



The Secretary-8 'h '7 'h" 7





Evaluation purpose, objective, and scope Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined





Evaluation design and set of methods (e.g., non-experimental, theory-based, contribution analysis, etc.) are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives, and scope; and are fully and dearly described (including the rationale for selection of tools). Stakeholder groups are engaged in multiple ways to support triangulation (i.e., data collection goes beyond KIIs for government officials/implementers and FGDs for beneficiaries).

Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all dearly described.

Sampling strategy is provided -





Evaluation uses credible forms of both qualitative and quantitative data. Quantitative data can be numerical expressions of coded qualitative data. Main findings must be supported by more than one data source with explicit citations/references to specific groups of stakeholders. The evaluation presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.

Findings are clearly presented and are supported by and respond to the evidence presented, both positive and negative. Key findings should be clearly highlighted (i.e., through a summary of findings for each question or bolded finding statements). Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question. There is an in-depth level of analysis of outcome-level results in particular.

Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are dearly identified in the analysis. Unintended results, and the reasons for these, are also considered.

There is adequate coverage and analysis of cross-cutting themes human rights, gender equality, and Leave No One Behind. Disaggregated data is presented to show differential results (distribution of results across different groups) as relevant to the intervention.

Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (i.e., completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework, including M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.

Findings refer to and monitoring data, including mid-line, end-line and perception surveys (if available).

Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect all of the criteria that were to be covered as well as the cross-cutting themes. They are derived appropriately from the findings, clearly presenting the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention. They do not introduce new information.

Conclusions add insight and analysis beyond the findings. They reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and are sufficiently forward looking.

Identified lessons learned stem logically from the findings and have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation. They are clearly and concisely presented yet have sufficient detail to be useful for organizational learning. The lessons learned section should answer the question: what has been learned from the evaluation that would be useful for other/subsequent interventions in same country and in other contexts?

Recommendations

Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and conclusions. They address any major weaknesses identified in the findings. The





recommendations on cross-cutting themes, including gender equality, and about system, must be included.

M&E

Recommendations are useful and realistic within the peacebuilding (and PBF) context. They are actionable for primary intended users and uses (specific and relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.

Clear identification of stakeholders responsible for action for each recommendation (i.e., PBF, funds recipient/implementing agency, government counterpart), including the lead if multiple actors are responsible. A clear target should specify not only an organization but the level (e.g., HQ, RC, agency) and/or department/unit. There should be no more than 10 recommendations and they should be prioritized (e.g., urgent, high, medium).

Report structure and presentation

Opening pages include:

- Country
- Project number (MPTFO & PBF)
- Full project title
- Project start and end dates (month and year)
- Funds recipients
- Timeframe of the evaluation
- Date of the evaluation report (month and year)
- Names/organizations of evaluators
- Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
- Table of contents (including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers)

Annexes include:

- Terms of Reference for the evaluation
- Evaluation matrix (if not provided in the body of the report)
- List of stakeholder groups participating as informants (numbers of participants disaggregated by stakeholder group, and gender, if latter not provided in methodology section)
- Results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in the body of the report)
- List of site visits
- Data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires in the language of the evaluation report)
- Bibliography/list of documentary evidence
- Other appropriate annexes could include additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.

Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles, well formatted).





Structure follows an easily discernible logical flow. Context, purpose, and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR. If not specified, project evaluations should not exceed 30 pages (excluding annexes).

Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors. Inclusive language is used.

Frequent use of well-chosen visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.

UN-SWAP & Disability inclusion





Annex: Evaluation matrix template (to be adjusted as relevant)

Evaluation Criterion	Evaluation Question	Evaluation Sub-Question	Data collection method and source	Evaluation indicator	Evaluation benchmark
	Q1: Was the project relevant in addressing	Q1.1:			
Relevance	conflict drivers and factors for peace identified in a conflict analysis?	Q1.2:			
	Q2: Was the project appropriate and strategic	Q2.1:			
	to the main peacebuilding goals and				
	challenges in the country at the time of the	Q2.2:			
	throughout implementation?				
	Q3:	Q3.1:			
	peacebuilding mandate and the SDGs, in particular SDG 16?	Q3.2:			
	Q4: Was the project relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups/beneficiaries?	Q4.1:			
	Were they consulted during design and implementation of the project?	Q4.2:			
	Q5: How relevant and responsive has the	Q5.1:			
	project been to supporting peacebuilding priorities in the country?	Q5.2:			
	Q6:	Q6.1:			
	articulate assumptions about why the project				
	approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence?	Q6.2:			
	Q7: To what extent did the project respond to	Q7.1:			
	peacebuilding gaps?	Q7.2:			
Efficiency	Q8: How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the project	Q8.1:			
	(including between the implementing agencies and with stakeholders)? Have project	Q8.2:			





funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?			
Q9: How efficient and successful was the	Q9.1:		
procurement, number of implementing partners and other activities?	Q9.2:		