of Sector Working Groups
- Finalisation of National Human Development Report
- Formulation of successor National Development Strategy
- Strengthened debt and aid management functions including further upgrades to the AMP
- Implementation of the DCS and support to Malawi's co-chairmanship of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation

It is important to note that DEAP has been designed to support and operate within the structures of the government's PFEM reform programme. As the original PFEM RP expired in 2014 and a successor plan is still not in place, the 2015 AWP will be flexible to consider any new developments/agreements on the PFM agenda. The support will also be coordinated with the broader public sector reform agenda which is also currently being shaped.

Below follows the detailed 2015 Annual Work Plan. UNDP and EU will provide funding of up to \$850,000 and \$ 1,411,150 (**approx.**) respectively for this 2015 period. The support from other participating UN Agencies is through parallel funding.

## Annex I : DEAP 2015 Work Plan

UN organization-specific Annual Targets	UN organization	Activities	Time Frame				Responsible Party	Planned Budget		
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source of Funds	Amount US\$	
<b>JP Output 1: National Institutions utilize Results-Based Management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results</b>										
Indicator 1: No. of public institutions practicing RBM Baseline: 0 (2010); target 2015 (7); target (2016): 10	UNDP	<b>1. 1. Strengthen RBM capacity and practice:</b> (i) Support to setting results-oriented planning and M&E frameworks in 7 districts and 6 line ministries	x	x	x	x	EP&D/M&E and Planning	UNDP	71300 LocalCons EU	10,000
									71300 LocalCons UNDP	15,000
									75700 Training/Wksh UNDP	5,000
									75700 Training/wks EU	5,000
									71600 Travel EU	2,000
									72500 Supplies EU	5,000
									72300 Fuel UNDP	4,000
									71400 Cont-Serv/salary EU	15,000
									71400 Cont-Serv/salary UNDP	15,000
			Indicator 2: Number of staff in ministries and districts trained in RBM tools Baseline: 56 at district level; 25 in line ministries Target: 800 at district level; 260 at central level and in line ministries (2016) Target (2015): 140 at district level; 40 at central level							



	UNICEF	(iii) Support to MASEDA	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	UNICEF	Web based databank	75,000
	UNDP, UNICEF	<b>1. 3. Strengthen M&amp;E Systems at all levels (central, line ministries and District Councils)</b> (i) support quarterly meetings of M&E National Coordination Committee and TWG ( ToRs, action plan, M&E officers career path etc.); (ii) assess the functionality of the ministries and districts M&E systems; (iii) review and rationalize development impact and outcome indicators (headline indicators, indicators for equity, cost-benefit indicators); (iv) elaborate proposals for digitalized registers; (v) Development of a national evaluation plan; (vi) Support the M&E association	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	UNDP	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>205,000</b>
											71600 Travel UNDP	3,000
											75700 Training/wksp UNDP	15,000
											75700 Training/wksp EU	25,000
											72500 Supplies UNDP	3,000
											72300 Fuel UNDP	4,000
											72400 Comm UNDP	1,500
Indicator 4a: % of Ministries with functional M&E systems. Baseline: 60% (2010) Target:90% (2016); Target 2015: 80%											72300 Fuel EU	5,000
Indicator 4b: % of district councils with functional M&E systems Baseline: 7 (2012) Target: 28 (2016); Target 2015:14		(vii) Support establishment and implementation of an Integrated Performance Management Information System including the district databanks: - IT officer training, design, implementation/test of prototype, roll out to 7 districts/6 line ministries; CBM component integration); - develop standardized identifier across government MIS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	UNDP	71300 Local Cons (Local IT expert) UNDP	15,000
											75700 Training/wksh UNDP	10,000
											75700 Training/wksh EU	10,000
											72300 Fuel UNDP	3,000
											<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>94,500</b>
	UNDP	<b>1. 4. Support MGDS, MDGs</b>								UNDP	75700 Training/wks EU	10,000

										75700 Train/wksh UNDP	10,000	
										72500 Supplies EU	5,000	
										74200 Printing EU	25,000	
										72300 Fuel UNDP	3,500	
										72300 Fuel EU	3,500	
										71600 Travel UNDP	5,000	
										71600 Travel EU	5,000	
									UNICEF	Diagnostic PETS	15,000	
										75700 Train/wks UNDP	15,000	
										75700 Train/wks EU	15,000	
										72300 Fuel EU	3,000	
										71600 Travel EU	11,000	
										72400 Communic UNDP	1,500	
										72400 Communic EU	1,500	
										74200 Printing EU	20,000	
										Data collection and analysis	50,000	
										<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>199,000</b>	
										71200 Int Cons EU	40,000	
Indicator 5: Number of institutions reviewed for	UNDP	1.5. Support the Performance Enforcement Department to strengthen results assessment 1.5.1 Develop mechanisms at OPC								PED	UNDP	40,000





											74200 Commun UNDP	1,000
											72500 Supplies UNDP	1,000
											75700 Train/wksh UNDP	15,000
											72300 Fuel EU	5,000
											74200 Commun UNDP	1,000
											71600 Travel UNDP	7,000
											72800 IT equipment UNDP	20,000
											72200 Equip (Vehicle) UNDP	40,000
											<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>245,000</b>
											<b>Output 1 Total (UNDP)</b>	<b>372,500</b>
											<b>Output 1 Total (UNICEF)</b>	<b>195,000</b>
											<b>Output 1 Total (EU)</b>	<b>425,500</b>
											<b>GMS (EU)</b>	<b>27,836</b>
											<b>Output 1 Aggregate Total</b>	<b>1,020,836</b>
JP Output 2: National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and MDGs for efficient achievement of development results												
Indicator 1: Programme based budgeting piloted in institutions. Baseline: No (2012); Target 6 (2015)	UNDP	2.1. Support to Programme Based Budgeting: (i) comprehensive training to budget and development division desk officers and PED on the PBB reform; (ii) finalize PBB requirements (funding particulars, reporting templates, Chart of Accounts); (iii) work with pilot MDAs to define programmes and develop indicators and realistic targets ; (iv) assess and support districts	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
											71200 Int. Cons UNDP	30,000
											71300 Local cons EU	40,000
											75700 Training/wksh EU	15,000
											71300 Fuel EU	2,000

Indicator 2: Number of functional SWGs Baseline: 6 (2012); Target (2016): All Target (2015): 10	involved in the PBB pilot	UNDP	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	71600 Travel UNDP	2,000
										72500 Supplies UNDP	1,500
										71300 Local Cons (IT Expert) UNDP	6,000
										75700 Training/wksh UNDP	10,000
										71300 Fuel UNDP	1,000
										74200 Communication EU	1,000
										71600 Travel EU	15,000
										<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>123,500</b>
										74200 Printing UNDP	8,000
										75700 Training/wksh EU	11,000
										74200 Communication UNDP	2,000
										72500 Supplies EU	3,000
										71600 Travel UNDP	10,000
										71600 Travel EU	10,000
										75700 Training/wksh UNDP	7,500
75700 Train/wks EU	7,500										
74500 Insurance EU	5,000										
73400 Vehicle maint UNDP	7,000										
72300 Fuel EU	2,000										
61100 UNDP Staff UNDP	15,000										









Targeted Stakeholders Baseline: 1 (2014); Target: 6 ( Academia, Parliament, CSO, institutions, Private Sector)						central ministries), CSOs, Academia, Media, Private Sector and Members of Parliament; (ii) Support CSO, Private Sector, Academia Platforms and initiatives on development effectiveness.						75700 Training/wksh EU	6,000
												<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>30,500</b>
Indicator 6: % of Joint Programme results achieved as per the AWP. Baseline: 70% Target (2016): 90% Target (2015): 80%					X	<b>3.5 Programme Management</b> - Programme Steering Committee and Programme Management Coordination Committee meetings - Programme monitoring, evaluations, audits and visibility activities conducted						72500 Supplies EU	2,000
												75700 Training/wksh UNDP	4,000
												71600 Travel EU	5,000
												71300 Fuel EU	3,000
												74100 Prof Serv (Audit Fees) UNDP	10,000
												<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>24,000</b>
												<b>Output 3 Total (UNDP)</b>	<b>217,000</b>
												<b>Output 3 Total (EU)</b>	<b>541,000</b>
												<b>GMS (EU)</b>	<b>35,393</b>
												<b>Output 3 Aggregate Total</b>	<b>793,393</b>
												<b>Total Program (UNDP)</b>	<b>850,000</b>
												<b>Total Program (UNICEF)</b>	<b>195,000</b>
												<b>Total Program (EU)</b>	<b>1,324,500</b>
												<b>Total Project GMS (EU)</b>	<b>86,650</b>
												<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,456,150</b>



**ANNEX II: RISK LOG**

<b>Project Title: Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Development Effectiveness and Accountability</b>		<b>Project ID:</b>		<b>Date:</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Impact &amp; Probability (scale from 1-low to 5-high)</b>	<b>Countermeasures/ Management response</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Last Update</b>	<b>Status of risk</b>
1	Lack of high-level political commitment for Development Effectiveness and Accountability and Results-Based Management practices	Political	Risk occurring would have a very serious negative impact making it extremely difficult to achieve the programme outcome. Probability: 3 Impact: 5	OPC and MoFEPD to impress upon senior officials the need and merits of promoting development effectiveness and merits of RBM	Project Steering Committee and GFEM	26/01/2015	The risk is now medium to low as there has been varied commitment and interest from some senior government officers to spearhead development effectiveness and RBM agenda plus the National M&E Coordination Committee to reinforce commitment
2	Limited collaboration between Treasury and Economic Planning and Development (EPD) in promoting SGWs	Organizational	Risk occurring would have a negative impact making it difficult to achieve the programme outcome. Probability: 3 Impact: 5	Treasury and EPD to impress upon senior officials the need and merits of SGWs	Steering Committee	26/01/2015	The risk is still relatively high but of late there have been indications that things may improve regarding the work on SGWs e.g. OPC, EPD and Treasury participate in the drafting of SWG planning and management guidelines
3	Sector Ministries not able or willing to provide	Strategic	Risk occurring would have a serious negative impact as it will hamper achievement of the programme outcome and	OPC to impress upon Sector Ministries to collaborate and coordinate with EPD;	Steering Committee, PSs MoFEPD	26/01/2015	This risk stands at medium as some sector ministries have been providing

	M&E data to DoEPD		outputs. Probability: 3 Impact: 4	increase efforts to develop M&E capacity of Ministries. Sector M&E officers to be part of Coordination meetings.			data while some still show no willingness. Setting up of IPMIS is expected to reduce this risk to low.
4	Insufficient funding from donors	Financial	Insufficient funding may suggest limited donor confidence in the programme. This would have a serious negative impact on achieving the programme outcome and outputs. Probability: 2 Impact: 4	MoFEPD and UNDP to lobby current and new donors to allocate extra funds	Steering Committee	26/01/2015	This is no longer a risk as EU signed a Cooperation Agreement with UNDP to jointly fund DEAP activities until the end of the programme
5	Delays in financial reporting by DoEPD and Debt and Aid and PED (OPC)	Financial	Will lead to delays in transfer of quarterly advances to F and MoFEPD, hence potential delay in the implementation of programme activities. Probability: 2 Impact: 3	MoFEPD to adhere to financial reporting deadlines. UNDP to facilitate advance transfers once financial reports approved.	UNDP Programme Analyst	26/01/2015	This risk is low as there has been no significant delays in financial reporting during the last two quarters as opposed to the first quarter
6	Non-state actors not willing to participate in government committees	Strategic	Could result in lack of ownership of national initiative and ineffective achievement of results Probability: 2 Impact: 2	MoFEPD to implement awareness programmes to motivation participation by non-state actors	PSC	26/01/2015	This is still a risk and more work needs to be done particularly through Community Based Monitoring and Evaluation component and Kalondolondo.

**ANNEX III: MONITORING TOOL**

CP Component \_\_\_\_\_  
 Implementing Partner \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS AND INDICATORS INCLUDING ANNUAL TARGETS</b></p>	<p><b>PLANNED ACTIVITIES</b> <i>List all the activities including monitoring and evaluation activities to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs</i></p>	<p><b>EXPENDITURES</b> <i>List actual expenditures against activities completed</i></p>	<p><b>RESULTS OF ACTIVITIES</b> <i>For each activity, state the results of the activity</i></p>	<p><b>PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING CP OUTPUTS</b> Using data on annual indicator targets, state progress towards achieving the CP outputs. Where relevant, comment on factors that facilitated and/or constrained achievement of results including:                       - <i>What the risks and assumptions as identified in the CP M&amp;E Framework materialized or whether new risks emerged</i>                       - <i>Internal factors such as timing of inputs and activities, quality of products and services, coordination and/or other management issues</i></p>
---	---	---	---	--

**JP Output 1: National Institutions utilize Results-Based Management (RBM) systems for planning, monitoring and evaluation to enhance ownership and leadership for achievement of development results**

<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> No. of public institutions practicing RBM</p> <p>Baseline: 0 (2010; target 2015 (7); target (2016): 10</p>	<p>1.1 Support to setting results-oriented planning and M&amp;E frameworks in 7 districts and 6 line ministries</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Number of staff in ministries and districts trained in RBM tools</p> <p>Baseline: 56 at district level; 25 in line ministries</p> <p>Target: 800 at district level; 260 at central level and in line ministries (2016)</p> <p>Target (2015): 140 at district level; 40 at central level</p>	<p>1.2 RBM training for senior managers (PSS, Directors Planning, DCs-synchronised with Public Sector Reforms)</p>			
<p>Baseline: 56 at district level; 25 in line ministries</p> <p>Target: 800 at district level; 260 at central level and in line ministries (2016)</p> <p>Target (2015): 140 at district level; 40 at central level</p>	<p>1.3 capacity building support in 7 districts – training, meetings, equipment</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Number of staff within learning and training institutions who have RBM skills and knowledge and are delivering RBM training</p> <p>Baseline: 4; Target (2015): 20; Target (2016): 30</p>	<p>1.4 community-based monitoring of performance and feedback in 7 districts (agreement on core CBM indicators, facilitation of training to ADCs/VDCs in collaboration with civil society; quarterly review meetings)</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 4a:</b> % of Ministries with functional M&amp;E systems.</p> <p>Baseline: 60% (2010)</p> <p>Target: 90% (2016); Target</p>	<p>1.5 support selected training and learning institutions to introduce RBM in their regular calendar</p>			
<p>Baseline: 60% (2010)</p> <p>Target: 90% (2016); Target</p>	<p>1.6 tracking tool for key district indicators</p> <p>1.7 support WMS</p>			

<p>2015: 80%</p> <p><b>Indicator 4b: % of district councils with functional M&amp;E systems</b></p> <p>Baseline: 7 (2012) Target: 28 (2016); Target 2015:14</p>	<p>1.8 Assist in the introduction of statistics course for statisticians</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 5:</b> Number of institutions reviewed for performance and provided with feedback. Baseline 0 (2011); Target 38( 2015); Target 38 ( 2016)</p>	<p>1.9 support quarterly meetings of M&amp;E National Coordination Committee and TWG</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 6:</b> Number of MDAs that have implemented at least 70 % of OPA recommendations</p> <p>Baseline: 0; Target: 50 % (2015); Target: 75 % (2016)</p>	<p>1.10 assess the functionality of the ministries and districts M&amp;E systems</p>			
	<p>1.11 review and rationalize development impact and outcome indicators</p>			
	<p>1.12 elaborate proposals for digitalized registers</p>			
	<p>1.13 Development of a national evaluation plan</p>			
	<p>1.14 Support the M&amp;E association</p>			
	<p>1.15 Support establishment and implementation of an Integrated Performance Management Information System including the district databanks</p>			
	<p>1.16 MGDS Annual Review and MDG annual report</p>			

	<p>1.17 support PETS in health and education and further diagnosis with a focus on girls basic education and maternal mortality</p> <p>1.18 Develop mechanisms at OPC for assessing performance of public entities and holding managers accountable</p> <p>1.19 Assess the performance of public entities in achieving results</p>				
<p><b>JP Output 2: National Institutions have the capacity to align policies, programmes and budgets with national development strategies and MDGs for efficient achievement of development results</b></p>					
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Programme based budgeting piloted in institutions. Baseline: No</p>	<p>2.1 comprehensive training to budget and development division desk officers and PED on the PBB reform</p>				

<p>(2012); Target 15 (2015)</p> <p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Number of functional SWGs</p> <p>Baseline: 6 (2012); Target (2016): All Target (2015): 10</p>	<p>2.2 finalize PBB requirements (funding particulars, reporting templates, Chart of Accounts</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> National development strategy formulated through a participatory process by Dec 2015: Baseline: 0 Target: 1</p>	<p>2.3 work with pilot MDAs to define programmes and develop indicators and realistic targets</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 4:</b> Sector and district plans aligned with MGDS priorities and linked to MTEF process</p> <p>Baseline: 0 (2011); Target: 5 sectors and 10 districts (2016); Target (2015) : 4 sectors and 7 districts</p>	<p>2.4 assess and support districts involved in the PBB pilot</p> <p>2.5 Modify current budget reporting software to ensure it is compatible with PBB</p>			
	<p>2.6 Sensitisation workshops and briefings on PBB for key stakeholders</p>			
	<p>2.7 Specialized training in PBB for the core team</p> <p>2.8 Orientation in SWG Guidelines and Revive the ailing SWGs</p>			
	<p>2.9 joint learning events/trainings for SWG Secretariats and Desk Officers including study tour</p> <p>2.10 finalising the NHDR</p>			
	<p>2.11 Conduct training policy analysis and formulation for planning officers</p>			

	2.12 stakeholder consultations on new national development strategy			
	2.13 drafting strategy document incl. prioritization, results framework and costing			
	2.13 Review of Vision 2020			
<b>Output 3: Government has sufficient capacity to effectively negotiate, manage and account for development assistance</b>				
<b>Indicator 1:</b> 2014/15FY Aid Atlas produced by October 2015; Baseline: No ( 2012); Target (2015) : Yes ( 500 copies )  <b>Indicator 2a:</b> AMP integrated with IFMIS and PSIP  Baseline 2014: No Target (2015): Yes	3.1 Capacity building for DAD staff			
	3.2 Production and dissemination of debt and aid reports			
	3.3 Development of Medium Term Debt Strategy (MTDS)			
	3.4 Upgrade and extend access to AMP			
	3.5 Disseminate Development Cooperation Strategy			



<p><b>Indicator 2b:</b> Number of unique visits on the AMP public portal ; Baseline (2014): tbd; Target (2014): tbd</p>	<p>3.6 Develop Technical Assistance Guidelines and Division of Labour (DoL) Terms of Reference (ToRs) for leading, delegating, active and withdrawing DP in a sector</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 2c:</b> Number of DPs reporting on the online AMP. Baseline: 6 (2014) Target (2015): 12; Target (2016): All</p>	<p>3.7 Effective preparation of HLF and DCG meetings</p> <p>3.7) Support to invigorate Economic Governance Sector Working Group</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> T/A Guidelines and DoL ToRs in place; Baseline: 0, Target: 2 Documents</p> <p><b>Indicator 4:</b> Functional arrangements for mutual accountability in place</p> <p>Baseline: 1 DCG (2014) Target 2015: 1 HLF, 2 DCG meetings</p>	<p>3.8 Support Malawi's participation in international development effectiveness fora (Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation meetings and building blocks) and Co-chairmanship</p>			
	<p>3.9 Undertake learning and information exchange on development effectiveness for government</p>			

<p><b>Indicator 5:</b> Number of meetings around development effectiveness issues with Targeted Stakeholders  Baseline: 1 (2014); Target: 6 (Academia, Parliament, CSO, institutions, Private Sector)</p> <p><b>Indicator 6:</b> % of Joint Programme results achieved as per the AWP. Baseline: 70% Target (2016): 90% Target (2015): 80%</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

#### **ANNEX IV: INTEGRATED RESULTS AND RESOURCES FRAMEWORK (For UNDP internal reporting)**

**Indicator 1:** Existence of a development finance/cooperation and partnership framework

Baseline (2013): Yes; milestone (2015): Yes

Corresponding key activity: Support to effective development cooperation

**Indicator 2:** Existence and effectiveness of institutional framework for effective mobilization and management of development cooperation and finance

Baseline (2013): Yes; milestone (2015): Yes

Corresponding key activity: Strengthen debt and aid management functions

-Upgrade and extend access to AMP:

- Link the AMP to other Government Systems (PSIP & Budget System)

**Indicator 3:** Existence of a public financial management systems and/or development finance/cooperation/aid management systems that capture the timely, comprehensive, regular and useful information on development cooperation and finance flow in line with the IATI standard

Baseline (2013): 1; milestone (2015): 1

Corresponding key activity: Strengthen debt and aid management functions

**Indicator 4:** Existence of inclusive national annual/biennial policy dialogue that review report on development finance and cooperation and externally financed development projects/programmes

Baseline (2013): 1; milestone (2015): 3 Effective preparation of HLF and DCG meetings

Corresponding key activity: Support to effective development cooperation

-Effective preparation of HLF and DCG meetings