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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

3. Revitalise the economy and generate immediate peace dividends
   - (3.1) Employment; (3.2) Equitable access to social services

4. (Re)-establish essential administrative services
   - (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?