

Adapting to Complex and Dynamic Environments: the UN Peacebuilding Fund's new M&E approach

**Network for Peacebuilding Evaluation Thursday Talks
25 June 2015**



The Peacebuilding Support Office



PBF has four priority areas

1 Support the implementation of peace agreements and political dialogue

(1.1) Security Sector Reform, (1.2) Rule of Law, (1.3) DDR, (1.4) Political Dialogue

2 Promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflicts

(2.1) National reconciliation; (2.2) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Conflict prevention/management

□ Revitalise the economy and generate immediate peace dividends

3 (3.1) Employment; (3.2) Equitable access to social services

□ (Re)-establish essential administrative services

4 (4.1) Strengthening of national state capacity; (4.2) Extension of state authority/local administration; (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources



PBF Funding Mechanisms

Immediate Response Facility (IRF)

- Single Project
- Up to \$3 million
- Up to 18 months

IRF Packages

- Collection of single projects approved as a package
- Up to \$15 million
- Each project up to 18 months

Peacebuilding Response Facility (PRF)

- Programmatic funding, based on a Peacebuilding Priority Plan
- Typically \$7 - 15 million
- Up to three years



Improvements in Monitoring

□ Early monitoring

- Little input from PBF into results frameworks; initial projects often lacked results frameworks or had very weak links to peacebuilding outcome indicators.
- Monitoring at individual project level, usually on outputs. For programmatic PRF, no actor vested with responsibility for monitoring PRF outcomes

□ Monitoring innovations

- Close support during design stage to ensure appropriate peacebuilding outcomes are defined and measured.
- Field-initiated use of baseline and perception surveys (Liberia 2012-2014) to gauge progress on outcomes. Since then, baseline and perception surveys launched or planned in a number of other locations, including Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Guatemala and DRC.
- JSC Annual Reports on peacebuilding outcomes
- Piloting of community-based monitoring on outcomes reporting directly to JSCs in Mali



Improvements in Evaluating

□ **Early evaluation (2007-2013)**

- Fund established without M&E capacity; “light footprint”
- First M&E advisor (through UNDP secondment) in 2010
- Initial priority on final programmatic evaluations, for both accountability and learning. From 2010 to 2014, 13 evaluations in 10 PRF countries.
- Struggled with decentralized evaluation management, which contributed to deficits in evaluation timeliness, quality and utility.

□ **Evaluation innovation (2014-16)**

- Centralized management of programmatic evaluations
- Increased capacity to support UN teams in-country and manage evaluations centrally; establishment of M&E Unit in 2013.
- Three-step evaluation plan for programs: evaluability assessment, midterm partnership review, final evaluation
- Evaluations bolstered by improvements in monitoring



Persistent challenges/questions

□ Monitoring

- Identifying the right mechanism and local partnerships, and getting community buy-in
- Including control groups to understand impact
- Capturing attribution versus contribution
- Not duplicating existing efforts from within or outside the UN
- Capacity and time for analysis of data
- Capacity and openness of Fund implementers to recalibrate implementation approach, given changing circumstances

□ Evaluating

- What can we reasonably expect in terms of “peacebuilding results” in 18 months (projects) or 36 months (programs)?
- Can we expand/deepen our efforts at flexible evaluation that is more responsive to changing contexts? If yes, how do we still preserve high levels of accountability?
- Within a centralized system, how best to ensure partnership with national/local evaluation expertise? How to help strengthen this where needed?

