

**SECRETARY-GENERAL'S PEACEBUILDING FUND  
PROJECT DOCUMENT TEMPLATE**



United Nations  
Peacebuilding

**PBF PROJECT DOCUMENT**

(Length : Max. 12 pages plus cover page and annexes)

<b>Country (ies): United Nations</b>	
<b>Project Title: Country Support for Design, Monitoring and Evaluation</b> Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway (if existing project): 92393	
<b>PBF project modality:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRF <input type="checkbox"/> PRF	<b>If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund <b>Name of Recipient Fund:</b>
<b>List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc): DPPA, UNOPS, UNFPA</b> <b>List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:</b>	
<b>Expected project commencement date<sup>1</sup>: 5 November 2014</b> <b>Project duration in months:<sup>2</sup> 86 (74+ 12 months extension) new expected end date: 31 December 2021</b> <b>Geographic zones for project implementation: global</b>	
<b>Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Gender promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Youth promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-border or regional project	
<b>Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization):</b> <b>DPPA: \$5,199,898</b> <b>UNOPS: \$800,000</b> <b>UNFPA: \$199,555</b> <b>Total: \$6,199,453</b> <i>*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO's approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account. For payment of second and subsequent tranches the Coordinating agency needs to demonstrate expenditure/commitment of at least 75% of the previous tranche and provision of any PBF reports due in the period elapsed.</i>	
Any other existing funding for the project (amount and source): Project total budget:	

<sup>1</sup> Note: actual commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.

<sup>2</sup> Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

<b>PBF 1-2<sup>t</sup> tranche:</b> DPPA: \$ 4,842,767 UNFPA: \$ 199,555 Total: \$5,042,322	<b>PBF 3<sup>rd</sup> tranche*:</b> UNOPS: \$ 800,000 Total: \$800,000	<b>PBF 4<sup>th</sup> tranche*:</b> DPPA: \$ 357,131 Total: \$357,131	<b>__ tranche</b> XXXX: \$ XXXXXX XXXX: \$ XXXXXX XXXX: \$ XXXXXX Total:
<b>Two-three sentences with a brief project description and succinct explanation of how the project is time sensitive, catalytic and risk-tolerant/ innovative:</b> This project provides for an enhanced design, monitoring and evaluation function at PBSO to directly support country-based development of peacebuilding programming and to manage country-base evaluations. The combined DM&E support will help strengthen gender-sensitivity of PBF’s interventions through increased advocacy during programme or project design and the mainstreaming of gender sensitivity within evaluations commissioned by PBSO.			
<b>Summarize the in-country project consultation and endorsement process prior to submission to PBSO, including through any PBF Steering Committee where it exists:</b>			
<b>Project Gender Marker score: <u>  2  </u><sup>3</sup></b> Specify % and \$ of total project budget allocated to activities in direct pursuit of gender equality and women’s empowerment: _____			
<b>Project Risk Marker score: <u>  0  </u><sup>4</sup></b>			
<b>Select PBF Focus Areas</b> which best summarizes the focus of the project ( <i>select ONLY one</i> ): <u>  4.3  </u> <sup>5</sup> If applicable, <b>UNDAF outcome(s)</b> to which the project contributes: n/a If applicable, <b>Sustainable Development Goal</b> to which the project contributes: n/a			
<b>Type of submission:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> New project <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project amendment	<b>If it is a project amendment, select all changes that apply and provide a brief justification:</b>  <b>Extension of duration:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional duration in months: 12 (new end date 31 December 2021) <b>Change of project outcome/ scope:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Change of budget allocation between outcomes or budget categories of more than 15%:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Additional PBF budget:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Additional amount by recipient organization:		

<sup>3</sup> **Score 3** for projects that have gender equality as a principal objective  
**Score 2** for projects that have gender equality as a significant objective  
**Score 1** for projects that contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly (less than 15% of budget)

<sup>4</sup> **Risk marker 0** = low risk to achieving outcomes  
**Risk marker 1** = medium risk to achieving outcomes  
**Risk marker 2** = high risk to achieving outcomes

<sup>5</sup> **PBF Focus Areas** are:  
(1.1) SSR, (1.2) Rule of Law; (1.3) DDR; (1.4) Political Dialogue;  
(2.1) National reconciliation; (2.2) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Conflict prevention/management;  
(3.1) Employment; (3.2) Equitable access to social services  
(4.1) Strengthening of essential national state capacity; (4.2) extension of state authority/local administration; (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources (including PBF Secretariats)

	<p><b>Brief justification for extension:</b></p> <p>This extension concerns only the components managed by UNOPS. Deployments of experts on the UNOPS-managed surge roster was lower than expected in the second half of 2019 and in the entire year of 2020, due to the coronavirus pandemic-related travel bans and other restrictions, among other reasons. PBF has further identified the ongoing and increased need of surge support to its operations beyond the initial project end date and continues to rely on the Programme Support Team of peacebuilding experts also in order to achieve the objectives of the PBF 2020-2024 Strategy.. No additional funding is required to cover this extension of 12 months.</p>
--	--

**PROJECT SIGNATURES:**

	<p><b>Recipient Organization(s)<sup>6</sup></b></p> <p></p> <p><i>Signature</i> <i>Date &amp; Seal</i></p> <p>Kirk Bayabos Head of Cluster, SDC <b>UNOPS</b></p>
	<p><b>Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)</b></p> <p></p> <p><i>Signature</i> <i>Date &amp; Seal</i>      December 8, 2020</p> <p>for/ Oscar Fernandez-Taranco Assistant Secretary-General, Peacebuilding Support Office (<b>PBSO</b>)</p>

---

<sup>6</sup> Please include a separate signature block for each direct recipient organization under this project.

## I. Peacebuilding Context and Rationale for PBF support (4 pages max)

- a) A brief summary of **conflict analysis findings** as they relate to this project, focusing on the driving factors of tensions/conflict that the project aims to address and an analysis of the main actors/ stakeholders that have an impact on or are impacted by the driving factors, which the project will aim to engage. This analysis must be gender- and age- sensitive.

Effective peacebuilding programming begins with well-targeted and conceived programme design. Part and parcel of good programme design is ensuring that a given initiative's theory of change captures the logic of the programme's intervention, laying out the rationale for the specific outputs and clearly articulating the anticipated, aggregate effect on peacebuilding. As noted in the PBF's first-ever global Review (2013), for most sector specialists, identifying specific peacebuilding outcomes, articulating programme logic through a theory of change, and identifying indicators that capture the desired *peacebuilding* effect is no easy task.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, PBSO has frequently received requests for monitoring and evaluation specialists with specific peacebuilding experience throughout the design stage.

Monitoring and evaluation support, however, does not end with the acceptance of a proposal. Robust monitoring and evaluation is an essential aspect of increased accountability and improved learning for any organization. PBF has been continually enhancing these systems since 2010.<sup>8</sup> The impulse to improve has come internally as well externally, through the recommendations of various evaluative exercises which have called for the establishment of stronger M&E systems<sup>9</sup> and for enhancing the integration of gender throughout PBF evaluations.<sup>10</sup> More recently, the PBF 2013 Review recognized the positive impact these improvements had begun to make and DfID's review of its four-year partnership arrangement with the Fund in 2016 scored the PBF as "exceeds expectations", which serves to underscore the relevance and impact of the DM&E investments to date and the need for continued and expanded support to country partners.<sup>11</sup>

### **Design Support Efforts to Date.**

Starting in 2010, PBF acquired dedicated M&E expertise through the secondment of a Senior M&E Advisor from UNDP, tasked with providing all necessary support to PBF countries as well as policy development within PBF headquarters. In early 2013, M&E in PBF saw the arrival of a JPO and the eventual recruitment of a PBF Senior M&E Advisor, leading to the establishment of an M&E Unit in mid-2013.<sup>12</sup> Since

---

<sup>7</sup> Kluyskens and Clark (2013) Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund, p. 60.

<sup>8</sup> Given limited resources, until recently the PBF has relied exclusively on external assistance for its M&E capacity, including the generous secondment of a senior M&E advisor from UNDP and a JPO funded by the Government of Australia. While external support has been crucial for initiating this work, it is contingent on partners' prioritisation of scarce resources and, thus, not predictable.

<sup>9</sup> Kluyskens and Clark (2013), OIOS (2008), "Report of the Office of Internal Oversight on the Independent Evaluation of the Peacebuilding Fund," Ball and van Beijnum (2009) "Review of the Peacebuilding Fund"

<sup>10</sup> See recommendations from the recent SWAP 2014 Evaluation Performance review.

<sup>11</sup> Kluyskens and Clark (2013), p. 67.

<sup>12</sup> While providing essential M&E services, two members of the Unit also serve as Programme Officer in four of PBF's 23 operational countries. Moreover, on 1 July 2014 the UNDP seconded M&E Advisor retired, leaving the M&E Unit with one senior M&E Advisor and a part time M&E officer filled through a JPO position (ending in February 2015).

then, Unit members have been experimenting with country-tailored support during the design and implementation stages of the programming cycle through in-country support missions, VTC workshops, teleconferences and the drafting and quality assurance of key programme documents, including Priority Plans and project documents, and their associated results frameworks.

Experience with this type of close accompaniment has shown that where such support is not provided, in-country programme staff struggle to present clear peacebuilding theories of change, to identify appropriate indicators and adequate monitoring frameworks to gauge their progress on peacebuilding outcomes. The PBF's global Review (2013) validated this conclusion, noting that PBF's current "almost skeletal PBF Headquarters capacity" was insufficient for this task. In order to enable better programme design and the development of adequate M&E frameworks at programme conception, dedicated Design, Monitoring and Evaluation staff must be sufficiently expanded.<sup>13</sup>

### **Establishing the Practice of Independent Evaluations.**

From 2010 to 2013, PBSO ensured the organization of final evaluations of its portfolios in 11 countries. While this improvement in evaluation coverage has been welcome, the quality and timeliness of these evaluations has varied significantly across cases, driven largely by in-country capacity and willingness to address the particularities of independently evaluating peacebuilding interventions (as opposed to standard development interventions).

Why is the commissioning of high quality peacebuilding evaluations challenging? Similar to humanitarian evaluation, the evaluation of peacebuilding interventions is a subset within evaluation practice that requires specific expertise. Peacebuilding evaluators utilize a relatively new and innovative set of tools for confronting challenges stemming from the nature of conflict and post-conflict environments. Typical challenges include fluid programming contexts and constrained access to monitoring data and beneficiaries, all of which usually signal negative implications for quality evaluations using standard techniques. In addition to these environmental challenges, peacebuilding evaluators frequently confront projects in which the peacebuilding aspect of an intervention's expected outcomes is not explicit or has become blurred over time. In these cases, peacebuilding evaluators must construct a *post hoc* logic model, including a theory of change and associated indicators, for assessing the specific peacebuilding gains an intervention has accomplished. In the absence of doing this, evaluations tend to assess a project's outcomes within a given sector – education, security, local governance – at the expense of examining peacebuilding outcomes, rendering the evaluation only marginally useful for peacebuilding practice and PBF accountability. Moreover, peacebuilding evaluation needs to combine evaluation of multidisciplinary programming with the consideration of impact on the political objectives of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan.

Guaranteeing quality peacebuilding evaluations, then, requires the specific technical expertise noted above, as well as administrative and political will to ensure that sufficient resources are in place in a timely fashion. Regarding technical expertise, despite the fact that more than 30 UN entities have received PBF funding, none

---

<sup>13</sup> Kluyskens and Clark (2013), pp. 49 and 67.

possess in house expertise in peacebuilding evaluation, either in the countries receiving PBF funds or within headquarters. Instead, the Peacebuilding Fund has been called upon to assist UN country partners to co-manage such evaluations from afar through a hybrid arrangement that limits the PBF's ability to ensure the timeliness, independence and quality of the evaluation. This hybrid arrangement frequently produces tension between PBSO's lead in managing an evaluation and the practical constraint that funds dedicated to evaluation and procurement of consultants sit at the country level and require local administration.

Since the initial approval of this project in late 2014, the PBF has worked hard to implement its comprehensive DM&E Framework, including the global evaluation framework and rolling out enhanced monitoring at country level for programmatic investments. These investments resulted in a five-fold increase in evaluation coverage from 2014 to 2016 and a six-fold increase in technical support to countries during both design and implementation, and have triggered a near across the board improvement in programmatic results. Since then, evaluation coverage has continued to increase, providing a wider evidence base to inform PBF's operations and an enhanced accountability framework for donors and other Fund partners.

- b) A brief description of how the project aligns with/ supports **existing** Governmental and UN **strategic frameworks**, how it ensures **national ownership** and how the project complements/ builds on any other relevant interventions in this sector/area, including any lessons from previous PBF support.

The Peacebuilding Fund Strategic Plan 2017-2019 sets the establishment of a surge roster as a clear priority.

## **II. Project content, strategic justification and implementation strategy (4 pages max Plus Results Framework Annex)**

- a) A brief **description of the project content** – in a nutshell, what results is the project trying to achieve, and how does it aim to address the conflict analysis factors outlined in Section I (must be gender- and age- sensitive).

Overall aim of the project is to ensure that peacebuilding design, monitoring and evaluation is strengthened within PBF-funded programming.

- b) **Project result framework**, outlining all project results, outputs, activities with indicators of progress, baselines and targets (must be gender- and age- sensitive). Use **Annex B**; no need to provide additional narrative here.
- c) Provide a **project-level 'theory of change'** – i.e. how do you expect these interventions to lead to results and why have these interventions been selected. Specify if any of these interventions are particularly risky.

If country partners are supported with dedicated peacebuilding M&E expertise from the design through evaluation of interventions, interventions will have clearer peacebuilding outcomes and evaluations will be timelier and of higher peacebuilding quality.

- d) **Project implementation strategy** – explain **how** the project will undertake the activities to ensure most effective and efficient achievement of results, including justification for geographic zones, criteria for beneficiary selection, timing among various activities, coherence between results and any other information on implementation approach (must be gender- and age-sensitive). No need to repeat all outputs and activities from the Result Framework.

**DM&E country support.**

In its Business Plan 2014-16, the PBF committed to a target of roughly 20 countries actively receiving PBF support at any given time. Currently, PBF allocations have translated into approximately 200 active projects. The proposed IRF project will ensure that DM&E peacebuilding specialists are available to provide close support and ongoing guidance to country partners throughout the project cycle. Each of the specialists will act as focal point for approximately 10 countries.

Enhanced DM&E country support (through the DM&E experts) will consist of providing focused and flexible guidance to country-based PBF partners at key moments in the programming cycle. In particular, this assistance and quality assurance will be provided to the country teams while drafting Peacebuilding Priority Plans (PRF) and project documents (PRF and IRF). More specifically, the DM&E experts will assist the country teams to draft strong results frameworks, opening up opportunities to ensure that the ambitious political objectives of Priority Plans are reflected in monitoring and reporting mechanisms. Such work will include, when required, conducting Results Framework Workshops to translate the conceptual outcomes noted in the PRF or IRF proposals into measurable indicators.<sup>14</sup>

DM&E specialists will also review all proposals and will sit on PBSO Project Appraisal Committees to provide an assessment of the proposals' M&E frameworks. The DM&E specialists will also provide broader quality assurance to project design, including ensuring the project's general coherence with the PBF Priority Plan as well as helping to ensure that programmes are clearly designed to be supportive of the political strategy of the mission leadership and address the threats to peace and stability as identified by the conflict analysis.

Following application approval, DM&E specialists will work with country-based partners to encourage the timely undertaking of monitoring exercises, especially baseline surveys and the rolling-out of new "community based monitoring mechanisms" foreseen in this Business Plan. DM&E specialists will support country-based partners to utilize evidence from the monitoring systems established by projects and Priority Plans within the routine reporting required by MPTF-O and the PBF and for improved Results-Based Monitoring of interventions. DM&E specialists will assist in periodic review of implementation progress, including anticipated participatory eligibility reviews at the 5-year mark. While some of this has been done in the past, it has been on an ad hoc basis and several PBF evaluations have noted that

---

<sup>14</sup> Starting in late 2013, PBF initiated a two-phased approach for approving results frameworks for PRF applications: phase one that identifies indicators for Priority Plan level outcomes, to be completed upon approval of the PRF application, and phase two that includes the select project-level outcome indicators associated with each PPP outcome. While more labour-intensive for PBF staff, the revised approach to Results Frameworks helps to focus results in the early stages on higher-level PPP outcomes and ensures cohesion of project results within a given PPP outcome.

a lack of adequate real time monitoring has occasionally contributed to missed opportunities for course correction.

In addition, DM&E specialists will manage the first of three evaluation exercises that will be newly required of PRF countries: the evaluability assessments. Details of the new PRF evaluation strategy, including the evaluability assessments, are provided below, in the section on Evaluation Management.

### **Country Evaluation Strategy.**

For PRFs, evaluation will be strengthened through a more comprehensive approach to periodic review throughout the programme cycle. As previously mentioned, PBF will aim to engage country partners at three key moments: early in the implementation stage through an evaluability assessment, at midterm, and again for a final evaluation that will seek to measure the impact of PBF's investments. Table 1, below, reflects the proposed division of labour within the M&E Unit across the three evaluative exercises. Wherever relevant, the M&E Unit will seek to engage UNEG members to elicit their support of country-based colleagues and to increase their own headquarters' awareness of peacebuilding M&E. By providing three opportunities to reflect on anticipated outcomes and the fitness of inputs and outputs to achieve those outcomes, PBSO hopes to encourage a stronger connection between evaluation and programme management/learning.

The PBF's new centralized evaluation function will apply to the evaluation of PBF's more programmatic PRF investments, as well as packages of IRF projects in a given country.<sup>15</sup> Evaluation of individual project-based IRF projects will continue to be managed by the implementing RUNO. Monitoring of programme and project implementation will continue to be the responsibility of in-country partners in the JSC Secretariats and RUNOS, respectively, with support from PBF's M&E Unit. The M&E Unit anticipates that its new evaluation strategy will be piloted in five countries where PBF has allocated resources recently: Burundi, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Papua New Guinea, and Yemen.

For this purpose, PBSO will hire an evaluation manager who will ensure that all planned evaluation work is delivered on time and on budget. The evaluation manager will work closely with programme officers, DM&E specialists and PBSO's gender focal point, as well as field-based colleagues, government counterparts and PCG members, to ensure that the mid-term reviews and final evaluations are commissioned in a timely manner, that the right external expertise is sourced to undertake the evaluative exercises and that external consultants have the information and access they need in order to produce high quality evaluations. Evaluation Terms of Reference will be based on a comparable standard, customized as needed to individual country contexts. In addition to coordinating the work of the evaluation consultants, the evaluation manager will provide quality assurance on the consultants' work, including managing Reference Groups, reviewing preliminary work by the consultants, and the conduct of field visits during evaluation data collection wherever feasible. The evaluation manager will also take the lead in organizing a management response to

---

<sup>15</sup> This distribution refers to PBF investments before the effective start date of Strategic Plan 2017-2019. Since the launch of the current Strategic Plan, PRF allocations have been defined as any project or package of projects approved for funding to a PBF-eligible country (with the exception of GYPI projects).

each evaluation and for a dissemination strategy on all evaluation findings, thereby strengthening PBSO's knowledge management processes.

The proposed arrangement will provide greater predictability, and enable PBSO to better plan its global strategy for evaluation. Currently, PBF largely is responsive to field-based initiatives or demand for evaluation. By managing a global portfolio, PBSO will be better positioned to plan an evaluation strategy that provides key inputs to global planning and reporting cycles in addition to contributing to knowledge management of PBF and peacebuilding initiatives more generally.

A final anticipated strength of the proposed project will be its support to PBSO's adherence to UN Evaluation Group standards, including gender-related standards, and its ability to ensure that all evaluations conducted by PBSO maximize gender inclusiveness and sensitivity. By centralizing the evaluation function within PBSO's PBF Branch, the M&E Unit can work more closely with gender experts in PBSO and within the UN system to ensure that PBSO meets and, wherever possible, exceeds organization-wide gender standards. Relatedly, the Unit will be a central managing partner in the upcoming Gender Promotion Initiative II, which will mandate a rigorous monitoring and evaluation agenda over and above the regular country portfolio.

Invested with management authority over funds, moreover, PBSO will also be in a better position to ensure that all procurement of consultants is as transparent and competitive as possible; relatedly, PBSO has recently instituted a Consultants' Performance Review database, to retain institutional knowledge on its engagement with consultants in this specialty area of evaluation. By empowering PBSO with full accountability for managing the evaluation process from conceptualization to finalization, PBSO will be better positioned to monitor the performance of selected consultants, which over time should contribute to improved evaluation quality.

#### **Surge Capacity – PBF Programme Support Team (PST) – UNOPS Component**

Since the initial approval of this project in late 2014, the PBF has worked hard to implement its comprehensive M&E Framework, including a comprehensive evaluation framework and rolling out enhanced monitoring at country level for programmatic investments. Implementation during the last Business Plan provides evidence that investing in support to deliver stronger design, monitoring and evaluation is effective. Therefore, the PBF committed to continuing to invest in DM&E as a priority in its current Business Plan 2017-2019, which sets a higher level of ambition than previous plans. The aim is to invest at least \$500 million in at least 40 countries over this period. This will serve as a stepping-stone to the objective set in the forthcoming Secretary-General's Report on Sustaining Peace of \$500 million per year for the PBF. This new objective is driven by increased demand and the context of the Secretary-General's reform efforts, in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Financing will retain a critical role to improve coherence across the Development, Peace and Human Rights Pillars. The PBF will build on its unique role as a timely, catalytic and risk-tolerant financing instrument to reinforce the reforms in three ways: i) driving cohesion of UN strategies in conflict situations in support of nationally-led efforts, through joint analysis, planning and implementation; ii) enabling strong integrated support from the broad set of organizational tools at HQ and in the field; and iii) strengthening partnerships, particularly with the Peacebuilding Commission the World Bank, the European Union, the African Union, the Economic

Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and other (sub-)regional organizations.

In order to consolidate and exceed the gains in quality programming PBF has achieved in the face of considerable scale up, the Fund will develop a “surge roster” of peacebuilding programming and evaluation professionals who can deploy to countries receiving funds from PBF to ensure high-quality proposals, achievement of results and rigorous evaluation. Surge roster logistics will be managed on behalf of the Fund by UNOPS.

The PBF surge roster (PBF Programme Support Team) has been operational since June 2019 with 10 peacebuilding experts. In 2020 additional experts were recruited to this mechanism to allow PBF to respond to increasing demands.

See Annex D for details.

### **III. Project management and coordination (4 pages max)**

- a) Recipient organizations and implementing partners** – list direct recipient organizations and their implementing partners (international and local), specifying the Convening Organization, which will coordinate the project, and providing a brief justification for the choices, based on mandate, experience, local know-how and existing capacity.

DPKO – as the provider of administrative services for PBSO - is the recipient UN Department responsible for the finances and the overall implementation of the project. PBSO is the implementing agency which is responsible for the recruitment of the Evaluation Manager and two DM&E specialists, and the day-to-day running of the project.

UNOPS is a United Nations resource for services and solutions across peace and security, humanitarian, and development efforts. Its mission is to help people build better lives and countries achieve peace and sustainable development. While UNOPS can expand capacity towards achievement of all the sustainable development goals, the focus is based on partners’ demand and the needs of people and countries. UNOPS’ objectives are structured around three strategic contributions goals: (a) enable partners through efficient management support services; (b) help people through effective specialized technical expertise; and (c) support countries in expanding the pool and effect of resources.

- b) Project management and coordination** – present the project implementation team, including positions and roles and explanation of which positions are to be funded by the project (to which percentage). Explain project coordination and oversight arrangements. Fill out project implementation readiness checklist in **Annex C**.

The project team will include the Evaluation Manager, who will have direct responsibility for ensuring that the project’s outputs are achieved on time and on budget and two DM&E specialists; all three posts will report to PBF’s Senior M&E Advisor. PBF’s Senior M&E Advisor will be ultimately accountable for the success of the project in contributing to the improvement of the Unit’s M&E function.



The Surge Capacity component will be managed by the Chief, Financing for Peacebuilding Branch, Peacebuilding Support Office. The experts on the roster will report on all technical issues directly to the relevant PBF programme officer, delegated by the Chief, Financing for Peacebuilding Branch, Peacebuilding Support Office. The experts will also require clearance for any travel by the Chief, Financing for Peacebuilding Branch, Peacebuilding Support Office.

UNOPS will administer the recruitment and logistics, including travel arrangements, for all the consultants. This project will be under the Development and Special Initiative Portfolio. An assigned focal point will coordinate all day to day operations under the management of the Portfolio Manager who will provide oversight and monitoring to the project including approvals of contracts and procurement.

- c) **Risk management** – assess the level of risk for project success (low, medium and high) and provide a list of major project specific risks and how they will be managed, including the approach to updating risks and making project adjustments. Include any Do No Harm issues and project mitigation.

Low risk

- d) **Monitoring and evaluation** – What will be the M&E approach for the project, including M&E expertise in the project team and main means and timing of collecting data? Include a break-down of M&E budget that the project is putting aside, including for collection of baseline and end line data for indicators and independent evaluation, and an approximate M&E timeline. Ensure at least 5-7% of the project budget is set aside for M&E activities.

The PBF Senior M&E Advisor will provide oversight for the implementation of this project. Midterm and final reviews will be conducted to gauge whether the project has been successful in improving the quality and coverage of PBF evaluations and in providing headquarters and field colleagues with important knowledge about the still relatively new field of peacebuilding.

- e) **Project exit strategy/ sustainability** – Briefly explain the project's exit strategy to ensure that the project can be wrapped up at the end of the project duration, either through sustainability measures, agreements with other donors for follow-up funding or end of activities which do not need further support. If support from other donors is expected, explain what the project will do to try to ensure this support from the start.

#### **IV. Project budget**

Please provide a brief justification for the proposed budget, highlighting any specific choices that have underpinned the budget preparation, especially for personnel, travel or other indirect project support, to demonstrate value for money for the project. Proposed budget for all projects must include funds for independent evaluation. Proposed budget for projects involving non-UN direct recipients must include funds for independent audit.



Fill out two tables in the Excel budget **Annex D**.

ES

## **Annex A.1: Project Administrative arrangements for UN Recipient Organizations**

*(This section uses standard wording – please 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 Recipient 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), 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;
- Consolidate the financial statements (Annual and Final), based on submissions provided to the AA by RUNOS and provide the PBF annual 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 completed by the RUNO. A project will be considered as operationally closed upon submission of a joint final narrative report. In order for the MPTF Office to financially closed a project, each RUNO must refund unspent balance of over 250 USD, indirect cost (GMS) should not exceed 7% and submission of a certified final financial statement by the recipient organizations’ headquarters. );
- 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:

Type of report	Due when	Submitted by
Semi-annual project progress report	15 June	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist

Annual project progress report	15 November	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
End of project report covering entire project duration	Within three months from the operational project closure (it can be submitted instead of an annual report if timing coincides)	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
Annual strategic peacebuilding and PBF progress report (for PRF allocations only), which may contain a request for additional PBF allocation if the context requires it	1 December	PBF Secretariat on behalf of the PBF Steering Committee, where it exists or Head of UN Country Team where it does not.

#### Financial reporting and timeline

Timeline	Event
<b>30 April</b>	Annual reporting – Report <b>Q4 expenses</b> (Jan. to Dec. of previous year)
<b><i>Certified final financial report to be provided by 30 June of the calendar year after project closure</i></b>	

UNEX also opens for voluntary financial reporting for UN recipient organizations the following dates

<b>31 July</b>	Voluntary Q2 expenses (January to June)
<b>31 October</b>	Voluntary Q3 expenses (January to September)

Unspent Balance exceeding USD 250, at the closure of the project would have to be 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>).

## **Annex A.2: Project Administrative arrangements for Non-UN Recipient Organizations**

*(This section uses standard wording – please do not remove)*

### **Accountability, transparency and reporting of the Recipient Non-United Nations Organization:**

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

The Recipient Non-United Nations Organization will have full responsibility for ensuring that the Activity is implemented in accordance with the signed Project Document;

In the event of a financial review, audit or evaluation recommended by PBSO, the cost of such activity should be included in the project budget;

Ensure professional management of the Activity, including performance monitoring and reporting activities in accordance with PBSO guidelines.

Ensure compliance with the Financing Agreement and relevant applicable clauses in the Fund MOU.

### **Reporting:**

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

Type of report	Due when	Submitted by
Bi-annual project progress report	15 June	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
Annual project progress report	15 November	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
End of project report covering entire project duration	Within three months from the operational project closure (it can be submitted instead of an annual report if timing coincides)	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
Annual strategic peacebuilding and PBF progress report (for PRF allocations only), which may contain a request for additional PBF allocation if the context requires it	1 December	PBF Secretariat on behalf of the PBF Steering Committee, where it exists or Head of UN Country Team where it does not.

## Financial reports and timeline

Timeline	Event
28 February	Annual reporting – Report <b>Q4 expenses</b> (Jan. to Dec. of previous year)
30 April	Report <b>Q1 expenses</b> (January to March)
31 July	Report <b>Q2 expenses</b> (January to June)
31 October	Report <b>Q3 expenses</b> (January to September)
<i>Certified final financial report to be provided at the quarter following the project financial closure</i>	

Unspent Balance exceeding USD 250 at the closure of the project would have to be refunded and a notification sent to the Administrative Agent, no later than three months (31 March) of the year following the completion of the activities.

### **Ownership of Equipment, Supplies and Other Property**

Matters relating to the transfer of ownership by the Recipient Non-UN Recipient Organization will be determined in accordance with applicable policies and procedures defined by the PBSO.

### **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 website (<http://www.mptf.undp.org>)

### **Final Project Audit for non-UN recipient organization projects**

An independent project audit will be requested by the end of the project. The audit report needs to be attached to the final narrative project report. The cost of such activity must be included in the project budget.

### **Special Provisions regarding Financing of Terrorism**

Consistent with UN Security Council Resolutions relating to terrorism, including UN Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) and 1267 (1999) and related resolutions, the Participants are firmly committed to the international fight against terrorism, and in particular, against the financing of terrorism. Similarly, all Recipient Organizations recognize their obligation to comply with any applicable sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council. Each of the Recipient Organizations will use all reasonable efforts to ensure that the funds transferred to it in accordance with this agreement are not used to provide support or assistance to individuals or entities associated with terrorism as designated by any UN Security Council sanctions regime. If, during the term of this agreement, a Recipient Organization determines that there are credible allegations that funds transferred to it in accordance with this agreement have been used to provide support or assistance to individuals or entities associated with terrorism as designated by any UN Security Council sanctions regime it will as soon as it becomes aware of it inform the head of PBSO, the Administrative Agent and the donor(s) and, in consultation with the donors as appropriate, determine an appropriate response.

### **Non-UN recipient organization (NUNO) eligibility:**

In order to be declared eligible to receive PBF funds directly, NUNOs must be assessed as technically, financially and legally sound by the PBF and its agent, the Multi Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO). Prior to submitting a finalized project document, it is the responsibility of each NUNO to liaise with PBSO and MPTFO and provide all the necessary documents (see below) to demonstrate that all the criteria have been fulfilled and to be declared as eligible for direct PBF funds.

The NUNO must provide (in a timely fashion, ensuring PBSO and MPTFO have sufficient time to review the package) the documentation demonstrating that the NUNO:

- ☐ Has previously received funding from the UN, the PBF, or any of the contributors to the PBF, in the country of project implementation
- ☐ Has a current valid registration as a non-profit, tax exempt organization with a social based mission in both the country where headquarter is located and in country of project implementation for the duration of the proposed grant. (**NOTE:** If registration is done on an annual basis in the country, the organization must have the current registration and obtain renewals for the duration of the project, in order to receive subsequent funding tranches)
- ☐ Produces an annual report that includes the proposed country for the grant
- ☐ Commissions audited financial statements, available for the last two years, including the auditor opinion letter. The financial statements should include the legal organization that will sign the agreement (and oversee the country of implementation, if applicable) as well as the activities of the country of implementation. (**NOTE:** If these are not available for the country of proposed project implementation, the CSO will also need to provide the latest two audit reports for a program or project based audit in country.) The letter from the auditor should also state whether the auditor firm is part of the nationally qualified audit firms.
- ☐ Demonstrates an annual budget in the country of proposed project implementation for the previous two calendar years, which is at least twice the annualized budget sought from PBF for the project<sup>16</sup>
- ☐ Demonstrates at least 3 years of experience in the country where grant is sought
- ☐ Provides a clear explanation of the CSO's legal structure, including the specific entity which will enter into the legal agreement with the MPTF-O for the PBF grant.

---

<sup>16</sup> Annualized PBF project budget is obtained by dividing the PBF project budget by the number of project duration months and multiplying by 12.

**Annex B: Project Results Framework (MUST include sex- and age disaggregated data)**

Outcomes	Outputs	Indicators	Meas Veri
Outcome 1: JSCs, Secretariats, RUNOs, and PBSO are provided with well-targeted, actionable evaluations of their work.		Outcome Indicator 1 a  Number of evaluations rated as “confident to act” (independent rating).  Baseline: not applicable, as group has not yet been established Target: 100%	External
		Outcome Indicator 1 b  JSCs, Secretariats, RUNOs and PBSO find evaluative exercise findings to be timely and useful to their work.  Baseline: (not available, as partnership survey not established yet) Target: 100%	Partnersh
	Output 1.1 PBSO commissions and manages timely, high-quality, gender-sensitive evaluations.	Output Indicator 1.1.1  Ratio of completed evaluations that score at least 80% on a quality index per year (PBF rating).  Baseline: TBD Target: 100%	Index to I of a check OECD-D UNEG ev criteria
		Output Indicator 1.1.2  Ratio of field missions undertaken after approval of the Inception Report  Baseline: 0/2 (2013) Target: 100%	
	Output 1.2 PBSO coordinates communication and provides input to key evaluation documents through an active and broadly representative	Output Indicator 1.2.1  Ratio of evaluations that have been finalized with Reference Group endorsement to those without.  Baseline: 1/2 (2013)	Consolid comment members Report

	Reference Group associated with its evaluations.	Target: 9 /9 Output Indicator 1.2.2 Percentage of Reference Group members that are women. Baseline: 33% (2013) Target: 50%	Finalized Reference evaluation groups
	Output 1.3 PBSO supports in-country stakeholders to submit well-considered and timely management responses.	Output Indicator 1.3.1 Percentage of formal management responses submitted to PBF M&E Unit within 40 days of the Final Report acceptance. Baseline: 50% Target: 100%	
Outcome 2: Evaluations commissioned by PBF mainstream gender and are in line with UNEG and UN SWAP standards		Outcome Indicator 2 a PBF scores “compliant” or better in annual UN SWAP review. Baseline: “Approaching compliance” (2013) Target: Compliant	
	Output 2.1 Terms of reference and Inception Reports include evaluation criteria that integrate gender.	Output Indicator 2.1.1 Percentage of Inception Reports that analyze gender relations within the object of study. Baseline: 50% (2013) Target: 100%	

	<p>Output 2.2 Data collection tools and methods are gender-sensitive and support women’s participation and empowerment.</p>	<p>Output Indicator 2.2.1 Percentage of evaluations for which data collection tools explicitly target women.  Baseline: TBD Target: 100%</p>	
	<p>Output 2.3 Evaluation findings fully analyse gender dynamics and are sensitive to women’s empowerment.</p>	<p>Output Indicator 2.3.1 Percentage of evaluations for which the Evaluation Report includes findings, conclusions, recommendations that address gender dynamics and/or women’s empowerment  Baseline: TBD Target: 100%</p>	Quality i
<p>Outcome 3: PBF contributes to UN capacity development and global knowledge about peacebuilding</p>		<p>Outcome Indicator 3 a  Thematic reviews rated as “contributing to peacebuilding knowledge” by UN partners  Baseline: not available, as partnership survey has not yet been conducted Target: 100%</p>	Partnersh

		<p>Outcome Indicator 3 b</p> <p>By 2016, M&amp;E for peacebuilding working group is established and well-functioning based on: 1) adoption of a ToR, 2) number of meetings, 3) number of members</p> <p>Baseline: 1) no (group has not yet been formed); 2) 0 (group has not yet been formed); 3) 0 (group has not yet been formed)</p> <p>Target: 1) yes; 2) 4/year; 3) 12</p>	
	<p>Output 3.1 Thematic reviews and thematic evaluations provide in depth analysis on pressing peacebuilding topics</p>	<p>Output Indicator 3.1.1</p> <p>Number of Thematic reviews and thematic evaluations</p> <p>Baseline: 1 (2013)</p> <p>Target: 2/year</p>	
		<p>Output Indicator 3.1.2</p> <p>Number of brownbag lunches or other events to disseminate final reports</p> <p>Baseline: 0 (2013)</p> <p>Target: 2/year</p>	
<p>Outcome 4: PBF-funded programmes and projects are better designed and more evaluable</p>		<p>Outcome Indicator 4 a</p> <p>Percentage of PAC approval decisions for PRFs that are conditional on significant changes to the results framework</p> <p>Baseline: TBD</p> <p>Target: 25%</p>	

		Outcome Indicator 4 b	
		Percentage of projects within 6 months of ending that demonstrate evidence of peacebuilding outcomes.	
		Baseline: TBD Target: 50%	
	Output 4.1 Evaluability assessments (EAs) of all PRF programmes provide recommendations for improving design, implementation and evaluability.	Output Indicator 4.1.1 Number of Evaluability Assessments Baseline: 0 (2013) Target: 6 (2016)	
		Output Indicator 4.1.2 Percentage of EA recommendations implemented Baseline: not applicable, as EAs have not yet been conducted Target: 100%	
	Output Indicator 4.1.3 Percentage of PRF countries that collect monitoring data on non-target and target populations. Baseline: TBD Target: 100		
Output 4.2 Effective use of monitoring for management	Output Indicator 4.2.1 Of projects rated as “off track”, percentage of project reports that demonstrate corrective action taken as a result of monitoring data Baseline: TBD Target: 75%	RUNO 6- reports to	
Output 4.3	Output Indicator 4.3.1		

	Improved design through PBF direct country support for DM&E	Number of surge missions to support design and implementation	
		Baseline: TBD Target:	

### Annex C: Checklist of project implementation readiness

Question	Yes	N
1. Have all implementing partners been identified?		
2. Have TORs for key project staff been finalized and ready to advertise?		
3. Have project sites been identified?		
4. Have local communities and government offices been consulted/ sensitized on the existence of the project?		
5. Has any preliminary analysis/ identification of lessons learned/ existing activities been done?		
6. Have beneficiary criteria been identified?		
7. Have any agreements been made with the relevant Government counterparts relating to project implementation sites, approaches, Government contribution?		
8. Have clear arrangements been made on project implementing approach between project recipient organizations?		
9. What other preparatory activities need to be undertaken before actual project implementation can begin and how long will this take?		N/A

**Annex D: Detailed and UNDG budgets (attached Excel sheet) December 2020)**

Outcome/ Output number	Outcome/ output/ activity formulation:	Budget by recipient organization in USD	Adjustment (-31 Dec 2021)	Total
<b>OUTCOME 1: PBF Portfolios and projects in countries supported by the project are more strategic, of better quality and developed timelier</b>				
<b>Output 1.1:</b>	Experts in Peacebuilding and Experts in monitoring and evaluation contracted to UNOPS	\$ 483,658.00	\$ (49,947.00)	\$ 433,711.00
<b>Output 1.2:</b>	Induction training carried out for experts on PBF modalities, conditionalities and operations	\$ 15,000.00		\$ 15,000.00
<b>Output 1.3:</b>	Peacebuilding experts are deployed to selected PBF priority countries	\$ 70,000.00		\$ 70,000.00
<b>Output 1.4:</b>	Expert-level Monitoring and Evaluations experts are deployed to selected PBF priority countries	\$ 104,085.00		\$ 104,085.00
Project personnel costs if not included in activities above		\$ 56,921.00	\$ 37,947.00	\$ 94,868.00
Project operational costs if not included in activities above		\$ 18,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
Project M&E budget				
<b>SUB-TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET:</b>		<b>747,664</b>		
Indirect support costs (7%):		<b>52,336</b>		
<b>TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET:</b>		<b>800,000</b>		

## Annex E: Interim Financial Statement

Country Name :	Funding:
Project Atlas id:	All Amounts in US\$
Project Title :	Date:

**INTERIM FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2014\***

**1) INCOME**

**DEPOSITS**

Deposit received in 2014	
Deposit received in 2015	
Deposit received in 2016	
Deposit received in 2017	
Total Deposits received	0.00

**INTEREST**

Interest earned in 2014	
Interest earned in 2015	
Interest earned in 2016	
Interest earned in 2017	0.00

**MISCELLANEOUS INCOME**

Miscellaneous income earned in [yyyy]	
Miscellaneous income earned in [yyyy]	0.00

**TOTAL FUNDS (A)** **\$ 0.00**

**2) PROJECT EXPENSES**

**PERIOD - PRIOR YEARS:**

2014	Project Expenditure	
	Net exchange gain	
	Management fee	-
2015	Project Expenditure	
	Unliquidated Obligations (U)**	
	Net exchange Gain	
	Management fee	-
2016	Project Expenditure	
	Net exchange Gain	
	Management fee	-

**PERIOD - CURRENT YEAR**

2014	Disbursements	
	Receipt Accruals	
	Net exchange loss	
	Management fee	0

**TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES (B)** -

Project Advances (C)	0.00
----------------------	------

**PROJECT CASH BALANCE (D) = (A) - (B) - (C)** -

Open Purchase Orders (E)	0.00
--------------------------	------

**3) PROJECT FUND BALANCE (F) = (D) - (E)** -

\* This statement is interim and is provided for information purposes only. Figures are not final. Final figures will appear in the certified 2014 financial statement once the 2014 books are closed.

The Statement is following IPSAS reporting requirements, Management Fee is calculated and recorded against Project Expenses (Disbursements + Receipt Accruals)

Project Advances represents amounts yet to be either recovered or settled against Project Expenses. Open POs represents amounts committed against goods/services yet to be delivered/rendered. Fund balance represents cash available for implementation activities.

## Annex F: Final Financial Statement

Name of ..... Fund

Project: Atlas Project number and title

Certified Final Project Financial Statement as of Date [Insert date] USD

Reference:

		Cumulative	Notes
Funds Received from UN	A		
Total Expenditure	B		1
Refund of contributions	C		
Contribution Balance	D = A - (B + C)	-	

Total Interest earned	E		2
Interest paid to UN	F		
Interest to be paid to UN	$G = E - F$	-	
Total Balance to be returned to UN (Contribution + Interest)	$H = D + G$	-	3

*Tick the box if the Agency's Financial Regulations and Rules prohibit return of interest earned*

<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Total Programme costs</b>		
Indirect Costs	-	4
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		1
<u>Certified by:</u>		
Name and Title: (Controller)	Date	5

Notes:

- 1- These figures should agree
- 2- Complete rows for interest if your organization policy requires returning of interest
- 3 - For financial closure, this amount should equal zero, all refunds and returns should have been processed.
- 4- Must not exceed the approved percentage of indirect costs
- 5- Name and Title must be completed for the person certifying the report

**Annex G: Quarterly Statement of Income and Expenditure**



Financial Statements for the period XX 201 to XX 20XX  
 Project Number XXXX, Countering the Financing for Terrorism Project  
 (Expressed in US dollars)

<b>Income</b>	
Voluntary contributions	-
Interest income	-
<hr/>	
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	
Staff and other personnel cost	-
Supplies, Commodities and Materials	-
Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture	-
Contractual Services	-
Travel	-
General Operating and Other Direct Costs	-
<hr/>	
<b>Total direct expenditures</b>	<b>-</b>
<u>Indirect Support Costs</u>	<u>-</u>
<hr/>	
<b>Total indirect support costs</b>	<b>-</b>
<hr/>	
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>-</b>
<hr/>	
<b>Project Balance</b>	<b>-</b>
<hr/>	
<u>Certified by</u>	<u>Date</u>
<hr/>	

KB