



# **ROOM DOCUMENT 3**

**DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

**EVALUATING CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE-BUILDING PROGRAMMES – AN UPDATE ON JOINT WORK WITH THE DAC NETWORK ON CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE BUILDING (CPDC)**

**Item III. v.**

This document has been prepared by Norway and the Secretariat, and is submitted for consideration at the meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation 2 – 3 June 2005.

---

**3rd meeting  
2 – 3 June 2005**

## **EVALUATING CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE-BUILDING PROGRAMMES**

### **An update on joint work with the DAC Network on Conflict Prevention and Peace Building (CPDC)**

1. On 10 November 2004, the DAC Evaluation Network and CPDC agreed to begin joint work on evaluating conflict prevention and peace building (CPPB) activities. This note presents a brief update on progress so far and elicits Members' views on the organisation of the autumn workshop in Oslo on evaluating CPPB activities, their expectations regarding its outcomes, and potential indications of participation.

#### **A brief overview of progress**

2. At the second meeting of the Network on Development Evaluation (10 November), Network Members and CPDC representatives agreed to start joint work aimed at:

- Carrying out evaluations of conflict prevention programmes benefiting from field-level evidence based on case studies;
- Reviewing the methodological aspects of assessing impact of conflict prevention and peace building operations, with a view to developing evaluation guidance;
- Identifying ways to conflict-sensitive evaluation work.

3. As agreed at the November meeting, the first phase of this work will include a workshop to be held in Oslo in autumn 2005, provisionally scheduled for mid October / beginning of November. This workshop will focus on the assessment of current methodology used in evaluation CPPB, discuss the main challenges faced in undertaking evaluations in conflict affected and conflict prone countries/regions and outline the main substantive findings of evaluation of CPPB activities. The purpose of the workshop is to distil lessons learned from existing evaluations, review current evaluation approaches and draw out innovative ways of dealing with the challenges faced when undertaking evaluations of CPPB activities. The final dates of the workshop will be confirmed by mid June. Members are invited to indicate interest in participating in the workshop.

4. In preparation for the workshop, Norway - the task leader – and the Secretariat have contacted a number of institutions (listed below) to request an expression of interest in carrying out a study of available evaluations in advance of the autumn workshop. It is expected that the outcomes of the commissioned work and the workshop will lead to the development of new tools, guidance and evaluation studies.

#### **Institutions contacted to request 'interest and capability statements'**

- Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM)
- INCORE (International Conflict research)
- The Fletcher Centre for Human Rights and Conflict Resolution - Tufts University
- Conciliation Resources
- Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael

- Kings College London
- Collaborative for Development Action – CDA
- DCAF – Democratic Control of the Armed Forces
- Norwegian Institute for International Affairs NUPI
- The Carnegie Foundation for Peace
- SaferWorld
- FAFO, Institute for Applied International Studies
- PRIO, International Peace Research Institute
- CMI, Chr. Michelsen Institute

5. Norway and the Secretariat will engage one or more institutions to carry out the review of available evaluations. The contract(s) will be awarded by mid June, based on the response to the attached Terms of Reference.

## II. DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

### DAC Network on Development Evaluation and the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC)

#### Evaluating conflict prevention and peace-building activities

##### I. Activity

1. The purpose of this study is to undertake a review and analysis of the available evaluations covering conflict prevention and peace-building activities. The focus of the study is twofold i) to distil substantive and technical lessons from available evaluations which could lead to improvement in donor policy and implementation and ii) analysis of current methodologies utilised for evaluations of conflict prevention and peace building (CPPB) activities and to suggest new approaches for evaluations accordingly. After identifying the challenges faced when undertaking evaluations CPPB programmes, the study should also seek to challenge existing approaches and develop constructive suggestions for new ways of addressing programme effectiveness and impact.

##### II. Background

2. This work will build on the work previously carried out by the DAC Network on Development Evaluation and more recently by the Utstein group. The Utstein study was a review of the peace building experience of Germany, Netherlands, Norway and the UK.

3. This work by the DAC Evaluation Network and the CPDC seeks to address the evaluation element of the 'strategic deficit' identified in the Utstein study report ([www.aicpr.org/utstein.pdf](http://www.aicpr.org/utstein.pdf)). It has been initiated with a view to assessing the current evaluation work available in the area of conflict prevention and peace-building. It will look to identify possible gaps and, in the light of this analysis, it may develop methodological guidance on assessing impact of conflict prevention operations and possibly an evaluation framework for CPPB activities. One issue is how to feed (and build on) the findings of the Utstein study into the methodology of future evaluations of CPPB activities. At the joint meeting last year, Members of the Evaluation Network and the CPDC spelt out three objectives of this joint work: i) carry out evaluations of conflict prevention programmes benefiting from field-level evidence based on case studies; ii) the methodological aspects of assessing impact of conflict prevention operations, with a view to developing an evaluation framework; iii) ways to conflict-sensitive evaluation work.

4. This work is seen very much as a *process*, the initial phase of which will include the study being commissioned through these terms of reference and a Workshop to be held in autumn 2005 in Oslo. This workshop will focus on the conclusions of the commissioned study, and will assess whether there is a need to develop a specific evaluation framework for use when evaluating conflict prevention and peace building programmes. The purpose of phase one of this programme is to test current approaches to undertaking evaluation of CPPB activities and draw out innovative ways of dealing with the challenges faced when undertaking evaluations in conflict prone or conflict affected countries. Based on the outcomes of the workshop and the commissioned work, consideration will be given as to whether there is a need to develop new tools, guidance and frameworks.

### III. Focus and scope of work – Part A – Policy Recommendations and Lessons Learned from CPPB implementation

#### **Review of the main findings from the evaluation material available on CPPB activities**

6. Based on recent evaluations of CPPB activities that have been received from development agencies and independent research institutions, this study shall:
7. Identify policy and programme successes and constraints. In particular:
  - a) What pre-planning devices (e.g. stakeholder/political analysis, multi-donor dialogue) were used when developing CPPB programmes? Was the use (or lack thereof) of these tools highlighted as being a factor that determined the success of the programme?
  - b) Using the breakdown of CPPB activities below, what were the lessons learned? What activities succeeded? What activities did not? Why and what were the programme or contextual factors that caused the success/failure of the programme?
    - Capacity building initiatives for early warning and conflict assessment at the national, regional and sub-regional levels, carried out by state and/or non-state actors
    - Community level conflict prevention, peace-building and reconciliation programmes
    - Technical co-operation for institution building and capacity development
    - Support to Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) and Security System Reform (SSR) programmes.
  - c) Where certain CPPB activities were deemed to have not been successful is it possible to ascertain what alternatives would have led to a better outcome?

### IV. Focus and scope of work – Part B – Methodological Recommendations for evaluating CPPB activities

#### **Review the methodological approach as taken in evaluating CPPB activities**

8. Based on recent evaluations of CPPB activities that have been received from development agencies and independent research institutions, this study shall:
9. Review Evaluation Design and Methods. In particular:
  - d) What methods were used in evaluating CPPB programmes? This will include how the evaluation were conducted; the evaluation methodology utilised, the extent to which partner country stakeholders were involved in the (planning and execution of the) evaluation process.
  - e) What were the similarities and differences between these methodological approaches?
  - f) What are the apparent gaps in the current methodology when faced with the challenges of evaluating CPPB activities?
  - g) To what extent was the evaluation methodology used informed by political economy and/or conflict analysis.

- h) Was the activity being evaluated part of a whole-of-government approach or did it involve multi-donor activity and evaluation? How did these approaches alter the outcome of the programme?
- i) To what extent was attention given to the distinction between formal and/or informal institutions, actors and processes?

10. Evaluation Usage

- j) Who within development agencies commissioned the evaluations?
- k) Is it possible to assess whether the evaluation resulted in a change in policy or programming?
- l) Was the evaluation shared with other donor governments, partner governments or other stakeholders (civil society, NGOs) and if so, how and why?

11. Proposals for a new approach to evaluating CPPB activities

- m) Has the review of available evaluation material on CPPB activities suggested any need for modification to their design or implementation?
- n) How should a conflict/stakeholder analysis be included in the evaluation process?
- o) Should evaluation methodology differ in conflict situations, as opposed to countries where a peace building strategy is just getting underway, such as following a peace agreement? How should the lack of baseline information be dealt with as part of the evaluation process?
- p) Should a programme/project evaluation methodology be adapted where there is multi-donor engagement in a particular sector?
- q) What distinctions can or should be drawn in evaluating short term humanitarian programmes, conflict prevention or peace-building programmes such as DDR processes, and those programmes that are designed to build peace and development over the longer term.

V. Implementation
-------------------

***a) Methodology for conducting this study***

12. The study is to be based on:

- *A desk-based analysis*, aimed at reviewing currently available evaluations of CPPB and wider information gathering including some ‘‘how to’’ literature on undertaking evaluations in conflict prone and conflict affected environments and available information from donors, research and academic institutions. Of particular relevance will be the findings of the Utstein Study on the Peacebuilding Experience of Germany, Netherlands, Norway and the UK.
- *Direct contacts with key informants*. In addition to reviewing the available material, the consultants are also expected to make use of the experience of the authors of the various evaluations and the members of the evaluations unit within development agencies, through phone interviews, where possible. The consultants should also be able to tap into key institutions undertake work on CPPB activities in developing countries. This interaction should be aimed at seeking clarification on issues normally not contained in evaluation reports, such as the follow up

given to the evaluations, the way evaluation results fed into policy development and specific methodologies used.

### ***b) Inputs and Competencies***

13. Please see attached the list of the evaluations (not all of which focus on CPPB activities) currently available to the DAC Secretariat. Additional evaluation will be added to the list as they are received from development agencies. These evaluations will be made available, if necessary, to the institution undertaking this work. Institution should also have access to their own sources of CPPB evaluations.

14. Institutions are asked to detail the time (number of persons and person days) and cost of undertaking either or both parts of the study outlined above. The Consultants will have to have strong experience of donors' practices in development cooperation and a background in the following:

- Conflict prevention/ Peace building/ Security programming
- Conflict assessment/ Conflict Analysis
- Evaluation planning/Evaluation methodology

### ***c) Timing***

15. The Consultancy is expected to begin in late May or as soon as possible thereafter. The first draft of the final report is due for submission to the DAC Secretariat by the August 26, 2005. It is expected that the Consultants will meet with the CPDC and EVALUNET Secretariat and the leaders of the workstream to discuss the inception of the study in the first week of June (in Paris) and again to discuss the final report in early September.

### ***d) Reporting***

16. The Consultants will produce<sup>1</sup> two core outputs written in English; provisionally entitled *Evaluating conflict prevention and peace-building activities; towards innovative approaches*, for the CPDC and the Development Evaluation Network, these outputs will include:

- An inception report (to be produced and discussed with the Secretariat and leaders of the workstream two weeks after the official start date of the contract)
- A final report (due August 26), including two-page executive summary identifying the main conclusions and recommendations, main body of the report (maximum 20 pages) with footnotes, a bibliography and annexes

17. The consultants shall report to the DAC Secretariat (Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC) and the Development Evaluation Network), in consultation with the workstream leaders.

18. The contract shall be entered into with the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation and the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation, who are also responsible for the management and oversight of the work.

---

<sup>1</sup> Both hard copies and an electronic copy.

## VI. How proposals will be evaluated

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Institutional/individual experience with:	
• working with donors in the field of conflict prevention and peacebuilding.	15
• evaluations especially in the area of CPPB activities	15
Analysis/Methodology of how the institution is going to carry out the ToRs/ clarity of proposals / detailed timeplans and description of role and responsibilities	30
Links and partnership with other institutions especially in developing countries	15
Past references	10
Cost effectiveness	15