



u o G h F hBF
u k u k u h E

Important Note to Evaluation Managers

Each ToR , purpose and focus of a specific evaluation – there are no hard and fast blueprints, so please take the time to adapt to your needs.

The ToR template only covers the content – managerial and operational aspects such as timing, reporting lines etc. will need to be added based on context.

Evaluation managers are asked to distribute the PBF Project Evaluation Checklist with the selected evaluator(s), as each project evaluation commissioned in and after 2022 will be subject to external quality assessment to determine the credibility of all final evaluations. Evaluation quality scores will be publicly available on [PBF website](#), alongside the evaluation report.



sectors/thematic areas that are under evaluation]. In assessing the degree to which the project met its intended peacebuilding objectives and results, the evaluation will provide key lessons about successful peacebuilding approaches and operational practices, as well as highlight areas where the project performed less effectively than anticipated. In that sense, this project evaluation is equally about accountability as well as learning.

\ _____ :

Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project in terms of: 1) addressing key drivers of conflict and the most relevant peacebuilding issues; 2) alignment with National Peacebuilding Policy and national priorities of **country X**; 3) whether the project capitalized on the UN's added value in **country X**; and 4) the degree to which the project addressed cross-cutting issues such as conflict and gender equality in **country X**.

Assess to what extent the PBF-funded project has made a concrete contribution to reducing a conflict factor in **country X**. With respect to PBF's contribution, the evaluation should evaluate



provides a menu of options of which specific issues that will need to be chosen for the specific purposes of the evaluation at hand.

E | _____ \ ECD DAC

RELEVANCE:

Was the project relevant in addressing conflict drivers and factors for peace identified in a conflict analysis?

Was the project appropriate and strategic to the main peacebuilding goals and challenges in the country at the time of the project's design? Did relevance continue throughout implementation?

Was the project relevant to the UN's peacebuilding mandate and the SDGs, in particular SDG 16?

Was the project relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries? Were they consulted during design and implementation of the project?

How relevant and responsive has the project been to supporting peacebuilding priorities in **country X**?

Did the project's theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the project approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence?

To what extent did the project respond to peacebuilding gaps?

EFFICIENCY:



LOCALIZATION:

Were national and local stakeholders sufficiently consulted and involved throughout the project cycle?

Did the project strengthen capacities of national and local stakeholders (national and local governments and CSOs)?

How useful did national and local stakeholders perceive PBF's support?

TIME-SENSITIVITY:

Was the project well-timed to address a conflict factor or capitalize on a specific window of opportunity?

Was PBF funding used to leverage political windows of opportunity for engagement?

RISK-TOLERANCE AND INNOVATION:

If the project was characterized as "high risk", were risks adequately monitored and mitigated?

How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere?

The evaluation must identify lessons learned that would have wider applicability and relevance to other similar interventions in **country X** and in other contexts, and provide no more than 10 useful, realistic and actionable recommendations (including on cross-cutting themes and M&E system), with clear identification of responsible stakeholders.

EVALUATION DESIGN APPROACH

The evaluation will be summative and will employ a participatory approach whereby discussions with and surveys of key stakeholders provide and/or verify the substance of the findings. The evaluation should be based on a mixed method approach to data collection and analysis, employing various forms of evidence vis-à-vis each other to triangulate gathered information.

The methodology for data collection may include but not necessarily be limited to:

Desk review of key documents (including progress and monitoring reports)

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), as appropriate, with major stakeholders including PBF Secretariat, funds' recipients, officials from key ministries and the government, representatives of civil society organizations, community and religious leaders. Evaluator(s) should ensure equal participation among men and women and across age groups.



Incept on Report			
Field data collect on and analysis			
Validat on Exercise			
Draf Report			
Final Report			



respect ve level of effort/t