



United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)/ Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)

PROJECT DOCUMENT COVER SHEET

<p>Project Title: PBF Review</p>	<p>Recipient UN Organization(s): UN Secretariat</p>
<p>Project Contact: Address: Peacebuilding Support Office, UN Secretariat, New York Telephone: +1-212-963-0806 E-mail: rummel-shapiro@un.org</p>	<p>Implementing Partner(s): PBSO</p>
<p>Project Number:</p>	<p>Project Location: Various</p>
<p>Project Description: The 2013 Review responds to the Peacebuilding Fund's TORs calling for performance reviews every three years. Building on PBF's current M&E systems and independent country evaluations, this Review will focus on the analysis of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Fund's current business model and strategic positioning. The preliminary findings will be expected at the end of 2013 in time as crucial inputs for the Annual Stakeholder Meeting, the Annual Report (SG), and the formulation of the new Business Plan (2014 – 2016).</p>	<p>Total Project Cost: USD294,464 (estimated maximum) Peacebuilding Fund: UNDP BCPR TTF: Government Input: Other: Total: USD294,464 (estimated maximum) Project Start Date and Duration: May 2013 – 31 December 2014</p>
<p>Gender Marker Score¹: 0</p>	
<p>PBF Outcomes² (from an existing National Planning Framework or, if it does not exist, then PBF specific/ related to peacebuilding): The PBF business model and global strategy allow PBF support to be more strategic and effective at achieving peace relevant outcomes and to attract additional multi-annual donor commitments.</p>	

¹ The PBSO monitors the inclusion of women and girls in all PBF projects in line with SC Resolutions 1325, 1612, 1888, 1889.

² PBF outcome areas

1: Support the implementation of peace agreements and political dialogue (Priority Area 1):

(1.1) SSR, (1.2) ReL; (1.3) DDR; (1.4) Political Dialogue;

2: Promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflicts (Priority Area 2):

(2.1) National reconciliation; (2.1) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Management of natural resources;

3: Revitalize the economy and generate immediate peace dividends (Priority Area 3);

(3.1) Short-term employment generation; (3.2) Sustainable livelihoods

4) (Re)-establish essential administrative services (Priority Area 4)

(4.1) Public administration; (4.2) Public service delivery (including infrastructure).

(for IRF-funded projects)

Recipient UN Organization(s): <i>United Nations Secretariat Department of Peacekeeping Operations</i> <i>Joel Cohen</i> <i>Executive Office</i> <i>Signature</i> <i>Executive Office: DPKO and DFS</i> <i>Date & Seal</i>	Representative of National Authorities N/A
Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) <i>Judy Cheng-Hopkins</i> <i>Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support</i> <i>Signature</i> Peacebuilding Support Office, NY <i>Date & Seal</i> <i>30 May 2013</i>	Resident Coordinator (RC) N/A

Table of contents:

COMPONENT 1: (The “Why”)

- a) Situation analysis, financial gap analysis and assessment of critical peacebuilding needs
- b) Project/ Portfolio justification

COMPONENT 2: (The “What”)

- a) Project focus and target groups
- b) Theory of changes: linking activities to results

COMPONENT 3: (The “How”)

- a) Implementation approach
- b) Budget
- c) Sustainability
- d) Risk management
- e) Results framework and monitoring and evaluation

COMPONENT 4: (The “Who”)

- a) Implementing Agencies and their capacity
- b) Project management arrangements and coordination
- c) Administrative Arrangements

COMPONENT 5: Annexes

Annex A: Donor Mapping in Peacebuilding Strategic Outcome Area/s (including UN agencies) and gap analysis

Annex B: Mapping of UN Agency Capacity table

Annex C: Organigram of Project management structures

Annex D: Target table for outcome and output indicators of the results framework

Annex E: Project Summary (to be submitted to MPTF-Office for Gateway upload)

PROJECT COMPONENTS:

NOTE: This project, to commission the first independent global review of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), is not a standard country-based PBF project. The Immediate Response Facility (IRF) is being used exceptionally to fund the Review. The approach of using PBF programme funds for the Review was discussed with the PBF Advisory Group and they endorsed the final Terms of Reference where this approach was stated. As per standard procedure, the Project was shared with the Peacebuilding Contact Group.

COMPONENT 1: (The “WHY”) (maximum one and a half pages)

a) Situation analysis, financial gap analysis and assessment of critical peacebuilding needs
The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) was created in 2005, and has been operational since 2007. A first review was undertaken by the UN’s Office of Internal Oversight Services in 2008. The Fund’s core Terms of Reference were revised in 2009, and several donors joined together to commission a management review during the same year. Since then, the Fund has developed and begun implementation of a Business Plan 2011-13 and an associated M&E system anchored around a Performance Management Plan.

PBF Application Guidelines were published in 2009 and were updated in March 2013. After six years of operation, 2013 offers an opportune moment to review the PBF’s business model and strategic positioning within the peacebuilding architecture (PBF/PBC) and compared to other funding instruments (WB, AFDB). These areas had not been sufficiently addressed within the scope of PBF’s independent country evaluations.

b) Project (Portfolio) Justification

Taking note of the above chronology, PBSO proposed to the Secretary-General’s independent Advisory Group for the PBF that a Review be undertaken in 2013, which the Advisory Group endorsed. Undertaking a Review in 2013 fulfills a requirement of the Fund’s Terms of Reference (as revised in 2009), which call for independent evaluations every three years³.

Undertaking a Review in 2013 is also timely as 2013 is the last year of the 2011-2013 PBF Business Plan and because of the various changes that have taken place over the last couple of years with view to strengthening the strategic positioning of the Fund and improving the overall performance of country programmes. These include: the revision of PBF Guidelines, a stronger focus on results monitoring and management, collaboration with the World Bank and African Development Bank, surge support offered by PBSO to countries as pre-support before they start implementation of their Priority Plans.

COMPONENT 2: (the “What”) (maximum one and a half pages)

a) Project focus and target groups

In order to assess the effectiveness of the global strategy and approach of the Fund, the Review will focus on a series of questions under two broad categories.

The first category centers on the **business model** for the Fund, its strengths and weaknesses, and how it can be improved upon. This will include reflection upon the mechanics of the Fund, its two main facilities, the role of the Joint Steering Committee;

³ A/63/818, paragraph 6.3

relations between PBSO management in New York and the field, technical assistance for peacebuilding programme design, and relations with partners. How can the decision-making model – budget approval by HQ; selection of fund users and projects at country level – more effectively generate a response from the UN system to the country demand for assisting in consolidating peacebuilding processes?

The second category centers on the **strategic positioning** of the Fund at both global and national levels (among and within countries). Globally, the Review should explore the appropriateness of the set of countries that the PBF has so far assisted, and the processes that PBSO has put in place to make country eligibility recommendations. At country level, do the activities that the PBF is financing position it as the catalytic actor for peacebuilding that was envisioned by PBF founders? The review should reflect on how PBF activities respond to increasing demand for strong partnerships with national governments, IFIs and civil society organizations all the while ensuring high value for money in an era of scarce resources.

The Review will *not* carry out itself impact evaluations of country level activities but using for its performance assessment as a major data source the findings of previous independent evaluations of PBF country portfolios⁴. Further information is available in the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the Review, attached to this document. These TORs were completed following a thorough consultation with the PBF Advisory Group, the member states, and the Peacebuilding Contact Group in the UN.

b) Theory of changes: linking activities to results

By providing an assessment of the PBF business model and strategic positioning and setting out clear recommendations for improvements in these areas, the PBF Review will give to PBSO the guidance and tools necessary to strengthen its global strategy, its prioritization of programming, and its quality assurance support. All of this will be reflected in PBSO's next Business Plan.

By strengthening its strategic positioning, clarifying its value added and its modes of operation, the Fund will be able to ensure that its support more strategically targets the peace relevant areas which will have the most catalytic effects at the country and global levels.

This, in turn, will lead to a stronger impact of PBF support on the ground, and a stronger contribution to consolidation of peace and non-relapse into conflict of countries supported by PBF.

The demonstration of a clear strategic focus and of peace-relevant results by PBF will attract additional multi-annual donor support.

COMPONENT 3: (the “How” or Implementation Strategy) (maximum one and a half pages)

a) Implementation approach

The review will be undertaken by a consultant team, which will be recruited using transparent and competitive UN procedures by the UN Secretariat.

⁴ Burundi (2010), the Comoros (2011), Guinea Bissau (2011), Nepal (2011), Sierra Leone (2011), Sri Lanka (2011), Timor Leste (2011), Central African Republic (2012), Guinea (2012) Kyrgyzstan (2012), Uganda (2012)

This review will take a phased approach, using a consultative process. The inception report and initial findings will be discussed with PBF stakeholders from the UN system (PCG/SPG), Member States and community of practitioners. The approach will consist of the following phases: Phase I: Desk review and inception report; Phase II: Key informant interviews; Phase III: Field work; and Phase IV: Drafting and finalization.

b) Budget

In October 2012 and April 2013, the PBF Advisory Group made it clear that the PBF Review is a programme expense. The Group was also informed that the costs of the Review were not expected to exceed 0.1% of the total BF allocations to date, that is, USD300,000.

The total estimated budget for the Review will be a maximum of USD294,464. The break-down is provided in the table below.

CATEGORIES	Expenses	TOTAL
1. Staff and other personnel	- 125 days for two senior professionals (in total, not each) at US\$1,000 per day; - 60 days for two junior professionals (in total, not each) at US\$500 per day	US\$155,000
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials		US\$20,000
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture (including Depreciation)		US\$50,000
4. Contractual services		
5. Travel	- 8 economy class tickets plus DSA for 20 days (for all members in total – 2 tickets per person) - 2 economy tickets to New York (for senior professionals) plus DSA for 2 days	US\$50,200
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts		
7. General Operating and other Direct Costs		
Sub-Total Project Costs		US\$275,200
8. Indirect Support Costs*		US\$19,264
TOTAL		US\$294,464

7% OK.

* The rate shall not exceed 7% of the total of categories 1-7, as specified in the PBF MOU and should follow the rules and guidelines of each recipient organization. Note that Agency-incurred direct project implementation costs should be charged to the relevant budget line, according to the Agency's regulations, rules and procedures.

c) Sustainability

N/A

d) Risk management

Risks:

Risk	Likelihood (high, medium low)	Severity of impact on project (high, medium, low)	Mitigating Strategy
PBF Review does not provide adequate (quality) guidance to strengthen the PBF business model and strategic positioning with view to achieving better results and attracting additional financing	low	high	Provision of clear TORs for the review with objectives, tasks and a timeline; sound review of the applicants' expertise by the Procurement Office & PBSO under the support of the senior M&E Advisor; detailed briefing of consultants by PBSO and Advisory Board; provision of feedback on inception report and draft Review report by PBSO, member states and other stakeholders as quality assurance.
The information provided by PBSO/partners is not adequate to make informed recommendations in the Review.	low	medium	The Review is structured as to draw on a variety of sources. The field visits include two clusters of several countries with different circumstances to ensure a wide pool of lessons and approaches. In the field, the consultants will meet with various government, UN and non-government stakeholders, including direct beneficiaries. In addition, consultants will be provided with written materials and interviews with PBSO Program Officers for additional information.
PBF Review timeline is delayed due to logistical issues	low	medium	The timeline for the Review incorporates sufficient time to allow for unforeseen events and all the activities. The UN Country Offices in countries which are part of the field review will be contacted to designate an officer to help with logistics on the ground.

e) Results framework and Monitoring and evaluation:

Results Framework for IRF projects or portfolio of projects

<i>Policy statement / national roadmap for peace building: N/A</i>								
<i>Purpose of PBF support (type of expected change): To strengthen the PBF added value and strategic positioning at global and country level with view to achieving better results and attracting additional financing.</i>								
<i>Theory of change statement: By providing an assessment of the PBF business model and strategic positioning and setting out clear recommendations for improvement in these areas, the PBF Review will give to PBSO the guidance and tools necessary to strengthen its global strategy, its prioritization of programming, its quality assurance support. The Fund will be able to ensure that its support more strategically targets the peace relevant areas which will have the most catalytic effects at the country and global levels. This will lead to a stronger impact of PBF support on the ground and attract additional multi-annual donor commitments.</i>								
(1) Outcomes and type of change required	(2) Indicators	(3) Baselines and time-bound targets	(4) Outputs and activities	(5) Indicators	(6) Baselines and time-bound targets	(7) RUNO & party responsible for mobilizing inputs	(8) Inputs/ budget	(9) Assumptions
Outcome 1 : The PBF business model and global strategy allow PBF support to be more strategic and effective at achieving peace relevant outcomes and to attract additional multi-annual donor commitments	1.1 Positive trend in donor funding pledges (total amount \$ and # of donors) in response to the findings/recommendations of the review 1.2 Evidence of improved programme effectiveness (# of projects contributing to PB)		PBF Review Consultant Team: PBF Review inception report; PBF Review draft Report; PBF Review final Report; PBSO: Dissemination and incorporation of findings	1.1 PBF Review report 1.2 PBSO dissemination of report 1.3 # of changes to PBSO guidelines/strategy		DPKO/PBSO	USD294,464	PBF Review proceeds on schedule, PBF Review consultant team provides a high quality report with clear recommendations
Outcome 2: The PBF branch consolidates current core	New Business Plan endorsed by PBF Advisory Group		PBF Review Team: PBF Review inception report; PBF Review draft Report;			DPKO/PBSO		PBF Review proceeds on schedule, PBF Review

<p>business areas and explores new strategic options for better positioning vis-à-vis other funding instruments (WB/AFDB, New Deal)</p>				<p>PBF Review final Report PBSO: Preparation and presentation of next Business Plan</p>		<p>consultant team provides a high quality report with clear recommendations</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

- Systems for M&E of the project (portfolio):

The M&E Unit of PBF will provide the day to day oversight to the PBF Review, including liaison, quality assurance and support as well as keeping sight of timelines and progress.

COMPONENT 4: (The “WHO”) (maximum one and a half pages)

a) Implementing agencies and their capacity:

PBSO has a long experience of undertaking and overseeing evaluations. It has an experienced M&E Unit. The review consultant team will include two Senior professionals with demonstrated expertise in the areas of peacebuilding, programme evaluation and performance assessment of business models and operations within the United Nations environment. It will also include two junior professionals to assist in the research and data collection and analysis.

b) Project Management Arrangements and coordination:

DPKO is the recipient UN agency responsible for the finances and the overall implementation of the review. PBSO is the implementing agency which is responsible for the recruitment of the consultant team and the day-to-day running of the Review.

The PBF Review consultant team will report to the Chief of the PBF Branch of the PBSO. The PBF M&E Unit will provide the quality assurance and day-to-day technical guidance to the PBF Team. The PBF M&E Unit and the Chief of the PBF branch will approve the Inception Report and the draft and final reports of the Review Team. The PBF Secretariats in country will be supporting the in-country travel/logistics of the PBF Review Team.

c) Administrative Arrangements (standardized paragraphs – do not remove)

The UNDP MPTF Office serves as the Administrative Agent (AA) of the PBF and is responsible for the receipt of donor contributions, the transfer of funds to Recipient UN Organizations, the consolidation of narrative and financial reports and the submission of these to the PBSO and the PBF donors. As the Administrative Agent of the PBF, MPTF Office transfers funds to RUNOS on the basis of the signed Memorandum of Understanding between each RUNO and the MPTF Office.

AA Functions

On behalf of the Participating Organizations, and in accordance with the UNDG-approved “Protocol on the Administrative Agent for Multi Donor Trust Funds and Joint Programmes, and One UN funds” (2008)⁵, the MPTF Office as the AA of the PBF will:

- Disburse funds to each of the RUNO in accordance with instructions from the PBSO. The AA will normally make each disbursement within three (3) to five (5) business days after having received instructions from the PBSO along with the relevant Submission form and Project document signed by all participants concerned;

⁵ Available at: <http://www.undg.org/docs/9885/Protocol-on-the-role-of-the-AA,-10.30.2008.doc>

- Consolidate narrative reports and financial statements (Annual and Final), based on submissions provided to the AA by RUNOS and provide the PBF consolidated progress reports to the donors and the PBSO;
- Proceed with the operational and financial closure of the project in the MPTF Office system once the completion is notified by the RUNO (accompanied by the final narrative report, the final certified financial statement and the balance refund);
- Disburse funds to any RUNO for any costs extension that the PBSO may decide in accordance with the PBF rules & regulations.

Accountability, transparency and reporting of the Recipient United Nations Organizations

Recipient United Nations Organizations will assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to them by the Administrative Agent. Such funds will be administered by each RUNO in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures.

Each RUNO shall establish a separate ledger account for the receipt and administration of the funds disbursed to it by the Administrative Agent from the PBF account. This separate ledger account shall be administered by each RUNO in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures, including those relating to interest. The separate ledger account shall be subject exclusively to the internal and external auditing procedures laid down in the financial regulations, rules, directives and procedures applicable to the RUNO.

Each RUNO will provide the Administrative Agent and the PBSO (for narrative reports only) with:

- Bi-annual progress reports to be provide no later than July 31st;
- Annual narrative progress reports, to be provided no later than three months (31 March) after the end of the calendar year;
- Annual financial statements as of 31 December with respect to the funds disbursed to it from the PBF, to be provided no later than four months (30 April) after the end of the calendar year;
- Final narrative reports, after the completion of the activities in the approved programmatic document, to be provided no later than four months (30 April) of the year following the completion of the activities. The final report will give a summary of results and achievements compared to the goals and objectives of the PBF; and
- Certified final financial statements after the completion of the activities in the approved programmatic document, to be provided no later than six months (30 June) of the year following the completion of the activities.
- Unspent Balance at the closure of the project would have to been refunded and a notification sent to the MPTF Office, no later than six months (30 June) of the year following the completion of the activities.

Ownership of Equipment, Supplies and Other Property

Ownership of equipment, supplies and other property financed from the PBF shall vest in the RUNO undertaking the activities. Matters relating to the transfer of ownership by the RUNO shall be determined in accordance with its own applicable policies and procedures.

Public Disclosure

The PBSO and Administrative Agent will ensure that operations of the PBF are publicly disclosed on the PBF website (<http://unpbf.org>) and the Administrative Agent's website (<http://mptf.undp.org>).

Component 5: Annexes

Annex A:

Donor Mapping in Peacebuilding Strategic Outcome Area/s (including UN agencies) and gap analysis

N/A

Annex B:

Mapping of UN Recipient Organizations

N/A

Annex C

Project Board Organigram

N/A

Annex D

Target Table for Outcome and Output Indicators of the Results Framework

N/A