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# DCPSF Overview

The Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund (DCPSF) is a multi-donor trust fund established in 2007. Its objective is to achieve local-level peace, stability, and sustainable growth by supporting inclusive and sustainable Darfur-wide peace negotiations using a community-based, bottom-up approach to ensure communities are stabilized, and trust and confidence between communities is restored, paving the way towards early recovery.

The DCPSF Phase II started in 2011 and was planned to continue until December 2017, though the Steering Committee guiding the Fund extended Phase II until 2020 in the spring of 2017. The objective of Phase II is to support Darfur-wide peace efforts by addressing local peace and stability issues through inclusive and sustainable engagement. The Theory of Change (ToC) concentrates on the restoration of *trust and confidence* in the diverse communities of Darfur, through independently brokered inclusive dialogue processes and consultations, which are further underpinned insofar as material inputs deriving from these consultations, such as services, deliver wide-reaching peace dividends to the community.

As a funding mechanism, DCPSF thus distinguishes itself from other funding streams by prioritizing conflict-sensitive approaches to the promotion of trust and confidence within and between communities, rather than by a strictly defined position in the humanitarian-development nexus. DCPSF focuses on grass-roots level conflict resolution and aims to address the root causes of conflict at the community level, guided by a general strategy deriving from a regional conflict analysis, with activities tailored to community needs, including strengthening community-level conflict resolution mechanisms, addressing conflict over natural resources, enhancing economic cooperation over shared livelihood assets, and facilitating peacebuilding networks. Through its programming, DCPSF aims to improve social capital (trust and confidence) and peace dividends, and its projects are successful insofar as they are able to deliver this.

The key way wherein the DCPSF supports peacebuilding activities is by allocating (financial) resources to implementing organisations through an open funding process. The projects supported by the fund are categorised and address four outputs:

1. “Effective community-level conflict resolution and prevention platforms in Darfur are in place”. This output is the foundation of all DCPSF interventions and is mandatory to be addressed by all funded projects, and is mainly done through reviving traditional conflict resolution mechanisms that have the capacity to solve disputes before they escalate;
2. “Cooperation between communities is enhanced through shared livelihood assets and income generating opportunities activities”, which aims at promoting positive interactions between conflicting parties and promoting co-operation on issues of common interest, leading to peace dividends in the form of livelihood opportunities and improved household and community resilience;
3. “Cooperation between competing communities over management of natural resources and access to basic social services increased”, which addresses root and underlying causes of conflict and disputes, both through improving the material situation for the groups involved as well as supporting good governance;
4. “A network of effective collaborative peacebuilding initiatives created and feeding into wider peace fora and Darfur”, which links local peace efforts to higher-level initiatives.

Other elements that shape the DCPSF include:

* Responding to gaps in knowledge and understanding regarding issues of land management, gender, and interaction between native and local government administration. DCPSF’s approach includes a learning-by-doing approach, which facilitates the results leading to best practices and lessons learned, as well a deep understanding of the local dynamics;
* Investing resources in CSOs and NGOs to strengthen their organisational capacity to prioritizes, plan, design and implement projects that result in equitable and sustainable growth, addressing issues including livelihoods, vocational training and employability. This includes both direct programming to support local CSO/NGO capacity, but also by allocating funds that only local organisations can compete for, so that they can improve their capacity through implementation;
* Strengthening the peacebuilding and monitoring & evaluation skills of partner staff to increase their learning abilities.

Within the wider organisational landscape, the DCPSF is one of three large UN funds addressing Darfur issues, which also include the Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SHF) and the UN Darfur Fund (UNDF). It is led by a Technical Secretariat (TS) and overseen by a Steering Committee (SC), which includes donors, technical experts, and implementers.

# Evaluation Overview

In mid-2016, DCPSF began the process of conducting an evaluation on Phase II to both assess the successes and failures of the phase to date, and to advise the future strategy of the Fund. In April 2017, Forcier Consulting was contracted to carry out the evaluation.[[1]](#footnote-1) According to the ToR, the main objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To establish and document the positive impact & any unintended consequences of DCPSF funded activities and the relevance of the DCPSF’s overall strategy for community stabilisation in Darfur;
   1. to validate DCPSF results in terms of achievements toward the fund goal and outputs;
   2. to examine to what extent DCPSF interventions supported peaceful co-existence efforts at the community level, strengthened local peace governance, and empowered and enhanced participation of vulnerable groups, particularly in decision-making and resource-sharing;
2. To assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, economy, and sustainability of DCPSF interventions and its contribution to the creation of network of effective collaborative peacebuilding initiatives that feed into wider peace for a;
3. To document lessons learned, best practices, success stories, and challenges to inform future initiatives;
4. To formulate informed recommendations on future programmatic vision for DCPSF, including the processes and governance mechanisms of the Fund.

In late April, individual meetings with the key stakeholders (members of the SC) were conducted to gather further thoughts and priorities regarding the objectives. Through this round of meetings, it was established that the key focus of the evaluation should be on assessing the strategic elements of the fund. Considering this, the methodology was reoriented from the project level to include three levels of analysis, which all complement each other to produce a holistic view of the Fund’s operation. The overall approach taken by the evaluation team is to seek contribution (as opposed to attribution) to outcomes and impact at those three levels:

* **Project-level operations**, which will focus on the effectiveness and outcomes, impact, and sustainability of the peacebuilding activities supported in the DCPSF’s Phase II. A strong concentration on the project level will be given to how well the implementing partners are implementing cross-cutting priorities such as conflict sensitivity, gender, youth and pastoral inclusion in practice, as well as how the local conflict resolution mechanisms are functioning after the project period ended. Guiding research questions for project-level operations can be found in Section 4. The study will also provide an overview of aggregate project outputs based on the project documents provided;
* **Programme-level operations**, which will review the DCPSF’s strategy to create effects and lasting results beyond the project level. The key questions of this level relate to how the Fund operates as a whole to ensure that the individual projects combine together to produce something that is more than the sum of their parts, as well as how the Fund interacts with other Funds and organisations to create synergies. Guiding research questions for programme-level operations can be found in Section 4;
* **Process-level operations**, which will evaluate the various structures and procedures that guide the DCPSF and its functioning. The key priorities of this level of analysis relate to how the Fund itself is structured, how it selects projects and partners, and how cooperation and collaboration systems are formalised. Guiding research questions for process-level operations can be found in Section 4;

The tools used for the evaluation include a wide range of secondary data sources, as well as primary data collection in the relevant programming locations. In the following section, the methodology for the evaluation is elaborated.

While gender is a cross-cutting issue in all of the Fund’s activities, and will be reviewed as such also in the evaluation, the Fund also explicitly promotes gender sensitivity and aims to transform gender roles through its work, leading to a change of attitudes and behaviour. The evaluation will include questions to measure how successful this approach has been.

# Methodology

The methodology for this study includes a thorough desk review, qualitative data collection (Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews) and quantitative data collection (Household Survey). Data will be collected in three states in Darfur (North, South, and West) and in Khartoum. East and Central Darfur will be covered through document review and interviews with UN staff and other stakeholders. Based on the time and financial and human resources available, a total of 600 HHS will be conducted. The precise distribution of those 600 interviews will be finalised after the selection of the projects for review (see the sampling section below).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tool | Quantity |
| Household Survey | 600   * 200 North Darfur * 200 South Darfur * 200 West Darfur |
| Key Informant Interviews | 66 |
| Focus Group Discussions | 24 |

## 

## 3.1 Desk Review

A thorough desk review will be conducted to inform the design of the programme evaluation, to gain information on the DCPSF, and answer the main evaluation questions. At a project level, the desk review will focus on the documentation of the main achievements of the DCPSF’s activities, including questions such as achievement of outputs. On the programme level, the desk review will focus on the documentation of the overall programme strategy and reporting of achievements that go beyond the project level. Finally, at the process level, the desk review will focus on the procedures within the DCPSF, with a focus on partner selection and fund disbursement. The desk review will provide valuable information on how well the DCPSF documents its results as well as provide context on the internal processes of the DCPSF. The desk review will include, but not be limited to, a review of the following documents listed below.

The Desk Review conducted for the evaluation serves three purposes:

* To inform the creation of tools and instruments
* To inform the sampling and methodology
* To serve as a source of information for the evaluation itself

In order to create the tools and instruments used during the evaluation, various documents will be studied in-depth, which include, but are not limited to:

* DCPSF Thematic Areas and Conflict Analysis
* DCPSF Call for Proposals Guidance Note May 2015
* DCPSF Phase II Revised Result Framework

These three documents, in combination with the consultations conducted with stakeholders during the inception phase, are reviewed to set the stage for the evaluation. The document highlighting the thematic areas DCPSF aims to focus on and conflict analysis that informed these decisions, shape the Call for Proposals. In combination with the Result Framework, this suggests which areas are prioritized by DCPSF. Using these documents, it will become clear which core questions the evaluation will need to answer.

To inform the sampling and methodology, and to choose which 12 projects will be selected in North, South, and West Darfur, at least the following two documents from every project in these states that has taken place in Phase II will be reviewed:

* Project Proposals
* Final Reports

These documents will be used to purposefully select projects based on the state they were implemented in, the funding window, the type or project, the thematic area, the project length, and end date. Further information on the sampling criteria is provided in Section 4. Reviewing these documents will not only be used to select a balanced group of varied projects, but also to further determine the quantitative sample. For example, the demographic composition and number of reached beneficiaries in combination with the thematic area of intervention could potentially determine the exact sample draw.

Finally, a broad range of sources will be used to guide the evaluation of project, programme, and process level operations. While project-level documents such as aforementioned project proposals and final reports are used for the methodology, they will also be used to summarize project outputs. Project documents from East and Central Darfur, states that are not covered during fieldwork and primary data collection, will be reviewed more closely in order to also evaluate those areas. For the document review, the evaluation will focus more closely on documents, including the following:

* Perception Survey 2014
* December 2012 DCPSF Impact Assessment
* DCPSF Gender Strategy
* Environment Marker
* DCPSF Steering Committee Terms of Reference
* DCPSF ToRs Phase II
* Job descriptions
* DCPSF Thematic Areas and Conflict Analysis

Documents such as the DCPSF Gender Strategy, Environment Marker, and Conflict Analysis will be evaluated on several levels. For example, how is the Gender Strategy translated into an inclusive, gender sensitive approach by the Implementing Partners on the project level? On the programme level, what is the evidence of capacity building support offered to Implementing Partners to help them design inclusive programming? On the process level, the mechanisms, if any, which inform the Gender Strategy, are assessed. Other documents, such as the Steering Committee Terms of Reference, in conjunction with KIIs, inform the assessment of the management and strategy of DCPSF.

## 3.2 Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data will be collected with multiple types of respondents in order to elicit narrative and in-depth information about the project activities. Respondent selection for qualitative interviews will follow the principle of representation rather than representativeness, maximizing the number of different voices heard in the study.

## Key Informant Interviews

KIIs will be conducted with the following groups of people, covering representation of opinion from each of the following stakeholders. A minimum of 6 KIIs per group will be conducted, which is likely to provide sufficient data for analysis. When necessary, additional data may be collected.

By interviewing stakeholders and beneficiaries, as well as others such as relevant experts and similar pooled funding initiative, qualitative data is collected on two levels: 1) strategic, high-level KIIs, and 2) field-based, local KIIs with majority of beneficiaries. On both levels, the KIIs will provide insights regarding what was expected, what succeeded, or what was lacking, in DCPSF programming.

High-level KIIs with stakeholders will be conducted with various groups, including the DCPSF Technical Secretariat, donors, and local authorities. Members of the DCPSF Technical Secretariat will provide information on the design and motivations behind the Fund’s structuring, while donors may elaborate on their expectations regarding the outcomes and impact of the Fund, as well as their expectations of the future. While these interviews will largely take place in Khartoum, KIIs with Local Authorities and State-Level Government Officials in the field will provide practical insights into the functioning of the DCPSF on a practical policy level.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stakeholders | # |
| Technical Secretariat and Steering Committee | 6 |
| DCPSF Donors | 6 |
| Local Authorities | 6 |
| State-Level Government Officials | 6 |

KIIs will take place with both direct and indirect beneficiaries. KIIs with Implementing Partners, actors who have directly received financial or other material or non-material sources of support, will be asked to elaborate about their direct experiences with the fund, as will Civil Society Leaders and CBRMs. Indirect Fund beneficiaries, such as community leaders, will be asked about the positive and possible unintended negative effects the various projects have had on their community.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Beneficiaries | # |
| Implementing Partners | 6 |
| Civil Society Leaders and CBRMs | 6 |
| Community Leaders | 6 |

Finally, KIIs will be conducted with a range of other actors to supplement data collection. Interviewing other locally active NGOs will provide insights regarding the coherence and coordination of implementing partners with other relevant local actors, and inform suggestions for strengthening cooperation. KIIs with other active pooled funds in Darfur will allow for relative comparison of strengths, coverage, and complementarity. KIIs with other relevant UN agencies and topical experts will provide context and inform further analysis and future directions of the DCPSF and its activities.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Other | # |
| Locally Active NGOs | 6 |
| Pooled Funds (Sudan Humanitarian Fund, UN Darfur Fund) | 6 |
| UN Agencies | 6 |
| Darfur Peacebuilding and Conflict Experts | 6 |

## Focus Group Discussions

Focus Group Discussions are of a semi-structured, narrative nature that will inform the study of the changes and results as perceived and experienced by direct beneficiaries of the individual projects. It will indicate the process-based causes for these changes, both positive and unintended negative effects, and provide an understanding of how key programme outcomes can be improved and amplified, as well as how negative externalities may be minimized in the future. FGDs will be conducted with beneficiaries to establish a direct conversation about progress and observed change over time, and be compared with quantitative data collection. As such, they will provide insight in possible cause-effect relationships that may relate to observed changes since the initial intervention.

FGD participants will be selected purposively in order to maximize the diversity of opinions represented in the study. This is particularly important to ensure that marginalized groups, particularly women, are included among the respondents for these tools. As such, separate FGDs will be conducted with male and female beneficiaries in each project location (12), for a total of 24 FGDs.

## 3.3 Quantitative Data Collection

In order to address the quantitative indicators and collect results comparable to previously collected measurements, Forcier Consulting will design and implement a household survey with community members inclusive of direct and indirect beneficiaries.

The survey will be implemented by using smartphones and computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) with the ODK-based ONA software. This method is used by Forcier in all its work in Sudan. The CAPI methods allows for instant remote quality control and rapid data cleaning prior to analysis. By scripting the survey using a modular design, programme-level general satisfaction questions can be asked of all areas, topics, and respondents, while asking more specific modules only of certain sub-groups.

The questionnaire will be translated to Arabic to facilitate the State approval process and implementation. Although there are a multitude of different languages spoken across the country, getting permissions for any of the local non-Arabic languages is not possible based on previous experience. However, excluding certain groups of the population would highly skew the sample towards Arabic speakers, and likely result in under-representation of marginalized groups. This issue is mitigated by relying on the use of locally recruited enumerators, who are able to read Arabic while conducting the interviews in the language that the households are most comfortable with. During training, all questions in the questionnaire will be extensively discussed with enumerators to ensure that they are fully understood, and oral translations are as consistent as possible. For the respondents of South Sudanese origin, the English version is often more convenient than the Arabic. Therefore, the survey will be available on the phone both in English and Arabic.

## 3.4 Ethical Considerations

All participants in the data collection exercises will be informed fully of their rights as an interviewee, and thus informed consent will be verbally received:

1. Respondent rights will be read to each potential participant and oral (due to low levels of literacy) informed consent will be acquired from each respondent:
   1. The respondent’s consent to take part in the data collection is completely voluntary and refusing to take part will have no negative consequences;
   2. The respondent has the right to end the interview at any point with no reason given;
   3. The respondent has the right to refuse to answer any question they feel uncomfortable with;
   4. All the information given by the respondent will be kept confidential so that their responses and their identity cannot be linked together;
   5. Insofar as in-depth interviews are recorded, the oral permission will be part of the recording;
2. No under-age individuals will be asked to participate in the study;
3. All persons shown in photographs from fieldwork will be asked for their permission prior to taking the photo;
4. All data collection will follow a do-no-harm principle where speaking with the evaluation team should not lead to any negative outcomes. The principle will be part of the field team training and all responses will be anonymised to protect respondent identity.

## 3.5 Data Quality Control

Forcier will implement a rigorous data quality control system to ensure the highest possible data integrity. Using strict quality control procedures improves the reliability and consistency of data, enhancing the quality of analysis and credibility.

The quality control process starts prior to fieldwork, when Team Leaders heading the enumerator teams are trained in analysing basic demographics such as gender distribution, conducting spot checks in completed surveys and performing callbacks, and using tracking sheets to record household visits. The use of the CAPI method allows for the instant upload of completed surveys to a server, where daily quality control checks are conducted in Khartoum. Daily checks allow for the early detection of abnormalities that may skew or bias the representativeness of the data, for example highly unusual gender distributions. Quality control will also focus on logical consistency in a respondent’s flow of answers, possible contradictions, prompted awareness, and other issues that may play a role.

Analysis of the quantitative data is complemented with daily debrief calls with Team Leaders in the field, who may discuss interesting findings or logistical challenges. Simultaneously, qualitative data collection is also checked for quality and consistency. For example, Team Leaders are required to submit notes, transcripts, or translations from interviews or focus group discussions on a daily basis.

# Sampling

Forcier Consulting will design and implement a household survey with community members inclusive of direct and indirect beneficiaries. The household survey will take place in the three targeted states in close proximity of 12 selected projects, which counts for 21.4% of all projects in these states. Projects to be included in the sampling are not chosen randomly, but instead are based on the following factors:

* State – an approximately similar number of projects in each of the three targeted states will be included
* Windows – an approximately similar number of projects from each of the three windows will be included
* Type of the project – an approximately similar number of projects of each type (e.g. capacity building, construction/rehabilitation, etc.) will be included
* Thematic areas of the project – an approximately similar number of projects addressing different themes (governance for peace, natural resources, livelihoods, stabilisation, social cohesion, etc.) will be included
* Length of the project (an approximately similar number of projects with a short, medium or long project duration will be included
* End date – focus will be on projects that have already concluded as to focus on sustainability

The selection determination of projects will take place in collaboration with DCPSF. In total, 600 household surveys will be taken, 200 in each of the targeted localities. In each of the project locations, enumerators will use standard random household and respondent selection techniques.

# Indicator Matrix

The following table provides an overview of the guiding research questions that the study aims to evaluate. It includes, but is not limited to the research areas in the table below. The questions, broken by down the three levels of analysis, will allow the study to evaluate the DCPSF on a strategic level. Perceptions of the implementation of the crosscutting themes of gender, youth, inclusivity, and sustainability will be measured in the household survey and FGDs, where respondents will be asked about these themes in the project activities of which they have been beneficiaries.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Tentative Indicators** | **Sources of Verification** | **Means of Verification** |
| **RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS**  The extent to which the objectives of DCPSF are relevant and consistent with the Implementing Partner’s needs, national/regional needs and priorities, and support the implementation of donor strategies | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent did Implementing Partners tailor projects to local needs and adapt interventions to the local context? | **Needs assessments**   * Quality and robustness of intervention planning * Activities were aligned with policy frameworks and specifically translate objectives to locally relevant activities * Implementing partners strategies were aligned with the DCPSF objectives * To extent to which CBRMs were the most relevant mechanism for local peace governance | * Project documentation Implementing Partners * Strategy documents * Insights from stakeholders * Insights from beneficiaries | * Document review * KIIs with Implementing Partners * FGDs with beneficiaries * Household survey |
| **Programme-level:** The extent to which DCPSF not only stabilizes communities, but also contributes to durable peace / DSCPF objectives are relevant to the programme area | **Regional needs and priorities**   * Evidence that DCPSF filled a programmatic gap not covered by other regional funds or initiatives * Frameworks were followed by regional activities directed towards trust, peacebuilding, capacity building * Evidence that the regional approach was meaningful in the local contexts and corresponds to the needs of the communities involved * The extent to which CBRMs were the most relevant mechanism for local peace governance * The extent to which DCPSF has been able to address the root causes of the conflict, moving beyond stabilisation * The position DCPSF occupies on the humanitarian-development nexus | * Donor coordination protocols and reports * DCPSF framework and strategy documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with DCPSF Technical Secretariat, Donors and Embassy Staff, Pooled Funds, NGOs |
| **Process-level:** To what extent does DCPSF maintain relevant, adaptive strategies responding to changing dynamics in Darfur? | **DCPSF strategies**   * Existence of mechanisms through which DCPSF creates and updates its approaches * The strategies supported by the DCPSF were relevant to the region and the communities, and aligned with their needs and priorities * The strategies were sufficiently flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances and conflict dynamics, demonstrating agility, including the anticipated drawdown of UNAMID | * DCPSF framework and strategy documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with DCPSF Technical Secretariat, Donors and Embassy Staff, UN Agencies, other Experts * KIIs with Assessment Team |
| **EFFECTIVENESS**  The extent to which the DCPSF attained its objectives of restoring trust between communities and peace in Darfur | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent have the Implementing Partners contributed to the restoring of trust and peace between communities? | **Outputs and outcomes**   * The extent to which Implementing Partners have achieved the set objectives, against planned outputs * The extent to which Implementing Partners have contributed to outcomes, against planned outcomes * To extent to which CBRMs were the most effective mechanism for local peace governance | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders * Insights from beneficiaries | * Document review * FGDs with beneficiaries * Household Survey * KIIs with Community Leaders, Civil Society Leaders and CBRMs, Implementing Partners |
| **Programme-level:** The extent to which DCPSF has been able to amplify the effect of individual projects through its pooled approach? | **Amplified effectiveness**   * The extent to which the DCPSF has the ability to link individual projects to regional strategy/initiative * The extent to which the DCPSF has established a catalytic effect * The extent to which DCPSF has contributed to outcomes * To extent to which CBRMs were the most effective mechanism for local peace governance * The extent to which DCPSF transcends the perception of service provider | * DCPSF strategy documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Technical Secretariat, Implementing Partners, Donors, UN Agencies |
| **Process-level:** To what extent do DCPSF processes lead to the selection of the most effective partners and projects? | **Project and partner selection**   * The extent to which the project and partner selection procedures select the most capable Implementing Partners | * DCPSF selection process documentation and guidelines * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Technical Secretariat, Implementing Partners, NGOs (applicants) |
| **EFFICIENCY**  The extent to which outputs have been achieved with the least costly resources possible to achieve the desired results. | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent did Implementing Partners achieve their outputs/outcomes within the allocated time and with the allocated resources? | **Timeliness of implementation**   * Evidence of timely project implementation against the planned timelines   **Efficient use of financial resources**   * Evidence of value-for-money | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * FGDs with beneficiaries * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Technical Secretariat, Community Leaders, Local Authorities |
| **Programme-level:** To what extent does the DCPSF strategy of pooling projects amplify the individual effects? | **Amplifying effects**   * Evidence that pooled funds increase efficiency, effectiveness, and maximises impact of the programme (more than the sum of its parts) * Evidence that pooled funds correspond to a real need of implementing partners * Evidence that coordination of projects delegated to Implementing Partners increases ownership and efficiency, effectiveness and impact, as well as builds capacity * Distinction between funding categories (Window I and II) is relevant and reflect programme objectives * Characteristics of windows are different and complementary | * Project documentation * DCPSF procurement process * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Pooled Funds, NGOs, UN Agencies, Technical Secretariat, |
| **Process-level:** To what extent has disbursement of funds been efficient? | **Procurement process**   * Eligibility and award criteria for partner and project selection reflect the objectives of programme * Requirements are appropriate/achievable for majority (critical mass) of applicants (requirements set out by DCPSF in partner and project selection are realistic and feasible for funding applications) * Openness and transparency of the selection and funding process * Management structure of the DCPSF enhances efficiency (short lines, strong M&E) | * Selection procedures * Disbursement procedures * Insights from successful and unsuccessful applicants * DCPSF procurement process * DCPSF management structures and team composition | * Document review * KIIs with Technical Secretariat, Donors, Implementing Partners, NGOs, applicants |
| **IMPACT**  The positive and negative, direct and indirect, and intended and unintended, long-term changes produced by the DCPSF | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent have Implementing Partners and their projects led to intended or unintended, direct or indirect, positive and negative impacts (trust, peacebuilding, stability)? | **Observed impacts**   * Evidence of tangible, meaningful impact on objectives in target communities (direct beneficiaries) * Broader (long-term) meaningful impact of interventions on indirect beneficiaries | * Project documentation on outputs, i.e. quarterly reports, final reports, progress reports, etc. * Insights from beneficiaries * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * Household survey * FGDs with beneficiaries * KIIs with Community Leaders, Civil Society Leaders and CBRMs, Local Authorities, Implementing Partners |
| **Programme-level:** To what extent has the DCPSF led to intended or unintended, direct or indirect, positive and negative impacts (trust, peacebuilding, stability)? | **Observed impacts**   * Evidence of increase of institutional capacity of local communities and local government * Evidence of significant impact of DCPSF establishing and improving cooperation between actors in the Fund and in the region at large | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * FGDs with beneficiaries * KIIs with Community Leaders, Civil Society Leaders and CBRMs, Local Authorities, Implementing Partners |
| **Process-level:** To what extent have the processes underpinning DCPSF led to intended or unintended, direct or indirect, positive and negative impacts (trust, peacebuilding, stability)? | **Observed impacts**   * Existence of mechanisms through which DCPSF encourages and supports an impactful intervention * Implementing Partners, evidence of positive snowballing effects of individual/collective progress | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Technical Secretariat, Implementing Partners, NGOs, UN Agencies, Pooled Funds |
| **SUSTAINABILITY**  Which activities and/or outcomes are likely to continue once DCPSF support discontinues | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent have Implementing Partners achieved results that are likely to continue after project conclusion? | **Capacity building**   * The extent to which Implementing Partners have promoted capacity building in the targeted communities, predominantly through CBRMs * The extent to which local government buy-in was strengthened by Implementing Partners | * Project documentation, specifically regarding the CBRMs * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * FGDs with beneficiaries * KIIs with Community Leaders, Civil Society Leaders and CBRMs, Local Authorities, Implementing Partners |
| **Programme-level:** To what extent has the DCPSF achieved change that is likely to continue after project conclusion? | **Capacity building**   * The extent to which DCPSF has supported capacity building of Implementing Partners * The extent to which Sudanese government, such as HAC and state-level government, was involved * The extent to which CBRMs are the most suitable mechanism for sustainable local peace governance, also after conclusion of project | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Community Leaders, Civil Society Leaders and CBRMs, Local Authorities, Implementing Partners |
| **Process-level:** The extent to which DCPSF developed and use “future proof” strategies | **Capacity building**   * Existence of mechanisms wherein DCPSF informs and adapts sustainable strategies * The extent to which Sudanese government was included in the DCPSF, strengthening their capacity | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Technical Staff, UN Agencies, Pooled Funds, Donors |
| **COOPERATION AND COORDINATION**  The extent to which DCPSF has established and strengthened cooperation and coordination between relevant actors (Implementing Partners, local actors, donors, regional initiatives and funds) | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent have implementing partners cooperated and coordinated with other local actors? | **Project design and implementation**   * Evidence of complementarity of interventions in the region * Evidence of duplication of efforts with other actors in the region * Results build on existing results and are complementary * Evidence of formal inclusion or engagement with other local stakeholders * Perceptions and quality of relations between the parties * Stakeholders consider regional cooperation beneficial to the needs of the community | * Implementing Partners project documents * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Local NGOs |
| **Programme-level:** To what extent has DCPSF coordinated its programme with other funds or regional activities, supporting a regional strategy? | **Regional coherence**   * Evidence of linkages and synergy with other funds such as SHF, UNDF (within UN framework and beyond) * Regional coordination/dimensions are of added value to the programme and contribute to the achievement of objectives * The extent to which DCPSF functions as a thought leader in peacebuilding in Darfur * To what extent is the Fund complementary at the programme level, specifically as it relates to Rule of Law * Perceptions and understanding of DCPSF, its mandate and purpose by beneficiaries and government | * Strategy documents from other Pooled Funds and regional initiatives, UN frameworks, etc. * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Pooled Funds, UN Agencies, NGOs, Technical Secretariat |
| **Process-level:** To what extent does the DCPSF enable and guide cooperation and coordination on the project- and programme level? | **Management structures**   * Evidence of presence and use of formal coordination mechanisms * Evidence of regular meaningful meetings and subsequent evidence of feedback cycles, follow-up or enforcement informing programming * DCPSF facilitates communication between relevant stakeholders, as well as information and feedback flows, such as Sudanese government and HAC * Processes in place for coordination with other funds and initiatives | * Evidence of incidence/frequency of meetings * Evidence of meeting notes, shared feedback, comments * Evidence of formalized communication flows or guidelines * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Technical Secretariat |
| **INCLUSIVENESS**  The extent to which the DCPSF has applied an approach promoting the inclusion of women, youth, and pastoralists | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent did implementing partners apply an inclusive approach (gender, youth, pastoralists) in the project cycle (design, implementation)? | **Needs assessments**   * Evidence of gender, youth, and pastoralists components in the needs assessments   **Responsive project activities**   * Meaningful gender-, youth-, and pastoralist-responsive project activities leading to behavioural and attitudinal change | * Implementing Partners project documents * Stakeholders insights | * Document review * Household survey * FGDs with beneficiaries * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Technical Secretariat |
| **Programme-level:** To what extent was an inclusive approach (gender, youth, pastoralists) applied by the DCPSF? | **Capacity building**   * Evidence of capacity building support for Implementing Partners in enhancing inclusiveness, for example by offering learning and training regarding inclusiveness during project design and implementation, or offering inclusiveness approaches and guidelines * Evidence of understanding of regional differences and local dynamics regarding gender, youth, and pastoralists | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Technical Secretariat, Pooled Funds, NGOs, UN Agencies |
| **Process-level:** To what extent were processes and procedures in DCPSF inclusive, and promoting inclusiveness? | **Inclusivity in processes**   * Evidence of mechanisms informing inclusive approaches * Evidence of knowledge management and learning sharing * Evidence of inclusive mechanisms guiding DCPSF procedures | * Evidence of incidence/frequency of meetings * Evidence of meeting notes, shared feedback, comments * Evidence of formalized communication flows or guidelines * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Technical Secretariat, Pooled Funds, UN Agencies |
| **CONFLICT-SENSITIVITY**  The extent to which the DCPSF has applied an approach promoting conflict sensitive approaches | | | |
| **Project-level:** To what extent did implementing partners apply a conflict-sensitive approach in the project cycle (design, implementation)? | **Project planning**   * Evidence of project design being preceded, and informed by conflict mapping or analysis exercises * Projects are planned and executed sensitive to local cultures and dynamics * Evidence of projects capitalising on opportunities to support, strengthen peace, and peace dividends | * Implementing Partners project documents * Stakeholders insights | * Document review * Household survey * FGDs with beneficiaries * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Technical Secretariat |
| **Programme-level:** To what extent does DCPSF utilize and promote conflict sensitive approaches? | **Capacity building**   * Evidence of capacity building support for Implementing Partners in enhancing conflict sensitive approaches, for example by offering learning and training regarding conflict sensitivity during project design and implementation, or offering conflict sensitivity approaches and guidelines   **Flexibility and adaptability**   * Conflict sensitivity approaches are flexible, revised when necessary to adapt to changing circumstances * Understanding of regional differences and local conflict dynamics | * Project documentation * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Technical Secretariat, Pooled Funds, NGOs, UN Agencies |
| **Process-level:** To what extent are the processes and structures that underpin DCPSF conflict sensitive? | **Conflict sensitivity of processes**   * Evidence and functioning of mechanisms to inform and shape DCPSF conflict sensitivity approaches, adapting when necessary * Evidence that partner and project selection comply with conflict analysis and are conflict sensitive * Evidence of mitigation procedures when unintended negative impacts occur | * Evidence of incidence/frequency of meetings * Evidence of meeting notes, shared feedback, comments * Evidence of formalized communication flows or guidelines * Insights from stakeholders | * Document review * KIIs with Implementing Partners, Technical Secretariat, Pooled Funds, UN Agencies |

# Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Submission of Inception Report | 11 May |
| Training of field team leaders | 29 June - 04 July |
| Field training and data collection | 06-27 July |
| Team Leader interviews Khartoum and Darfur | 11 - 20 July |
| Analysis and report writing | 25 July - 23 August |
| Submission of draft Final Report | 24 August |
| Presentation of draft Final Report | 03 September |
| Stakeholder feedback | 10 September |
| Submission and approval of Final Report | 17 September |

# Limitations

As the study intends to focus on the DCPSF’s overall strategy and functioning, transcending solely project outputs, the information collected on individual project-level indicators will be limited to aggregating secondary data. Shaped as a programmatic review rather than an endline project evaluation, the study will provide in-depth information on the functioning of structures and processes, strategies, and assumptions underpinning the DCPSF. As such, the study aims to provide a high-level review of the DCPSF, rather than a summary of individual project outputs.

At the programme level, caution is needed in relation to the interpretation of outcome findings. While findings may suggest that the DCPSF has made significant contributions to a number of outcomes, it may be impossible to distinguish contributions from the DCPSF and other external influences. As such, conclusions on the results of the DCPSF need to be read with general caveats in regards to attribution from a single data point.

Since the study only includes data collection in three out of the five Darfur States, results cannot automatically be generalized to the other states. The evaluation team will mitigate this through document review and through interviewing UN staff and other stakeholders in order to appropriately cover East and Central Darfur as much as possible.

1. The core team members conducting the evaluation are: André Kahlmeyer (Team Leader), Eero Wahlstedt (Country Director), Sarah Nijholt (Research Manager), Chelsey Buurman (Project Officer), as well as the field teams and enumerators. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)