

PBF Monitoring and Evaluation requirements summary:

IRF allocations

- Individual IRF projects

Monitoring

- Each project has a Results Framework, which provides the basis for the project monitoring. It is recommended that in the first three months of project implementation, RUNOs develop an M&E Plan (see PBF template 4.1) with clear indication of M&E methodology, responsibilities, budget and timeframes. M&E Plans are compulsory for all projects which must undertake an independent evaluation (see below).
- RUNOs are responsible for regular and results-oriented monitoring, with partners, including a compilation of baselines, if these are missing, within the first three months of project implementation. RUNOs are encouraged to monitor in partnership with the civil society and the government counterparts. NGOs with M&E expertise can also be contracted to undertake additional community monitoring or to get baselines.

Reporting

- RUNOs are responsible for concise and peacebuilding focused reporting to PBF twice a year, in line with PBSO templates and timelines (mid-June and mid-November), providing one coherent report per project. RUNOs are also responsible for submitting a single End of Project report, within three months of operational project completion. The last annual project report may be substituted by the end of project report if the project is ending at the end of a calendar year.

Evaluation

- For IRF projects which are more than 12 months in duration, or more than \$1.5 million in budget, an independent final evaluation is mandatory. On a case by case basis, PBSO may require IRF projects other than those meeting this criteria, for example ones that are particularly risk, to be evaluated, in which case PBSO will indicate it at the time of approval.
- The evaluation budget should be included in the project budget. The lead RUNO is responsible for preparing the evaluation TORs, contracting the independent expert and managing the evaluation, including establishment and communication with an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) of key stakeholders. PBSO must be contacted for input into the TORs and comments on the draft evaluation and will sit on the ERG. The final evaluation must be shared with PBSO and will be posted on the website.

- IRF 'packages' (**in addition** to the responsibilities under individual IRF projects)

Monitoring

- Where a set of IRF projects was approved by PBSO as a 'package' with a common strategy and contributing towards common results, the RUNOs must also work together to prepare, through a participatory process, a common higher level results framework and M&E plan for the package. The results framework should clearly identify and provide measures of the joint peacebuilding results to which individual projects contribute.
- IRF package arrangements may include additional support at country level for coordinating and monitoring the IRF package, in the form of a mini PBF Secretariat, funded through PBF. In countries where additional support is not present, responsibility for monitoring joint results will fall to the RUNOs. RUNOs are encouraged to monitor in partnership with the civil society and

the government counterparts. NGOs with M&E expertise can also be contracted to undertake additional community monitoring or to get baselines.

Evaluation

- Responsibility for the evaluation of IRF packages – whether it should be led by PBSO, PBF Secretariats (if they exist) or RUNOs themselves – will be determined on a case-by-case basis. This should be discussed with PBSO at the time of project design.
- IRF packages will need to have a joint evaluation which will assess the IRFs as a package. This joint evaluation may also assess individual project progress, hence removing the necessity for an individual project evaluation.

PRF allocations

Monitoring

- Each Priority Plan has a Results Framework, which should be completed in a two-step process. The first step is completed at the time of the Priority Plan formulation and articulates the Plan's strategic priorities in outcome language. These strategic outcomes subsequently provide the basis for the selection and approval by the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) of individual PRF projects.
- Once the majority of the projects have been designed and approved by the JSC, RUNOs and the JSC Secretariat finalize the second phase of the Priority Plan Results Framework. The second phase incorporates the key project-level outcomes and indicators that support the achievement of the Priority Plan outcomes. The PBF Secretariat, in close cooperation with the RUNOs (and, if necessary, with support from the PBF M&E Unit) should ensure coherence and logic between the project-level and Priority Plan level within the Results Framework, as well as synergy among projects within a given Priority Plan outcome.
- The updated Final Results Framework must be submitted to PBSO within 30 days of the JSC's approval of the project documents, which projectise at least 75% of the Priority Plan budget.
- At the same time as submitting the updated Priority Plan Results Framework, the PBF Secretariat, together with the RUNOs, must submit to PBSO an M&E Plan for the Priority Plan (see PBF template 4.1) with clear indication of M&E methodology, responsibilities, budget and timeframes. Data collection exercises included in the M&E plan should be timed to inform key evaluative exercises (see below) as well as annual JSC reports.
- At the project level, RUNOs are responsible for regular and results-oriented monitoring, with partners, including a compilation of baselines, if these are missing, in the first three months of project implementation. The PBF Secretariat is responsible for monitoring the progress against the higher level Priority Plan outcomes and outputs, as well as for working with RUNOs to ensure coordination in monitoring of progress.
- RUNOs are encouraged to monitor in partnership with the civil society and the government counterparts. Moreover, Country Teams are encouraged to contract an NGO or an independent M&E institution to undertake regular independent field monitoring at the Priority level and/or to put in place community monitoring mechanisms for targeted communities to do real-time reporting by themselves. If possible, Priority Plan monitoring should include some comparative data on areas or communities not supported, so as to better assess the impact of PBF support.

Reporting

- RUNOs are responsible for concise and peacebuilding focused reporting to PBF twice a year, in line with PBSO templates and timelines (mid-June and mid-November), using one coherent

report per project. Prior to submitting the reports to PBSO, they must share them with the PBF Secretariat for quality assurance and with the Joint Steering Committee for comment and action, as part of their overall oversight of PBF PRF portfolio in the country.

- RUNOs are also responsible for submitting a single End of Project report, within three months of operational project completion. The last annual project report may be substituted by the end of project report if the project is ending at the end of a calendar year.
- PBF Secretariats are responsible for coordinating and leading on drafting of annual Joint Steering Committee reports on the progress against the Priority Plan, in time for JSC approval and submission to PBSO on 1 December every year. RUNOs need to provide inputs and participate in the annual analysis.

Evaluation

- Finally, in order to provide opportunities for course correction or adjustment of project implementation, all PRF allocations are obligated to undertake three evaluative exercises during the implementation of the Priority Plan, unless otherwise agreed with PBSO. These exercises are as follows:
 - o An **evaluability assessment** within the first 6-9 months of the Priority Plan implementation to assess the strength of the logic, approach and feasibility of the Priority Plan and the projects and consider the need for any small adjustments. The assessment will be funded and managed by PBSO and conducted by an independent consultant, with the PBF Secretariat providing assistance on the ground. The Joint Steering Committee and the RUNOs will play a key part in the evaluability process and will need to make time during the process and to respond to the findings.
 - o A **mid-term review** after the initial 18-20 months of project implementation, to assess progress against the overall objectives and higher level outcomes and allow for course correction. The mid-term review may be managed by PBSO or the PBF Secretariat/RC Office, depending on the context and capacities. It may be facilitated by an external consultant or done internally. Regardless of the management mode, the mid-term review should include in depth discussion and analysis of monitoring data with local stakeholders and other partners. Data collection, where required, should be planned in advance in order to inform this analysis. Following the mid-term review, an action plan needs to be endorsed by the Joint Steering Committee for action by RUNOs and partners.
 - o A **final evaluation** must be completed in the window between the last three months of project implementation and three months following the Priority Plan completion. An evaluation is recommended that before a new PRF allocation to the country. PBF is responsible for drafting the TORs, providing funding for and contracting the international independent experts, setting up a Reference Group, approving the inception report and providing comments on the draft evaluation. The PBF Secretariat, RC Office and RUNOs are to assist with the identification of any national consultants, logistics on the ground, comments on the TORs and provision of a management response.