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# Introduction

This report presents the first deliverable for the Terminal Evaluation of the “Building Trust and Confidence in Zimbabwe’s Transition” Project commonly referred to as the Zim-CATT project. Chapter 2 details the programme context, its objectives and interventions as well as changes that occurred during implementation. Last sections of Chapter 2 provide details of the evaluation scope (objectives, and evaluation questions). Chapter 3 presents details of the evaluation approach and methods while Chapter 4 presents the proposed work plan for completing the evaluation.

# Background

## Country Context

Since the turn of the new millennium, Zimbabwe’s election periods have been marred by politically motivated violence. There was a significant departure from this during the period prior to and during the 2018 National election, which was marked by a relatively peaceful pre-election period. This was partly owing to the Government of Zimbabwe putting in place strategies – including invitation of international election observers - to mitigate political and civil unrest as well as promote harmony. Despite these efforts, the response to the demonstrations that ensued following the post-election period was fraught with violence; alleged violation of human rights; loss of six lives (including one woman), and the contestation of the election outcome by the opposition due to concern over the credibility of the entire election process.[[1]](#footnote-1) During this period, gender inequity issues were also prominent with visible violence against women through social media to deter and threaten women from taking on roles in politics and civil life. An assessment by the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) found that between January and April 2018, “60% of violent discourse and related content in the political space were directed towards women”.[[2]](#footnote-2) These post-election events exacerbated the already existing public scepticism; disengagement; and political and social polarization. In addition, these challenges, rooted in historical conflict and grievances; deepened by a culture of intolerance across political divides; and characterized by intimidation, mistrust and fear, called for the need to address them in order to promote and consolidate democracy in Zimbabwe.

### State of peacebuilding in Zimbabwe

Since introduction of new national leadership and government after the resignation of the then President, significant efforts were put into developing and implementing a reconciliation and peace building framework. This started with the Transitional Stabilisation Programme (TSP). The TSP was conceptualized and implemented as a lead-up and to inform the five-year National Development Strategy (NDS) 1 2021-2025. The TSP was announced following the Presidential inauguration in August 2018 and approved on 2 October 2018, with the goal of governance and economic reform to facilitate the political transition and encourage international investment.[[3]](#footnote-3) The Programme prioritized economic stabilisation and growth; and also included a governance reform section focusing on rule of law, access to justice, democratization, respect for human rights, national unity, peace and reconciliation, and alignment of statutes to the constitution. One of the underlying values of the TSP was “citizenry participation in national and socio-economic development programmes”.[[4]](#footnote-4) Within the TSP, national unity, peace, and reconciliation was one of the five priority governance reforms advocating for the need for “promotion of unity across the country and healing wounds of the past as an opportunity to foster peace, reconciliation and harmony”[[5]](#footnote-5). Additionally, the TSP outlined six key milestones and deliverables related to gender issues including: 1) Mainstreaming of gender sensitive policies and regulations; 2) Integrating gender into national and economic policies; 3) identification of gender issues in programming and budgeting; 4) prioritization of resource allocation for the implementation of gender programmes; 5) Implementation of gender sensitive programmes and projects targeting women and youths; and 6) monitoring and evaluation for programmes.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The process of building national peace and reconciliation has also been supported by the enactment of the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission (NPRC) Act[[7]](#footnote-7) and subsequent five-year Strategic Plan (2018-2022).[[8]](#footnote-8) Through adoption of more inclusive approaches, the overall mandate of the NPRC is to ensure post-conflict justice, healing and reconciliation; break the culture of impunity; deal with the nation’s past conflicts and institute mechanisms for peaceful conflict resolution. Fundamental to the work of the NPRC is addressing both new and old grievances as informed by priorities of affected communities. This involved establishing and convening 10 consultative forums in all 10 provinces to identify grievances, key threats to reconciliation, existing opportunities for facilitating healing, and the role of NPRC in pushing forward the goals of the NPRC that foster the peace and reconciliation agenda. Over 1,800 key stakeholder representatives were engaged and participated in this process including civil society, faith institutions, governments entities, women, and youth groups. The findings from the consultations with the stakeholder groups informed the NPRC 2018-2022 Strategic Plan.

Another significant investment to peacebuilding and reducing conflict are social protection systems that were set up to aid in addressing inequalities and marginalization of communities that came about as a result of historical political and tribal conflict. Some of these communities are located in the Matabeleland region; and the Manicaland and, Masvingo, Midlands, and the Mashonaland provinces. “The majority of families in these regions rely on government and development partner-provided social benefits.”[[9]](#footnote-9) However, due to the national economic crises, the social protection system has been disrupted with some schemes contracting or completely collapsing. In addition, lack of transparency and accountability has resulted in mistrust in the government’s capacity to deliver basic services. Further, social protection systems, have in some instances been misused has an instrument of power and control resulting in exclusion and polarization among political institutions. Thus, design and implementation of social protection systems, should be guided by gender and conflict-sensitive principles. In this regard, there is need to apply ‘do no harm’ principles to social protection services programming; ensure quality services are responsive to the context within which they are delivered; and supported by adequate transparent and accountability systems.[[10]](#footnote-10) This was done through supporting capacity of key actors and institutions in their planning, coordinating, and provision of social protection in ways that are gender and conflict sensitive; and in consideration of historical and structural drivers of marginalization and tribal fault lines.[[11]](#footnote-11)

### Peacebuilding initiatives at project inception

At the inception of the project, several initiatives were conceptualized and planned for each of the three output areas of the project. To strengthen civic engagement, as the first output area, the focus was on enhancing the capacities of the Government entities in collaborative leadership, participatory development planning, strategic foresight, and risk analysis especially those of women’s rights and youth organizations. Secondly, there was emphasis on building a strong and visible social network at the national, sub-national, and community levels. These social networks were envisioned to be inclusive of voices and perspectives of those from marginalized groups; within communities; and in positions of power and formal authority. This was done by strengthening and enhancing multi-stakeholder monitoring of platforms for social dialogue, such as the Tripartite Negotiating Forum (TNF). For the second output area, the Ministry of Public Service, Labour, and Social Welfare proposed to provide and review social protection in a gender and conflict sensitive manner taking into account historical and structural drivers of marginalization, ethnic and tribal fault lines. Additionally, enhanced the capacity of key stakeholders in all tiers of the government, including local authorities, traditional leadership and education sector to strength their ability for dialogue and promotion of conflict transformation. The third output area, aimed at advancing the national healing and reconciliation agenda in the country, was supported through the implementation of the TSP and NPRC strategic plan.

## Project Description

Anchored under the UN’s Peace and Democracy Facility, the overall goal of the project was to support interventions that aimed to promote and sustain peace to enhance confidence and trust building during the country’s political transition[[12]](#footnote-12) through:

*“Improved national capacities for gender and youth inclusive dialogue, consensus-building and reconciliation, with participation of marginalized and at-risk groups (women, youth and people living with disabilities)” (TOR page 1)*

These goals are in line with the priority areas outlined in Zimbabwe’s United National Development Framework (ZUNDAF) on public administration and governance, and gender equality[[13]](#footnote-13) and contribute to SDG16 on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions and SDG 5 on promoting gender equality. Specifically, the three main inter-related output areas were to: 1) Promote meaningful participation of citizens – including women and youth – in monitoring the implementation of the TSP; 2) improve dispute resolution services and social protection systems design in marginalized and at-risk communities; and 3) Advance national peace and reconciliation. Achieving these objectives and output areas was envisioned to contribute toward a conducive environment for peace, trust, and citizen participation in the development process. The project was responsive to governance priorities set out in the constitution and the TSP. Firstly, under the coordination of the Office of the President and Cabinet – through the Vice President – the project included resources to the State’s capacities in specific areas including risk analysis, scenario building, fore sighting, perception surveying, and citizen engagement. Secondly, complimentary downstream delivery of social protection was provided and dispute resolution services to at-risk communities were provided. Thirdly, technical, advisory, logistical and financial support was provided to the NPRC and key stakeholders to kick start the implementation of the five-year strategic plan.

The total budget for the project was $3,143,861.00.

### The project results and activities

In early 2019, the initial stages of the PBF project focused on laying the groundwork for partnership building and stakeholder engagement.[[14]](#footnote-14) The majority of activities, including capacitation, sensitization, and trust-building, informed preparation and harmonization with implementing partners and participating ministries. Building on established partnerships, the project gained momentum early 2020 before the COVID-19 pandemic. Although the pandemic had a significant impact on the project approach and timeline, several key achievements were realized through the project reported within the period. These included 1) trust building, induction, capacitation, and deployment of the NRPC and 10 Provincial Peace Committees (PPCs) which are a key architecture for providing durable peace at community level; 2) facilitated the meaningful contribution of young people to the national TSP policy making processes; 3) development and submission of three policy papers to the Ministry of Finance to be considered in the design of the 2021-2025 National Development Strategy; 4) participation of 1,000 education stakeholders in the various consultative platforms; 5) continuation of the Internship Fellowship Programme (IFP) with a second cohort of 45 students from the initial 20 students in the 2018/2019 cycle. Fifteen of the IFP fellows attended at the 6th Africa Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Forum held in Zimbabwe, which provided the opportunity for exposure to peacebuilding; and 6) beyond the focus on conflict resolution, the project conducted a survey research to assess the impact of the COVID-19 on women and citizens[[15]](#footnote-15) (further details are provided in the section on the COVID-19 impact below). Table 1 outlines the activities, outputs, and outcomes within each output area.12, [[16]](#footnote-16)

Table 1: Summary of activities and output within three PBF project output areas

| **Output area** | **Activities** | **Outputs** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meaningful participation of citizens – including women and youth – in monitoring the implementation of the TSP | * Train and support targeted State entities to oversee mandates and develop strategies that are gender response for civic engagement in TSP implementation
* Support creation of platforms for interaction between women’s civil society, rights groups and key stakeholders for peace building
* Awareness raising by CSOs among citizens on TSP and NDS
* Convene provincial and district-level multi-stakeholder meetings (including technical review committee) meetings to assess and review TSP implementation and identify strategies address TSP bottlenecks
* Documentation and dissemination of key outcomes to the public through multi-media channels
* Support NDS strategy 1 consultation with a peace lens to ensure input from TSP consultations are incorporated in the NDS
 | * Created platforms for women and youth’s meaningful engagement in the initial NDS processes to input and provide feedback
* 2 strategic plans: NPRC PPC strategies for conflict management & resolution & curriculum for civic managers, commissions and Ministry of Women Affairs with UZ
* 1 Local Authorities Citizen Engagement Handbook developed
* 248 multiple stakeholders trained on strategic planning
* Countrywide meetings to sensitive and raise awareness about NDP development (196 CSOs, 286 members) and TSP (10 provinces, 16 districts, 770 women, 214 men)
* Strategic intergenerational dialogue on gender equality during IWD 2020
* 2 high-level discussion led by the Office of the President and Cabinet and Ministry of Finance focusing on governance, social protection, TSP
* Identification of priorities for the NDS 2021-2025 by the National Government and citizen engagement
* Trained CSOs on Monitoring Accountability to TSP
 |
| Improve dispute resolution services and social protection systems design in marginalized and at-risk communities | * Assessment of existing conflict-prevention initiatives and develop integrated mechanism for early detection of potential conflict
* Develop capacity enhancement plan that is age and gender responsive
* Develop handbook and manual for policy makers and practitioners to support delivery of gender- and conflict-sensitive services
* Train facilitators to assist stakeholders in collaboratively finding solutions to conflict
* Develop capacity of academic institutions to integrate conflict transformation skills & research
* Support social protection initiatives – NRPC committees; conflict prevention and alternative dispute resolution
* Support network development between women and youth organizations and those at national level
 | * Concluded 1 social sector review
* One MoPLSW
* Baseline study commissioned by NRPC on conflict mapping & Development of community-based plan is underway
* Undertook targeted programming specifically addressing women’s peace & safety issues within communities. This included establishing gender & diversity committee of the NPRC to operationalize section 9 of NPRC Act to promote gender mainstreaming in healing & reconciliation.
* Social protection steering committee reconvened resulting in systems set up to develop and deliver gender and conflict-sensitive social protection services
* & handbook under development
* Produced 2 Gender Monitoring Survey reports to inform Government’s response to gender-related issues
* Training of community stakeholders (legal aid, women, men, community peace facilitators, education including children)
* 16 youth delegates attended African Regional SDG Forum
* 92 cases received by NRPC in 2020 currently under investigation
 |
| Advance national peace and reconciliation | * Public engagement, communication strategy to guide NPRC’s outreach and stakeholder processes - 10 pilot public outreach campaigns across 10 districts
* High-level session with key state institution on NPRC strategic plan
* Support development of an NPRC Operational Plan
* Induction and orientation of multi-stakeholder national, provincial, and district peace and reconciliation committees
* Develop and pilot national truth telling programme
* Provide seed funding to the Government and NPRC for healing & reconciliation initiatives
* Quarterly National and Provincial level gender peace and reconciliation meetings
* Support CSOs, FBOs, Women and youth organization to implement community-based peacebuilding programmes.
 | * 1500 citizens participated in NPRC provincial stakeholder consultation and disseminations
* High-level confidence building session by the NRPC, ZRP command, Parliament, and National army on maintaining peace/order
* NRPC established 10 Provincial Peace Committees in all 10 provinces
* Healing & reconciliation in targeted communities (7 MOUs signed between Local & District authorities, Tradition leaders & Councillors; support of 2 FBOs in promoting women’s participation)
* ECLF & NANGO carried out Engagement on NRPC mandate & consultation with local authorities.
* Strategy for dealing with the past conflict (NRPC) developed by Conflict Prevention, Management & Transformation Thematic Committee.
* Created safer spaces for women in 4 provinces and developed gender-sensitive initiatives
* Developed Social Cohesion Reconciliation Index (SCORE) to measure social cohesion & reconciliation for peace in multi-ethnic societies
* 13 recommendations on exhumations and burials made by the NPRC under consideration by GoZ
 |

 The project provides the opportunity to build the trust and confidence of the public in the nation’s governance and economic structures through utilizing inclusive and participatory approaches for civic engagement. Additionally, it also strengthens the linkages between peace development, gender, and human rights. With the focus on empowerment of historically marginalized populations, including women and youths, the project broadens their participation in multiple spheres of their lives. The project also provides a collaborative platform for various stakeholders including UN agencies, governance institutions, civic organisations, academic institutions, and independent commissions. Thus, it leverages on unique strengths of multi-stakeholders enhancing relationship building and engagement as well as the subsequent sustainment of peace building strategies beyond the project period.

Overall, the project has had a positive impact on citizens. For instance, as described in the project’s semi-annual report,[[17]](#footnote-17) the 10 Provincial Peace Committees (PPCs) were set up to help identify potential conflicts and act as a port of first instance in conflict issues in their provinces. With the advent of the lockdown, due to COVID-19 and amid the existing distrust between the security forces and citizens, these PPCs carried out human rights and situational monitoring of the prevailing context. This has seen the NPRC receive 92 complaints cases pertaining to human rights issues and conflict during the COVID-19 enforced lockdown. The cases are still currently under investigation.17,[[18]](#footnote-18),[[19]](#footnote-19) Additionally, the ongoing discussions and policy engagements to facilitate national healing and reconciliation have seen consideration of the policy options related the Gukurahundi on exhumations and reburials by the government. Policy set up and consultations have commenced on the issue of exhumations and reburials.[[20]](#footnote-20),[[21]](#footnote-21),[[22]](#footnote-22) Lastly, the 2020 Local Authorities budget is reported to show a shift of expenditure from overheads to social services reflecting benefits of the PBF investments in Local Authorities TSP dialogue with the central government.[[23]](#footnote-23)

### Implementation arrangements and division of labour for the RUNOs

The project was implemented through the national implementation modality. The National Executing Agency for the project was the Office of the President and Cabinet responsible for the central coordination and overarching monitoring. Other partners included the NPRC Commission, the Ministry of Public Service, Labour, and Social Welfare. Each component of the programme included implementation by Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) – including women and youth-based CSOs as well as faith-based organizations, mobilized through the National Association of NGOs (NANGO), National Association of Youth Organisations (NAYO), Women’s Coalition of Zimbabwe (WCoZ), and Zimbabwe Heads of Christian Denominations (ZHOCD).[[24]](#footnote-24) The RUNOs supported the government-led drafting of the NDS strategy, including the efforts toward citizen participation.

The UNDP was the convening agency and in collaboration with UN Women, UNICEF, and WFP ensured the effective implementation of the project. Technical support was provided by other UN agencies, including the UNFPA and UNESCO with the UNDP serving as the lead technical agency. The UNDP has previously supported Zimbabwe in peace building, thus is well positioned as trusted partner in peace and reconciliation efforts.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Table 2: Key responsibilities for the Recipient UN Organizations (RUNOs)

| **RUNO** | **Key Responsibility** | **Partners/Stakeholders** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| UNDP | * Convening role and technical lead for the project responsible for overall project management, monitoring, and reporting
* Collaboratively ensure project implementation with the UNICEF & UN Women
 | Office of the President and CabinetWFP; Ministry of Public Service Labour and Social WelfareWLSA; Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission (ZHRC); Gender Commission; Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) – including women and youth-based CSOs; faith-based organizations (FBOs); National Association of NGOs (NANGO); National Association of Youth Organisations (NAYO); Women’s Coalition of Zimbabwe (WCoZ); Zimbabwe Heads of Christian Denominations (ZHOCD) |
| UNICEF | * Provide support to the Ministry of Public Service, Labour, Social Welfare to build capacity of key state and non-state actors to plan, coordinate, and provide social protection in a gender and conflict-sensitive way, ensuring key populations participate as partners
 |
| UN Women | * With the WLSA, ensure that overall planning, frameworks, and programming is gender inclusive and responsive at all stages, including ensuring participation of women
* Funding support toward capacity building of NPRC members and staff on delivering gender mainstreaming and gender responsive programmes
 |

### Impact of COVID-19 on the project

Since the WHO declaration of the COVID-19 outbreak as a pandemic on 11 March 2020, the National Government has instituted lockdown measures which have resulted in some changes in the application modalities and timelines of the PBF project. Additionally, the social distancing measures disrupted peace and reconciliation community-based efforts, which depend on in-person interaction and approaches. Some of the community-based in-person activities were either shifted to online engagements, suspended or deferred.[[26]](#footnote-26) As the restrictions were progressively lifted the projects work gradually resumed with modification to work plans, alternative execution, digital adaptation, including utilization of online and virtual communication platforms. One of the activities conducted during the pandemic period was a survey to assess impact of COVID-19 on women gender issues to understand women’s experiences and gender-related changes resulting from the pandemic. Findings from the survey revealed new emerging risks and conflicts in communities during the pandemic. As an example, the lockdown measures further limited the ability of women to access essential services, including health service.[[27]](#footnote-27) As such, one of the recommendations was to ensure the continued running of gender-sensitive health services during the lockdown period. From the 10 provinces, Peace Committees and Gender Champions were engaged to monitor women’s rights situation as it relates to the pandemic and inform the Gender Monitoring Survey. Information was fed into gender monitoring. The COVID-19 pandemic has also seen an upsurge of violence against women and children, and other vulnerable groups.[[28]](#footnote-28) Based on a situation report in 2020, the National Gender Based Violence (GBV) Hotline reported a 175% increase in cases compared to the year 2019.[[29]](#footnote-29) The impact of COVID-19 on other aspects of people’s livelihoods, has seen the PBF project considering strengthening the capacities of organizations and institutions to respond to emerging vulnerability including increased poverty and conflict in communities resulting from COVID-19 related stigma.

### Changes to the PBF programme

The specific changes made to the project were largely at the implementation phase of the programme. Firstly, to be responsive to the shift in priorities of the Government to more pressing and immediate challenges, including Cyclone Idai and the current COVID-19 pandemic, the project timeline was amended with an additional six months (end date of February 2021).[[30]](#footnote-30) Secondly, as part of the risk management, the project instituted continuous monitoring of the COVID-19 pandemic and alternative programmes that utilized virtual tools to assess the impact of the pandemic on overall programming. Third, the project factored in anticipated negative effects of COVID-19 on social protection and vulnerable groups by focusing on easing tension and conflict at the grass roots level. This was done by capacitating the NRPC and Peace committees to handle complaints which included cases of human rights violation.[[31]](#footnote-31) Fourth, to implement project-related activities digital and virtual approaches were adopted in adherence to COVID-19 prevention measures. Specifically, virtual approaches were employed for consultation at the national and sub-national levels and digital tools were utilized to continually engage stakeholders in peace building programmes. The PBF project also supported the development and dissemination of Social Protection Digital Handbook used to train government staff in peace building, social cohesion, and gender issues. These PBF project initiatives are complementary to the Humanitarian Response Plan 2020 aimed at supporting the Zimbabwean Government and its partners in addressing arising challenges, including GBV and child abuse.[[32]](#footnote-32)

## Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

### Evaluation purpose

Being a summative evaluation, its main purpose is to take stock of results achieved and challenges experienced and distil lessons learned and recommendations for future similar programmes. This will be done at two levels: programmatic level; and partnership level i.e., UN joint programming approach and other strategic partnerships. At the programme level, the evaluation will serve as an accountability mechanism and provide insights on priorities that have an impact on governance within the dynamic peacebuilding context of Zimbabwe. It will provide the Country office with evidence-based analysis and recommendations to facilitate strategic decisions, positioning for within the peacebuilding sphere. At the partnership level, the evaluation will aim to assess the implementation modalities, in particular the effectiveness of the funding approach between the UN and the PBSO as well as the working arrangements between the RUNOs. Partnership arrangements, institutional strengthening, and beneficiary participation will also be an area of focus. The evaluation is expected to determine the extent to which linkages, synergies and coordination with other Projects/programmes were established.

Specifically, the evaluation will assess programme performance using the criteria of: 1) Relevance and Strategic Positioning; 2) Process; 3) Effectiveness; 4) Efficiency; 5) Sustainability; 6) Partnership Strategy; 7) Human Rights; 8) Gender Equality; and Cross Cutting Issues (see TOR page 4).

### Evaluation objectives

According to the TOR, the evaluation will:

1. Determine the extent to which the Project results have been achieved, partnerships established, capacities built.
2. Establish the extent to which and cross cutting issues such as gender equality were achieved.
3. Assess whether the Project implementation strategy has been optimum and recommend areas for improvement and learning.
4. Assess the project contribution to achievement of UN Country Programme Documents (CPD), UN Strategic Plan and Government of Zimbabwe development goals and results.
5. Assess the relevance and strategic positioning of this project’s support to in the context of Zimbabwe as well as the overall contribution of the project to the strengthening peace infrastructure in Zimbabwe.
6. Analyse the peace infrastructure and draw out potential advantages it may bring to Zimbabwe as formal infrastructure for conflict resolution and prevention; and
7. Draw, based on above objectives, lessons and recommendations for sustaining the Building Trust and Confidence in Zimbabwe project results, and providing guidance for the future strategic direction peacebuilding projects in Zimbabwe.
8. Investigate the specific activities relating to each of the Project objectives/outcomes listed above including training and technical support through co-located team members.
9. Analyse the capacity building approach including training design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation initiatives.
10. Assess Programme accountability in as far as communication and visibility is concerned.

### Evaluation questions

The TOR page 4-8 provide a detailed list of questions to be answered by the evaluation. Methods and tools proposed in this report aim to answer all these questions. While details of the questions are contained in the TOR (Annex 1) and in the Evaluation Framework (Annex 2) we provide a summary analysis of these questions in the sections that follow. The Evaluation Framework shall be the guiding document for the scope of the evaluation and issues that will be explored and detailed in the evaluation report.

**Relevance and Strategic Positioning**

Under this criterion the evaluation will determine the strategic positioning of the UN agencies in the peacebuilding sphere in Zimbabwe. It will explore the specific value addition or comparative advantage of the UN, their capacity and position to influence peacebuilding and governance policies and debates in the country. Through assessment of perceptions of key stakeholders in government and civic sectors the evaluation will make evidence-based judgements on the UN’s comparative advantage and strategic positioning. In particular, this assessment will be made to determine the extent to which the UN agencies in the programme built on this comparative advantage and positioning within the Governance and Peacebuilding context.

Additional analysis will focus on the strength of logic between the problem, activities, implementation approaches and intended goal of the programme. Relevance will also explore partner capacities to deliver on their mandates in the programme (UN agencies, state actors and non-state actors (Commissions and NGOs).

Another key issues is that the programme straddled two national blueprints: TSP and NDS 1. In the first phase of the programme, implementation was aligned to the TSP objectives. Programme orientation had to be changed with the start of the NDS1 development processes. The evaluation will explore to what extent the programme was successful and flexible to change orientation given the changing national development priorities.

**Process**

This criterion will analyse:

1. Programme identification and formulation processes;
2. Programme management and governance institutional framework;
3. Programme management and monitoring systems; and
4. Flexibility of the programme to align with a changing context, especially the advent of COVID-19.

Programme identification and formulation will analyse programme identification and formulation processes with specific focus on participation of beneficiaries (government) and RUNOs. This analysis will also explore the extent to which activities were based on a conflict analysis to ascertain entry points and key interlocuters for advancing programme objectives. The extent to which children, youth and women, including Leave Noone Behind (LNOB) and Do no Harm principles, were integrated in the programme will be an area of analysis.

Under programme management and oversight, the evaluation will assess whether the programme management and oversight structures facilitated joint planning, management and decision making and contributed to a coherent programme among the RUNOs. Additional analysis will explore how governance structures such as the Advisory Committee provided strategic guidance for programme implementation, including enhancing the programme’s effectiveness.

Management systems will assess whether guiding frameworks for RUNOs to facilitate joint programming were developed and implemented[[33]](#footnote-33), the extent programme managers provided technical guidance to the programme and the efficacy and adequacy of monitoring systems established for the programme.

**Effectiveness**

The primary objective of this criterion will be to determine the extent to which programme results have been achieved including influence on domestications of reginal and international frameworks. Supporting this analysis will be a determination of success factors, capacities of implementors and the strategic role of the RUNOs in delivering achieved results. Other areas of analysis will include creation of strategic partnerships with other UN agencies and programmes, value added of each of the three RUNOs in delivering the programme as well as their strategic positioning and capacities to engage and deliver results in the Governance and Peacebuilding sectors.

The evaluation will also determine unfinished business that a successor programme can build on to strengthen the programme’s influence.

**Efficiency**

In this evaluation, efficiency of resource use will measure how resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, knowledge etc.) were economically converted to results. Key issues the evaluation will focus on will include:

* Timeliness of programme implementation;
* Quality of programme implementation;
* Challenges in implementation;
* Capacities of RUNOs and their partners to implement the programme activities;
* Effect of management and governance structures in enhancing programme efficiency; and
* Synergies and linkages that avoided duplication and enhanced cost sharing in delivery of activities.

There is an expectation for a Value for Money assessment as can be drawn from the following question:

*“Was the process of achieving the results efficient? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results be attained with fewer resources?”*

Such analysis will require use of the 3’Es value for money framework:

* Economy: getting the best value inputs
* Efficiency: maximising the outputs for a given level of inputs
* Effectiveness: ensuring that the outputs deliver the desired outcomes and impact

As Figure 1 illustrates the 3Es framework relates closely to the programme’s results chain.

Figure 1: 3E's Framework



Given the timeline for implementation and the nature of results (which are mainly qualitative), the quantitative assessment of value for money assessment will be limited to economy (unit costs) and efficiency (cost of delivery). Analysis of cost effectiveness will be qualitative – comparing investments against results and their quality achieved by the programme. This information will be based on beneficiary and other stakeholder perceptions on the quality of results.

**Sustainability**

This criterion will explore extent to which national capacities (central government, commissions and civil society)will continue with the interventions (either through upscaling or replication) including identifying further support needed to enhance the role of civil society, central authorities and local communities in improving and maintaining peace dividends over the long term. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the results achieved will likely continue after the project.

**Partnership strategy**

The evaluation will assess the quality and relevance of partnerships to deliver the governance and peacebuilding objectives of the programme. Assessment of the partnership strategy will be done at two levels. The first level concerns the internal collaborations and linkages between programmes in each RUNO. At this level a critical analysis will be made of the appropriateness of partners and decision factors for their selection for delivery of programme objectives. Second is external to each RUNO, measuring the extent there are complementarities and linkages between work conducted by each RUNO in the programme including deliberate measures to enhance systematic partnership building. In addition, assessing partnerships between the RUNOs, the evaluation will explore how the RUNOs explored partnerships with international partners including working arrangements and partnerships with CSOs in delivering the programme objectives.

Assessment of partnerships will be made within the context of determining value addition towards achieving the programme’s objectives. In this regard, analysis will determine extent to which various partnerships are contributing to the achievement of programme objectives. It will also determine lessons that can be learned from partnerships that did not work as expected including structure of partnerships, arrangements, and implementation.

**Human rights, gender equality and other cross-cutting issues**

These criteria will explore the extent to which issues of gender, human rights and other cross-cutting were addressed in design and implementation of the project at both the level of RUNOs and their national partners as well as the results of such integration.

## Evaluation audience

The main audience of the evaluation and their roles during implementation are provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Evaluation audience and interests

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Audience | Interest in the evaluation | Role in project implementation  |
| United Nations Secretary General’s Peacebuilding Fund | Achievement of project targets Project’s alignment to objectives of the PBF Sustainability of benefitsLessons learned for future similar projects | Funder |
| UNRCO | Project Performance Effectiveness of joint programming in the context of One UNProject’s influence on governance and peacebuilding in Zimbabwe Lessons learned for future similar projects | Project Oversight  |
| RUNOs | Project Performance Recommendations for improving implementation in the Zimbabwe context Sustainability of benefits Lessons learned for future similar projects | Recipient |
| RUNOs global and regional offices  | Lessons learned for design and implementation of similar projects | No specific role |
| Office of the President and Cabinet | Performance of the projectRecommendations for improving implementation in the Zimbabwe context Lessons learned for design and implementation of future similar projects | Implementing partners |
| National Peace and Reconciliation Commission  |
| Government Ministries  |
| Civil Society |
| Citizens  | Performance of the projectRecommendations for improving performance | Ultimate beneficiaries peaceful state with a new social contract |

The evaluation will be used to:

1. Demonstrate accountability of the programme;
2. Provide independent assessment of the results of the peacebuilding programme;
3. Provide perspectives on an ever evolving peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe; and
4. Support strategic realignment and prioritisation of support within the peacebuilding sector.

# Approach and Methodology

## Approach

### Evaluation design

The evaluation will adopt a theory of change approach using mixed methods approaches. Peacebuilding results chains are complex and non-linear due to the everchanging dimensions of peacebuilding infrastructure and systems and processes. While the results framework serves as a good framework for providing the lense through which results for the project can be framed, the dynamism and potential alternative pathways require an approach that captures expected and unexpected results. A theory of change approach enhances the ability of the evaluation to capture the broadness of these changes – thus improving evaluability of the programme. As shall be discussed in the methodology section this approach will be set off by a results participatory workshop whose aim will be to retrospectively develop the Theory of Change (TOC). The outcome harvesting approach will be used to identify results across TOC causality chains. This will subsequently frame the evaluation’s approach and focus on results.

Qualitative and quantitative methods will be used in data collection. Quantitative information will be collected from secondary data while qualitative data, that will provide more in-depth analysis of evaluation criteria, will mainly be drawn from primary data collection methods.

### Evaluation guidance

Guided by the interests of RUNOs in the TOR and general UNEG evaluation requirements for which our team is adept, the evaluation will use the following UNEG guidance documents to frame methods:

1. UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations (2014);
2. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2008); and
3. UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016).

### Evaluation principles

Based on these guidance documents the evaluation adopts the following principles:

*Independence, impartiality and credibility:* External third party evaluations are premised on impartiality, independence and credibility of findings. As external evaluators, we have no interest in the outcome of the evaluation but more critically, ensure that our whole approach is underpinned by independence from the programme under assessment, its funders and its beneficiaries, which is a defining condition for a quality evaluation output. Therefore, the findings represent an independent opinion. The evaluation team have no prior interaction with the project or interests during its implementation and therefore no conflict of interest.

To enhance credibility of findings, data collection and reporting will be based on evidence obtained from the field. This evidence will be triangulated between sources including a validation process with stakeholders of the project. Any divergence from the evaluation’s view will require support of evidence from those that do not concur with the findings. Where points of disagreement arise, project staff will be requested to respond through a management response.

*Transparency and Communication:* We will conduct this review in a transparent manner ensuring that all stakeholders and beneficiaries understand the purpose and scope of this review process and are engaged and committed to the review’s success. We shall also communicate and consult with the team in charge of the review on a regular basis to update on progress and to alert the team of any challenges which we may encounter to remedy them as quickly as possible.

*Quality:* We will ensure that evaluation results are of high-quality based on a sound and tested methodology, which is comprehensive, evidence based, uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods appropriate to this assignment, and includes participation of key stakeholders and beneficiaries. The strength of our analysis and assessment is based on asking the right questions, speaking to relevant stakeholders, and collecting the required information, as well as extensive experience by our team members, to reach sound and justifiable conclusions and recommendations to meet the needs of the evaluation’s target audience. The structure and content of the report will be strongly influenced by UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation.

*Inclusiveness:* all categories of beneficiaries of the project will contribute to the evaluation. As described in the methodology section, this takes into cognisance, disaggregation of age and sex and disability.

*Fair power relations:* We will ensure all voices are heard during the evaluation including those of rights holders. Care will be taken to understand the power relations between stakeholders and to ensure that such power relations do not influence the outcome of the evaluation. This is particularly important for when evaluating a sensitive subject of governance and peacebuilding. For example, majority of our interviews will done with individuals rather than groups. We will ensure these interviews are conducted in spaces that ensure confidence and openness of respondents.

Our process will also ensure no one voice is emphasised over the other. Lastly, we acknowledge that the status of an evaluator can bring overbearing power on those being interviewed resulting in biased responses. We have taken note of this in our method – particularly using participatory methods that ensure the opinions of all participants are heard and noted.

*Honesty and Integrity:* All findings and conclusions will be evidence based. Where evidence is inconclusive this will be highlighted in the findings.

*Gender and human rights:* gender and human rights will be incorporated in the evaluation in various ways. First the evaluation methodology will ensure rights holders and duty bearers are included in the process of data collection. Second, analysis of findings will be undertaken with a human rights lens. Third, the proposed data collection approach recognises the implications gender has in respect to women’s inability to express themselves in the presence of men. All data collected from primary and secondary data sources shall be sex disaggregated.

### Ethical Consideration

There are no major issues regarding the conduct of this evaluation which is not an intervention. No risks have been identified for participating in the study. So, the participants’ safety is assured. All stakeholders will have an equal opportunity to participate including men, women and youth at community level, except in situations where a certain group or individuals ought to participate for an identifiable reason. However, the participants will have to sign a consent form to show that they are willingly participating in the evaluation and are not forced to participate or volunteer any information. The participants will be asked to participate with their full knowledge, do so voluntarily and with full consciousness give their consent. The study will be explained to the participants and asked to participate after consenting. It will be explained to them that their views, ideas and values will be respected and kept confidential and anonymous. The data will be used only for the intended purpose and that the evaluation will be beneficial to them as the findings will enable the government and UN agencies prioritise governance and peacebuilding efforts.

## Methodology

### Documentary review

Secondary data review will be an important component to 1) understand the programme design; 2) determine progress in implementation and challenges experienced; 3) results the programme achieved; and 4) lessons learned by implementers. Table 4 provides details of the literature to be reviewed and the corresponding issues.

Table 4: Documents for review

| Document category | Issues  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme DocumentRevised Programme DocumentNo cost extension justification | Programme designChanges to the programme as a result of COVID-19Challenges faced by implementers Stakeholders of the programme |
| Semi-annual reportsAnnual Reports Summary of Results  | Activities implementedResults being achieved Challenges being experiencedLessons being learned Adjustments to programme activitiesChanges in stakeholders |
| Financial Reports | Delivery rates for the programme and RUNOs |
| Partner grants reports | Geographic coverage of interventionsTarget groups Activities implemented  |
| Activity reports  | Governance and peacebuilding context in ZimbabweScope of support/activities Content of activities  |
| Other secondary literature on governance and peacebuilding in Zimbabwe  | Peacebuilding and governance context in Zimbabwe Initiatives in peacebuilding and governance in Zimbabwe  |

### Results workshop

A one-day results workshop will be conducted with staff from RUNOs and their national partners (OPC, independent commissions and CSOs). The objectives of the results workshop will be to:

* Clarify the Theory of Change for the programme;
* Discuss results along the TOC causality chain; and
* Identify the main success factors and challenges for further investigation during the data collection.

Details of the process and approach are presented in Annex 5.

### National Key informant interviews

National level interviews will be held with a cross-section of the project stakeholders. These will include high level interviews in government and the RUNOs to get a strategic perspective on the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe and strategic positioning of the programme. RUNO programme managers will provide broad information across all evaluation criteria. The interviews will draw on their experiences, results and recommendations for a future programme or support peacebuilding infrastructure in Zimbabwe. National partners, government ministries, independent commissions, and civil society will be incorporated to understand their role in the project, contribution to peacebuilding processes and infrastructure, measures being put in place to sustain the programme and lessons for future programme.

Other development partners engaged in governance, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO), and the European Union (EU) will be incorporated for interviews to hear perspectives on UN strategic positioning for governance and peacebuilding, to determine interventions of these partners in governance and peacebuilding and collaborations.

A list of respondents for national level key informant interviews is presented in Annex 4. All interviews will be guided by the tools developed in Annex 3.

### Subnational consultations

Sub-national level consultations will be undertaken at provincial and district levels. At provincial level interviews will be held with the Provincial Ministers, members of Provincial Peace Committees, and local authority personnel that participated in programme activities. At district level interviews will be held with the district Development Coordinators, Council Chief Executive Officers and other local government personnel that participated in programme activities. Key interviews will be the main method used at province and district. At community level we will speak to groups of community leaders (village headmen and councillors) youth, men, and women in communities where partners facilitated consultations or other support aimed at strengthening citizen engagement. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Case Studies will be used collect information from community level stakeholders. Tools for data collection at this level are presented in Annex 3.

***Sampling***

Three provinces will be selected for the sub-national visits. The province will include districts were district and community level interventions were done. One district will be selected in each province. Selection of provinces and districts will ensure coverage of citizen engagement, national healing and reconciliation activities, and women empowerment activities. A separate field plan will be developed to provide specific details on the sampling, respondents and field work process once data is available from civil society partners.

### Validation meetings

Once data collection is complete, a preliminary findings presentation will be prepared and presented to RUNOs and national partners. The presentation will seek to validate the preliminary findings and recommendations. Using responses from the validation meeting the consultant will proceed to prepare a draft report which will be reviewed by all stakeholders.

### Data analysis and report preparation

*Qualitative data:* all qualitative transcripts will be transcribed in excel according to respondents, themes and questions to prepare for analysis. Atlas ti, a qualitative data analysis software, will then be used to identify emerging themes from the data and the supporting quotations.

All primary data will be anonymised to ensure confidentiality. Access to this data will remain with the technical consultants. Upon completion of the evaluation all data will be handed over to UNDP as part of the consultant’s contractual obligation.

### Evaluation outputs

The following will be the evaluation outputs:

* Evaluation inception report
* Draft evaluation report
* Final evaluation report

All deliverables will follow the outline provided in the TOR.

## Risks and Mitigation

There are several risks that the study may face. We have undertaken an inventory of these risks and put forward mitigation measures in Table 5.

Table 5: Risk and mitigation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk | Probability of Occurrence *(Very Likely, Likely, Low)* | Impact on the Assignment  | Mitigation measures |
| COVID-19 lockdown can be imposed which prevents inter-city travel and interaction with some Government officials | Very Likely | Inability to apply our full package of methodsInaccessibility of some stakeholders  | Consultant to use remote communication (e-mail, phones, Zoom, etc) for top level discussion and deploy local field teams for field data collection. Consultant will also seek official permission to engage with local stakeholders as per government guidelines. |
| COVID-19 situation gets worse and takes priority over all other activities for key stakeholders like city and government authorities | Likely | Inaccessibility of stakeholders | Consultant will seek to gather all available documentation on the project and increase time on documents review in lieu of direct beneficiary communication. Consultant will also seek to use its local networks in districts to access as much relevant data as possible, including access to key informants |
| Communities are reluctant, or unwilling, to interact with “strangers” due to COVID-19 fears. | Likely | Inaccessibility of potential respondents.  | Consultant will endeavour to engage the local leadership in communities and also get official clearance letters from local administrators.Consultant will also offer masks and hand sanitisers to ensure adequate provisions to mitigate infection.  |
| Weak internet for targeted individuals | Likely | Stakeholders unable to participate in online workshops | Combine group and individual meetings to ensure full participation of all stakeholders.  |

# Work Plan

The following Gant chart presents the proposed timeline for completing the evaluation.



# Annex 1: Terms of Reference



# Annex 2: Evaluation Framework

**Evaluation Framework**

| **Evaluation Criterion** | **Evaluation Question** | **Detailed questions** | **Evidence** | **Method of Data collection** | **Data Source** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance and Strategic Positioning | To what extent are the respective UN Agencies engagement in governance support a reflection of strategic considerations, including UN’s role in the particular development context in Zimbabwe and its comparative advantage vis-a-vis other partners? | What are the drivers/motivation for engagement in governance for UN agencies within the development context of Zimbabwe? What is the comparative advantage for Un agencies’ involvement in governance vis a vis capacities and positioning?  | Drivers for engagement in governanceDevelopment and governance interface in ZimbabweHistorical engagement in governance for each UN agencyComparative advantage vis a vis other partners | Key Informant Interviews (KII) | RUNOs manages and resident representativesOffice of the President and Cabinet RCOGovernment MinistriesCivil Society OrganisationsIndependent Commissions |
| Has UNDP, UN-Women & UNICEF been influential in national debates on governance and peace issues and has it influenced national policies on legal reforms, human rights protection and peace and reconciliation efforts? | What influence has UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF had in national debates on governance and peace issues? How has this influence contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts?  | Specific influence of UN agenciesLink between influence and reforms  | Documentary reviewKIIs | Semi-annual reportsAnnual reportsSummary results reportsRUNO programme managers and resident representativesOffice of the President and Cabinet Government MinistriesCivil Society OrganisationsIndependent Commissions |
| To what extent has the project influenced the relevance of peacebuilding support to Zimbabwe in the Governance and Peacebuilding sector | How have the RUNOs contributed to prioritisation of peacebuilding within the Government? How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?  | Change in peacebuilding prioritisation in government Contribution of RUNOs to prioritisationPerceptions among government, development partners and CSOs on peacebuilding  | Key Informant Interviews (KII) | RUNOs managers and resident representativesOffice of the President and Cabinet RCOGovernment MinistriesCivil Society OrganisationsBilateral partners (FCDO, EU and USAID)Independent Commissions |
| Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives? Were the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended outcomes and effects? | How were the activities and outputs linked to the outcomes and overall programme goal?Were the activities and outputs sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes, goal and programme objectives?  | Theory of change for the programme demonstrating link between activities, outputs and overall goal of the project.  | Documentary reviewKIIs | Project document Joint Annual work plansRUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Did the outputs and outcomes address the specific development challenges of the Country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the human development goals of the country? | What development challenge were the project addressing? What linkage exist between the development challenges, activities and the outcomes of the project?  | Challenges addressed by the projectChallenges being addressed by project outcomes | Documentary reviewKIIsFGDs  | Project document Joint Annual work plansRUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOsIndependent CommissionsProvincial Peace committeesLocal peace committees |
| Were the inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? To what extent has the projects selected method of delivery been appropriate to supporting the current project and the overall development context? | Were the implementation approaches appropriate for the desired results?  | Implementation approaches Perceptions on effectiveness of implementation approaches  | Documentary review KIIs | Project document Joint Annual work plansSemi annual and annual reportsRUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOsIndependent CommissionsProvincial Peace committeesLocal peace committees |
| Process | How was the project conceived and designed? What was the role of each development partner design/modification/implementation? To what extent was it participatory and done through consultations? | What process was undertaken in developing the project? What roles were played by RUNOs, OPC, civil society in project formulation?  | Process of development of project Roles of RUNOs, OPC, CSOs in project development | Documentary review KIIs | Project document RUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Was there a conflict analysis, involving input from a wide range of stakeholders? Was there a geographic mapping of high needs areas and a prioritizing of peacebuilding needs? How would/did that have helped? | What was the scope of consultations for the conflict analysis? How was gender considered in the conflict analysis? Was there a process of prioritising needs and mapping needs in various geographic areas?  | Stakeholders consultedGender issues identified in the conflict analysis Needs geographic map Needs prioritisation | Documentary reviewKIIs | Project document RUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOsIndependent Commissions |
| When additional funds were received in the course of the implementation, what was the role of contributing partners in designing, modifying, and implementing project activities? | What additional funding was received by the project and its focus? How were all project partners involved in designing and modifying the project and its activities? | Additional funding received and intentionsRole of partners (RUNOs, State and non-state actors) | Documentary reviewKIIs  | Project addendumProject Management Unit meeting reportsProject steering committee meeting reportsRUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Were there special components built in for women, youth & children and for any particular hotspot areas? | What were the components for women, youth & children in the programme?How have these been implemented in project areas?  | Project components for women, youth and children Appropriateness of the special groups for the objectives  | DocumentsKIIsFGDs | Project documents Semi annual and annual reportsRUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOsWomen, young men and women |
| Was there a capacity assessment (including HACT assessments) of any of the program relevant institutions (not only at national level but local and especially in high‐risk areas) | What capacity assessments were done and the gaps identified? What measures were put in place to support capacity gaps of partners to facilitate programme implementation and success?  | Gaps in capacity identifiedMeasures put in place in place to address capacity gaps and their success | Documentary reviewKIIs | HACT reportsJoint annual work plansSemi annual and annual reportsRUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOs |
| Was there a Project LPAC at which efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, value for money, gender dimensions were discussed and addressed? | What were the Project LPAC findings? What measures were put in place to address the LPAC findings and their success?  | Findings of the LPAC Measures implemented and their success | Documentary review KIIs | LPAC documents RUNOs programme managersGovernment ministriesCSOs |
| Was the results framework developed with SMART indicators? Was that relevant and did it help? To what extent did the M&E mechanism of the Project contribute in meeting the Project results?Was the RRF utilized as a monitoring instrument during implementation? | Do all the indicators meet the SMART criteria? How were the indicators used to measure project performance and make decisions? Were monitoring tools developed in line with the Results framework? What monitoring activities were undertaken to operationalise the results framework?  | Indicators are SMART Decisions made based on indicators Monitoring tools developed to measure indicators Monitoring activities planned and implemented  | Documentary reviewKIIs  | Project DocumentSemi annual and annual reportsProject Management Unit meeting reportsProject steering committee meeting reportsMonitoring visit reports Monitoring tools Joint annual work planRUNOs programme managers |
| To what extent did UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women work together towards common strategic objectives? | What platforms were put in place to encourage and facilitate joint working for the RUNOs? What successes were recorded and challenges?  | Platforms and systems for joint programmingSuccesses and failures in joint programming | Documentary review | Project DocumentSemi annual and annual reportsProject Management Unit meeting reportsProject steering committee meeting reportsRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCGovernment ministries Independent Commissions |
| What was the process for compiling project reports and work plans, and their quality? | How were project reports prepared?Did this affect quality and timeliness of reports?  | Process of preparing reportsTimeliness of reports and feedback on quality of reports | Documentary review KIIs | Project Management Unit meeting reportsProject steering committee meeting reportsRUNOs programme managers |
| How effective was the project management in providing technical oversight? | What technical support is provided by senior managers in RUNOs during implementation? Is this support sufficient?  | Stakeholders view on role played by senior managers in RUNOs and other implementing partnersSupport provided by senior managers of RUNOs and partnersPerceptions on adequacy of this support | KIIs | RUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCGovernment ministries Independent Commissions |
| How well did the monitoring system function? Was baseline data collected/available/used in measuring achievements? | Was baseline data collected sufficient to provide a basis for assessing programme performance? Were the baseline findings consistently used to determine programme performance?  | Indicators collected by the baseline vis a vis the results frameworkReference to baseline findings in programme performance reportsViews on the adequacy of baseline report | Documentary reviewKIIs | Baseline reportResults frameworkSemi-annual and annual reportsRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCGovernment ministries Independent Commissions |
| How were the principles of do no harm integrated in day‐to‐day management and oversight? | What support was provided to partners to ensure integration of do no harm principles?What mechanisms were put in place by RUNOs to monitor implementation do no harm principles?  | Support to partners on implementation of do no harm principles Monitoring mechanisms for implementation of do no harm principles | Documentary review KIIs | Project documentPartner reportsRUNOs programme managersOPC, Government ministries, CSOs, Independent Commissions |
| How did the programme evolve due to changing context- in view of COVID-19? What programme adaptations were made and what were the effects to the programmes’ results. | What challenges did COVID-19 pose to the project? What modifications were made to the project? What effect did the modifications have on project performance?  | Challenges posed by COVID-19Modifications made to the project Effectiveness of the chosen modifications to the programme | Documentary reviewKIIs | Revised project documentJoint Annual Work plansSemi-annual and Annual reports RUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCCSOsGovernment ministries Independent Commissions |
| Effectiveness | What evidence is there that the support has contributed towards an improvement in government capacity, including institutional strengthening?What evidence is there that project support has contributed towards an improvement in the country’s capacity, including institutional strengthening? | What capacities have been built within government to support government’s peacebuilding efforts? How have independent commissions been strengthened to advance peacebuilding? How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?  | Observed Government capacity and contribution of the projectExamples of capacities Observed capacities of Independent Commissions targeted by the programmeContribution of the programme to observed capacities Change in the relationship between state actors and state actors and non-state actorsInstitutional structures established to facilitate peace building Examples that demonstrate effectiveness of these structures | Documentary ReviewResults workshopKIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsSummary of programme resultsOther relevant literature including activity reportsAll RUNOs and OPC staffRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCCSOsGovernment ministries Independent CommissionsProvincial Peace committeesLocal Peace CommitteesLocal Governments  |
| Has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women worked effectively with other UN Agencies and other international and national delivery partners to deliver governance and peacebuilding services? | How have the RUNOs worked with other UN agencies and other international and national delivery partners and their result on governance and peacebuilding? What results were achieved, and challenges experienced?  | Partnerships establishedScope of partnerships Results of the partnershipsChallenges in establishing partnerships and operationalising them | Documentary ReviewResults workshopKIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsSummary of programme resultsOther relevant literature including activity reportsAll RUNOs and OPC staffRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCGovernment ministries  |
| How effective has UNDP been in partnering with civil society to promote peace and good governance in Zimbabwe | What partnerships were established with civil society to promote peace and good governance in Zimbabwe? What have been successes and challenges in partnering civil society for governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwe context? | Partnerships established with Civil societyScope of partnershipsSuccesses of civil society partnershipsChallenges in partnering with civil society in governance and peacebuildingApproaches to address challenges  | Documentary reviewKIIs | Original Project Document and Revised Project DocumentSemi-annual and annual reportsSummary Results ReportRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCGovernment ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| Has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women utilised innovative approaches, techniques and best practices in its peacebuilding and governance programming? | What innovations were utilised in the programme by RUNOs? What approaches could be highlighted as best practice and the reasons for such recognition? What were the successes and challenges of these approaches and innovations  | Innovations utilisedBest practice approaches Reasons for recognitionResults if innovations and best practice approaches Challenges in applying them  | Documentary reviewKIIs | Original Project Document and Revised Project DocumentSemi-annual and annual reportsSummary Results ReportRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators RCOOPCGovernment ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| Is UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women perceived by stakeholders as a strong advocate for improving government and peacebuilding effectiveness and integrity in Zimbabwe? | What are the stakeholders’ views on the capacity of RUNOs to engage in governance and peacebuilding? What are stakeholder views on the positioning of RUNOs to address governance and peace building?  | Stakeholder views on capacity of RUNOs to support governance and peacebuilding in ZimbabweStakeholder view on the strategic positioning of RUNOs to address governance and peacebuilding | Documentary reviewKIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsSummary Results ReportOPCGovernment ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| Considering the technical capacity and institutional arrangements of the UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women country office, is UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women well suited to providing governance and peacebuilding support to the country? | Did RUNOs have technical capacities to provide governance and peace building support? What cross partner support was available to ensure all RUNOs deliver on their objectives? What initiatives were implemented by each RUNO to address internal capacity gaps in governance and peacebuilding?  | State of technical capacity with RUNO prior the programme Capacity gapsCross partner supportInternal initiatives address capacity weaknesses | KIIs | RUNO programme management and Resident RepresentativesRCOOPCGovernment ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| What contributing factors and impediments enhance or impede UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women performance in this area? | What are the internal challenges, bottlenecks and success factors experienced by each RUNO in delivering governance and peacebuilding support? What external challenges were faced by each RUNO?  | Internal challenges for each RUNOExternal challenge for each RUNO | KIIs | RUNO programme management and Resident RepresentativesRCO |
| As a supplement to project and other reports, implementing partners and stakeholders will be queried, as appropriate: What was achieved/not achieved and what factors were involved per activity? | What are the stakeholders’ and partners’ views on: 1. What was achieved by the project?
2. What factors facilitated success
3. What was challenging to achieve and the reasons?
 | Stakeholder views on: AchievementsChallenges Unfinished business | KIIs | OPCGovernment ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| Were the main beneficiaries reached and to what extent? | What was is the extent of citizen engagement? How were marginalised and at-risk groups reached?  | Approaches for citizen engagement sNumber of citizens reached by the programmeApproaches to reach marginalised and at-risk groupsMarginalised and at-risk groups reached by the programme  | Documentary reviewKIIs | Original Project Document and Revised Project DocumentSemi-annual and annual reportsSummary Results ReportRUNOs programme managers and OPCGovernment ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| Were the stated outputs achieved? Did they contribute to the stated outcomes? What are the key development and advisory contributions that project has made/is making towards the outcomes, if any? If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outputs has been made as measured by the output indicators presented in the results framework. | To what extent were outputs and their targets achieved? Have outputs translated to outcomes?How is the programme contributing to the observed outcomes?  | Achievement of set targetsOutcomes observed and contribution of outputs to outcomes | Documentary ReviewResults workshopKIIs | Project documentJoint annual work planSemi-annual and annual reportsSummary of programme resultsOther relevant literature including activity reportsAll RUNOs and OPC staffRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries  |
| What are the future intervention strategies and issues to be addressed? (split) | What remains outstanding to enhance state and non-state actors’ capacity to facilitate peacebuilding? How could these be addressed?  | Unfinished businessApproaches for addressing them | Documentary ReviewResults workshopKIIs | Project documentJoint annual work planSemi-annual and annual reportsSummary of programme resultsOther relevant literature including activity reportsAll RUNOs and OPC staffRUNOs programme managers Resident representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries  |
| To what extent has the project supported domestication of key regional frameworks, experiences and international best practices through national development plans and strategies? | How has the programme drawn from international best practice and examples of adoption?What support has been provided in domestication of regional frameworks in support of peacebuilding?  | Example of international best practice adopted for the programme Adaptations made to suite the Zimbabwean contextSupport from the programme for domestication of regional frameworks | Documentary ReviewResults workshopKIIs | Project documentJoint annual work planSemi-annual and annual reportsSummary of programme resultsOther relevant literature including activity reportsAll RUNOs and OPC staffRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries  |
| Efficiency  | How timely were: recruitments of staff and consultant? Procurements of goods and services? | Were recruitments done on time? What were the bottlenecks or factors that enhanced timely recruitment?  | Time taken to complete recruitment Bottlenecks for timely recruitment |  |  |
| How has the steering or advisory committee contributed to the success of the project? Does project governance facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved? | What were the benefits of the Project Management Committee in relation to facilitating project efficiency and effectiveness? Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations? What were the benefits of the Project Steering Committee?Were meetings consistently held and well attended?  | Extent of integration of programmesPartnerships between RUNOsReduced duplicationBottlenecks in implementing recommendationsInstitutional blockages unlockedPolicy guidance to project implementationNumber of meetings vis a vis planned numberAttendance by all  | Documentary reviewKII | Minutes of Project Management Team Minutes of Steering CommitteeRUNOs programme managers OPC |
| Were there delays in expenditures? If so, what were the reasons and how could they have been fixed? Have they been fixed? | What was the delivery rate for RUNOs? Were there RUNOs particularly affected and why? What could have been done to undo delays in expenditures? Were there activities more affected by delays in expenditures?  | Delivery rates for the programmeDelivery rates for each RUNOReasons for any delays Recommendations for addressing delaysActivities affected the most by delays in expenditures | Documentary reviewKII | Financial reportsSemi-annual and annual reportsJoint annual work plansRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators Government ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| Were there delays in implementation? How could those delays have been better handled? | Which activities were affected by delays in implementation? What were the main reasons for delays? How could those delays have been better handled? | Activities that were delayedReasons for delays Recommendations for addressing delays | Documentary reviewKII | Semi-annual and annual reportsJoint annual work plansRUNOs programme managers and resident coordinators Government ministriesIndependent CommissionsCSOs |
| What was the implementation capacity of the individual RUNOs and their implementing partners? | Did RUNOs have adequate staffing for their roles? Did all RUNOs have the technical capacity address governance and peacebuilding? Were the selected partners the right ones in terms of capacity to deliver the scale of the programme for working in governance and peacebuilding?  | Adequacy of staffing vis a vis the activities Availability of staff among project team with experience in governance and peacebuildingSelection process for partnersExperience of partners in governance and peacebuildingCapacity support for partners | Documentary ReviewKIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsSummary of programme resultsOther relevant literature including activity reportsRUNOs programme managers CSOsGovernment ministries Independent CommissionsProvincial Peace committeesLocal Peace CommitteesLocal Governments  |
| Were systems put in place to ensure accountability and mitigate against mismanagement and/or corruption? | What systems were put in place to ensure accountability and mitigate against mismanagement and/or corruption? Have these been consistently implemented and monitored?  | Measures put in placeExtent of implementation | KII | RUNOs programme managers CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? | What measures were put in place to ensure economical use of resources? How were human resources and expertise allocated to maximise economy? What extent was efficiency in expenditure a key consideration?  | Measures to ensure economic use of resourcesConsiderations in allocation of human resources for the projectConsiderations of efficiency in expenditures | KII | RUNOs programme managers CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Was the process of achieving the results efficient? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results be attained with fewer resources? | To what extent do the results achieved justify the costs of the programme?Were there alternative ways the project activities could have been implemented?  | Stakeholder perceptions on value for money of resultsAlternative ways for implementing the project | KII | RUNOs programme managers Government ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Did the Project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally or by other donors)? Are there other efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results with available inputs? | What additional funding were partners receiving for governance and peace building and its focus? Who are these funders?How could collaboration and coordination with these partners have been improved?  | Additional funding being received by partners/beneficiaries Activities for this additional fundingList of fundersStakeholder views on possible coordination and collaboration approaches | KII | RUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the Project’s implementation process? | What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the Project’s implementation process? | Strengths of the projectWeaknesses of the project Opportunities Threats  | KII | RUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Sustainability | What is the likelihood that UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women governance and peacebuilding interventions are sustainable? | Will partners continue with interventions in governance and peace building? How will the RUNOs support unfinished business?  | Measures put in place by partners to continue with interventionsMeasures put in place by RUNOs to support unfinished business | Documentary review KIIs | Partner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| To what extent are the benefits of the Project likely to be sustained by national capacities after the completion of this Project? If not, why? What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the Project outcomes and benefits after the completion of the Project? | What measures have been put in place by partners to sustain capacity from the project? How will the scale of interventions be maintained by national partners? What mechanisms have been set in place by UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women to support the government of Zimbabwe to sustain improvements made through these interventions? | Measures put in place by national partners to sustain capacity Measures put in place by government to support government to sustain benefits from interventions | Documentary review KIIs | Partner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| How should the peacebuilding portfolio be enhanced to support central authorities, local communities, and civil society in improving and maintaining peace dividends over the long term? | What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term? How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?  | Emerging issues at central authority, local community and civil societyRecommendations on how these can be addressed | Documentary review KIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability? | What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability? | Changes needed to partnerships | Documentary review KIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication of approach? | What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication of approach in terms of: * Partnerships
* Interventions
* Implementation approaches
 | Stakeholder views on changes needed in * Partnerships
* Interventions
* Implementation approaches
 | Documentary review KIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Has the project generated the buy- in and credibility needed for sustained impact? | Is there ownership of project interventions? How did the project facilitate ownership by national partners? How were national partners leaders of interventions?  | Perception of ownershipExamples that demonstrate ownershipMeasures put in place by the programme support national leadership Examples that demonstrate national leadership in design, implementation and monitoring of interventions | Documentary review KIIs | Exit strategySemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Is there an exit strategy to phase out the assistance provided by the Project including contributing factors and constraints? | Is there an exit strategy to phase out the assistance provided by the Project including contributing factors and constraints?Are the roles, responsibilities and expectations post project well understood by all? To what extent was the exit strategy mainstreamed throughout the project cycle?  | Exit strategy, activities and roles and responsibilitiesDemonstrable examples of partners delivering their roles and responsibilities Exit preparatory activities implemented across the project that  | Documentary review KIIs | Exit strategySemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Partnership and strategy | Has the partnership strategy in the governance and peacebuilding sector been appropriate and effective? | Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context? What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships? Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?  | Appropriateness of structure of partnershipsSuccesses achieved because of partnershipsResults that could not have been attained without the partnerships | Documentary review KIIs | Project documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers Country Representatives RCOOPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Are there current or potential complementarities or overlaps with existing national partners’ programmes? | What programmes are national partners implementing in advancing peacebuilding?How has the programme complimented these programmes? Are there any overlaps?  | Programmes implemented by national partners in governance and peacebuildingComplementaries established with national partners’ programmes Overlaps with national partners’ programmes | Documentary reviewKIIs | Project documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving the outputs? | What specific contributions have partnerships made in observed project outputs?  | Contributions made by partnerships | Documentary reviewKIIs | Project documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent Commissions |
| Has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women worked effectively with other international delivery partners to deliver on good governance initiatives? | What interventions are being implemented by international partners on good governance and peacebuilding? What partnerships were established with international partners working on good governance and peacebuilding? Have these partnerships yielded specific results?  | Interventions supported by other international partnersPartnerships established Nature of partnerships Results from these partnerships | Documentary reviewKIIs | Project documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansExit strategyRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries CSOsIndependent CommissionsOther DPs (EU, FCDO, USAID) |
| How effective has UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women been in partnering with civil society? | How have the RUNOs supported partnerships with civil society e.g. providing the framework for government – civil society working in the context of governance and peacebuilding? What results have been achieved through partnerships with civil society?  | Support provided to civil societyAppropriateness of support Results from partnership with civil society | Documentary reviewKIIs | Semi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries Civil societyIndependent Commissions |
| Human Rights | To what extent have indigenous and tribal peoples, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women work in support of good governance and peacebuilding? | How did the programme target the marginalised? Was the project successful in reaching these groups and the successes?  | Targeting approaches Effectiveness of targeting approachesSuccesses recorded in reaching the marginalised and disadvantaged groups | Documentary reviewKIIs | Programme documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries Civil societyIndependent Commissions |
| Gender Equality | To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of governance of the project? Is gender marker data assigned to the project representative of reality? | How was gender planned to be implemented within the programme? Was this supported by a gender analysis of the peacebuilding context? Have gender issues been sufficiently addressed in the context of gender influences and impact on conflict? | Gender considerations at programme designGender analysis and entry points identifiedLink between gender considerations and the gender analysis  | Documentary reviewKIIs | Programme documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries Civil societyIndependent Commissions |
| To what extent has UNDP governance and peacebuilding support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects? | What changes have been recorded on gender? What are the intended effects? *Information collected should be checked against data from the UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women country office’ Results-oriented Annual Reports (ROAR) during the period 2019-2020.* | Gender results as a result of the projectUnintended effects | Documentary reviewKIIs | Programme documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansRUNOs programme managers OPCGovernment ministries Civil societyIndependent Commissions |
| Cross cutting | To what extent were poverty, environmental issues, gender, disability and human rights addressed? | How was poverty, environment, disability and human rights addressed in programme design, planning and management?  | Measures taken to address poverty, environment, disability and human rights | Documentary reviewKIIs | Programme documentSemi-annual and annual reportsPartner sustainability plansRUNOs programme managers Government ministries Civil societyIndependent Commissions |

# Annex 3: Data Collection Tools

## Key Informant Guide UNRCO

**Time: 45minutes**

***Relevance and Strategic Positioning***

1. What are the drivers/motivation for engagement in governance for UN agencies within the development context of Zimbabwe?
	1. What was the motivation for the PBF?
	2. What is the comparative advantage for UN agencies’ involvement in governance vis a vis capacities and positioning?
2. What influence has UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF had in national debates on governance and peace issues?

***Process***

1. What platforms were put in place to encourage and facilitate joint working for the RUNOs?
	1. What successes were recorded and challenges?
	2. How can joint working be improved?

***Effectiveness***

1. How has the programme influenced the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe?
2. What capacities have been built within government to support government’s peacebuilding efforts?
3. Prioritisation peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
4. How have independent commissions been strengthened to advance peacebuilding?
5. How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?
6. Did RUNOs have technical capacities to provide governance and peace building support?
	1. What cross partner support was available to ensure all RUNOs deliver on their objectives?

***Efficiency***

1. What were the benefits of the Project Steering Committee?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?
	2. Were meetings consistently held and well attended?
2. Did all RUNOs have the technical capacity to address governance and peacebuilding?
	1. Were the selected partners the right ones in terms of capacity to deliver the scale of the programme for working in governance and peacebuilding?

***Sustainability***

1. What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term?
	1. How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?
2. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?

***Partnership strategy***

1. How have the RUNOs supported partnerships with civil society e.g. providing the framework for government – civil society working in the context of governance and peacebuilding?
	1. What results have been achieved through partnerships with civil society?
2. Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context?
3. What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships?
4. Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?

## Key Informant Guide CRs and RRs

**Time: 1 hour**

***Relevance and Strategic Positioning***

1. What are the drivers/motivation for engagement in governance for UN agencies within the development context of Zimbabwe?
	1. What development challenge were the project addressing?
	2. What was the motivation for the PBF?
	3. What is the comparative advantage for UN agencies’ involvement in governance vis a vis capacities and positioning?
2. In your opinion do you think the project design including its activities was sufficient to deliver on this development objective?
3. What influence has UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF had in national debates on governance and peace issues?
	1. How has this influence contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts?

***Process***

1. What platforms were put in place to encourage and facilitate joint working for the RUNOs?
	1. What successes were recorded and challenges?
	2. How can joint working be improved?
2. What technical support is provided by senior managers in RUNOs during implementation?
	1. Is this support sufficient?

***Effectiveness***

1. How has the programme influenced the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe?
2. What capacities have been built within government to support government’s peacebuilding efforts?
3. Prioritisation peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
4. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
5. How have independent commissions been strengthened to advance peacebuilding?
6. How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?
7. Did RUNOs have technical capacities to provide governance and peace building support?
	1. What cross partner support was available to ensure all RUNOs deliver on their objectives?
8. How have the RUNOs worked with other UN agencies and other international and national delivery partners and their result on governance and peacebuilding?
	1. What results were achieved, and challenges experienced?
9. What partnerships were established with civil society to promote peace and good governance in Zimbabwe?
	1. What have been successes and challenges in partnering civil society for governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwe context?
10. What are the internal challenges, bottlenecks and success factors experienced by each RUNO in delivering governance and peacebuilding support?
	1. What external challenges were faced by each RUNO?
	2. What initiatives were implemented by each RUNO to address internal capacity gaps in governance and peacebuilding?

***Efficiency***

1. What were the benefits of the Project Management Committee in relation to facilitating project efficiency and effectiveness?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?
2. What were the benefits of the Project Steering Committee?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?
	2. Were meetings consistently held and well attended?
3. Did all RUNOs have the technical capacity to address governance and peacebuilding?
	1. Were the selected partners the right ones in terms of capacity to deliver the scale of the programme for working in governance and peacebuilding?
4. Did RUNOs have adequate staffing for their roles?

***Sustainability***

1. What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term?
	1. How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?
2. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
3. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication of approach in terms of:
4. Partnerships
5. Interventions
6. Implementation approaches?
7. Is there ownership of project interventions?
8. How did the project facilitate ownership by national partners?
9. How were national partners leaders of interventions?

***Partnership strategy***

1. How have the RUNOs supported partnerships with civil society e.g. providing the framework for government – civil society working in the context of governance and peacebuilding?
	1. What results have been achieved through partnerships with civil society?
2. Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context?
3. What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships?
4. Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?

## Key Informant Guide OPC

**Time: 1 hour 30 minutes**

***Relevance and Strategic Positioning***

1. What development challenge was the project addressing?
	1. What was the Government of Zimbabwe doing to address it?
	2. What value addition did the UN agencies bring?
	3. What is the comparative advantage for UN agencies’ involvement in governance vis a vis capacities and positioning?
2. In your opinion do you think the project design including its activities was sufficient to deliver on this development objective?
3. What influence has UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF had in national debates on governance and peace issues?
	1. How has this influence contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts?
	2. How have the RUNOs contributed to prioritisation of peacebuilding within the Government?
	3. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
4. In your opinion was the way the project was implemented appropriate to support the Government Zimbabwe deliver on peacebuilding and governance objectives?

***Process***

1. Did you play any role in project design at the onset?
	1. What role did you play and was this sufficient?
	2. Were there any modifications to the programme during implementation?
	3. Why and was the Government of Zimbabwe involved in deciding on these modifications?
2. How did the project support the capacity of Government to effectively play its role in facilitating good governance and peacebuilding?
	1. What capacity assessments were done and the gaps identified?
	2. What measures were put in place to support capacity gaps of partners to facilitate programme implementation and success?
3. What platforms were put in place to encourage and facilitate joint working for the RUNOs and the Government of Zimbabwe?
	1. What successes were recorded and challenges?
	2. How can joint working be improved?
4. What technical support is provided by senior managers in RUNOs during implementation?
	1. Is this support sufficient?

***Effectiveness***

1. How has the programme influenced the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe?
2. What capacities have been built within government to support government’s peacebuilding efforts?
3. Prioritisation peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
	1. What programmes is government implementing in advancing peacebuilding?
	2. How has the programme complimented these programmes?
	3. Are there any overlaps?
4. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
5. How have independent commissions been strengthened to advance peacebuilding?
6. How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?
7. What partnerships were established with civil society to promote peace and good governance in Zimbabwe?
	1. What have been successes and challenges in partnering civil society for governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwe context?
8. What remains outstanding to enhance state and non-state actors’ capacity to facilitate peacebuilding?
	1. How could these be addressed?
	2. How has the programme drawn from international best practice and examples of adoption?
	3. What support has been provided in domestication of regional frameworks in support of peacebuilding?

***Efficiency***

1. What were the benefits of the Project Management Committee in relation to facilitating project efficiency and effectiveness?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?
2. What were the benefits of the Project Steering Committee?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?
	2. Were meetings consistently held and well attended?
3. Did all RUNOs have the technical capacity to address governance and peacebuilding?
	1. Were the selected partners the right ones in terms of capacity to deliver the scale of the programme for working in governance and peacebuilding?
4. Did RUNOs have adequate staffing for their roles?
5. What additional funding were you receiving for governance and peace building and its focus?
	1. Who are these funders?
6. How could collaboration and coordination with these partners and the PBF have been improved?

***Sustainability***

1. Will you continue with interventions in governance and peace building?
	1. What measures have been put in place by partners to sustain capacity from the project?
	2. How will the scale of interventions be maintained by national partners?
2. What remains outstanding?
	1. What support can be provided by RUNOs for the unfinished business?
3. What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term?
	1. How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?
4. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
5. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication?
6. Are you aware of any exit strategy?
	1. Do you understand your roles and responsibilities?
	2. How have you prepared for project exit?
	3. What factors constrain or support implementation of these measures?

***Partnership strategy***

1. How have the RUNOs supported partnerships with civil society e.g. providing the framework for government – civil society working in the context of governance and peacebuilding?
	1. What results have been achieved through partnerships with civil society?
2. Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context?
3. What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships?
4. Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?

## Key Informant Guide RUNO Programme Managers

**Time: 2 hours**

***Relevance and Strategic Positioning***

1. What are the drivers/motivation for engagement in governance for UN agencies within the development context of Zimbabwe?
	1. What development challenge were the project addressing?
	2. What was the motivation for the PBF?
	3. What is the comparative advantage for UN agencies’ involvement in governance vis a vis capacities and positioning?
2. In your opinion do you think the project design including its activities was sufficient to deliver on this development objective?
	1. What were positives and negative aspects of the design?
3. What influence has UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF had in national debates on governance and peace issues?
	1. How has this influence contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts?
4. Were the implementation approaches appropriate for the desired change?

***Process***

1. How was the programme developed?
	1. Was a conflict analysis done during the design of the programme, did it prioritise hot spot areas?
		1. How was gender considered in the conflict analysis?
		2. How did the conflict analysis influence design of the programme?
	2. How were partners (RUNOs, government and independent commissions and civil society) involved in the design process?
	3. What modifications were made during implementation to improve relevance of approaches? Including challenges posed by COVID-19 pandemic.
	4. How were partners involved in these modifications?
	5. What effects did the modifications have on project performance?
	6. How has the programme drawn from international best practice and examples of adoption?
2. How were women, youth & children incorporated in the programme?
	1. How have these been implemented in project area?
3. Were there any capacity assessments of partners undertaken under the HACT system?
	1. What capacity assessments were done and the gaps identified?
	2. What measures were put in place to support capacity gaps of partners to facilitate programme implementation and success?
4. What platforms were put in place to encourage and facilitate joint working for the RUNOs?
	1. What successes were recorded and challenges?
	2. How can joint working be improved?
5. What technical support is provided by senior managers in RUNOs during implementation?
	1. Is this support sufficient?
6. Now I would like to discuss with you monitoring for the project
	1. In your opinion were the indicators appropriate and sufficient to measure the results of the programme – given time and scale of the programme?
		1. Did they allow to adequately measure performance of the project?
		2. Was any baseline conducted and has it helped to determine project performance?
	2. What monitoring activities were undertaken during implementation?
		1. Joint monitoring with partners?
		2. Use of monitoring results for project steering – give examples of decisions made based on monitoring information.
		3. What else could have been done to ensure an effective monitoring system?
	3. How were project reports prepared?
		1. Did this affect quality and timeliness of reports?

***Effectiveness***

1. How has the programme influenced the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe?
2. What capacities have been built within government to support government’s peacebuilding efforts?
3. Prioritisation peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
4. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
5. How have independent commissions been strengthened to advance peacebuilding?
6. How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?
	1. What partnerships were established with civil society to promote peace and good governance in Zimbabwe?
	2. What have been successes and challenges in partnering civil society for governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwe context?
7. Did RUNOs have technical capacities to provide governance and peace building support?
	1. What cross partner support was available to ensure all RUNOs deliver on their objectives?
8. How have the RUNOs worked with other UN agencies and other international and national delivery partners and their result on governance and peacebuilding?
	1. What results were achieved, and challenges experienced?
	2. What have been successes and challenges in partnering civil society for governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwe context?
9. What are the internal challenges, bottlenecks and success factors experienced by each RUNO in delivering governance and peacebuilding support?
	1. What external challenges were faced by each RUNO?
	2. What initiatives were implemented by each RUNO to address internal capacity gaps in governance and peacebuilding?
10. What innovations were utilised in the programme by RUNOs?
	1. What approaches could be highlighted as best practice and the reasons for such recognition?
	2. What were the successes and challenges of these approaches and innovations
11. What was is the extent of citizen engagement?
	1. How were marginalised and at-risk groups reached?
12. To what extent were outputs and their targets achieved?
	1. Have outputs translated to outcomes?
	2. How is the programme contributing to the observed outcomes?
13. What remains outstanding to enhance state and non-state actors’ capacity to facilitate peacebuilding?
	1. How could these be addressed?
14. What support has been provided in domestication of regional frameworks in support of peacebuilding?

***Efficiency***

1. What was the delivery rate for RUNOs?
	1. Were there RUNOs particularly affected and why?
	2. What could have been done to undo delays in expenditures?
	3. Were there activities more affected by delays in expenditures?
	4. Which activities were affected by delays in implementation?
	5. What were the main reasons for delays?
	6. How could those delays have been better handled?
2. What systems were put in place to ensure accountability and mitigate against mismanagement and/or corruption?
	1. Have these been consistently implemented and monitored?
3. What measures were put in place to ensure economical use of resources?
	1. What extent was efficiency in expenditure a key consideration?
	2. How were human resources and expertise allocated to maximise economy?
	3. To what extent do the results achieved justify the costs of the programme?
	4. Were there alternative ways the project activities could have been implemented?
4. What were the benefits of the Project Management Committee in relation to facilitating project efficiency and effectiveness?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?
5. What were the benefits of the Project Steering Committee?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?
	2. Were meetings consistently held and well attended?
6. Did all RUNOs have the technical capacity to address governance and peacebuilding?
	1. Were the selected partners the right ones in terms of capacity to deliver the scale of the programme for working in governance and peacebuilding?
7. Did RUNOs have adequate staffing for their roles?
8. Overall, what are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the Project’s implementation process?

***Sustainability***

1. Will partners continue with interventions in governance and peace building?
	1. How will the RUNOs support unfinished business?
	2. What measures have been put in place by partners to sustain capacity from the project?
	3. How will the scale of interventions be maintained by national partners?
	4. What mechanisms have been set in place by UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women to support the government of Zimbabwe to sustain improvements made through these interventions?
2. Is there ownership of project interventions?
3. How did the project facilitate ownership by national partners?
4. How were national partners leaders of interventions?
5. What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term?
	1. How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?
6. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
7. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication of approach in terms of:
8. Partnerships
9. Interventions
10. Implementation approaches?
11. Is there an exit strategy to phase out the assistance provided by the Project including contributing factors and constraints?
12. Are the roles, responsibilities and expectations post project well understood by all?
13. To what extent was the exit strategy mainstreamed throughout the project cycle?

***Partnership strategy***

1. How have the RUNOs supported partnerships with civil society e.g. providing the framework for government – civil society working in the context of governance and peacebuilding?
	1. What results have been achieved through partnerships with civil society?
2. Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context?
	1. What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships?
	2. Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?
3. What partnerships were established with international partners working on good governance and peacebuilding?
	1. Have these partnerships yielded specific results?

***Human Rights, Gender and Cross-cutting issues***

1. How did the programme target the marginalised?
2. Was the project successful in reaching these groups and the successes?
3. How was gender incorporated in the programme
4. Was this supported by a gender analysis of the peacebuilding context?
5. Have gender issues been sufficiently addressed in the context of gender influences and impact on conflict?
6. What changes have been recorded on gender?
7. What are the intended effects?
8. How was poverty, environment, disability and human rights addressed in programme design, planning and management?

## Key Informant Guide Government Ministries

**Time: 1 hour and 30 minutes**

***Introduction***

1. What activities did you implement under the PBF?

***Relevance and Strategic Positioning***

1. What development challenge was the project addressing with your ministry?
	1. What was the Government of Zimbabwe doing to address it prior the project?
	2. What value addition did the UN agencies bring?
	3. What is the comparative advantage for UN agencies’ involvement in governance vis a vis capacities and positioning?
2. In your opinion do you think the project design including its activities was sufficient to deliver on this development objective?
3. Overall, what is your ministry’s contribution to peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
	1. What influence has the project had on your ministry’s work with regards promotion of peacebuilding and good governance?
	2. How has the project contributed to prioritisation of peacebuilding within the Government?
	3. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
	4. How has this support contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts by your ministry?
4. In your opinion was the way the project activities were implemented was appropriate to support your ministry deliver on peacebuilding and governance objectives?
	1. Were the activities the right ones
	2. Were they of sufficient scale and depth to effect the change required? Why do you say so?
5. What are your views on the strategic positioning of UN agencies to address governance and peace building in the Zimbabwean context in comparison with other international partners?

***Process***

1. Did you play any role in project design at the onset or in the activities you implemented as?
2. What role did you play and was this sufficient?
3. Were there any modifications to the programme during implementation?
4. Was the Government of Zimbabwe involved in deciding on these modifications?
5. How did the project support the capacity of your ministry to effectively play its role in facilitating good governance and peacebuilding?
6. What capacity assessments were done and the gaps identified?
7. What measures were put in place to support capacity gaps of partners to facilitate programme implementation and success?
8. What technical support was provided by senior managers in RUNOs during implementation?
9. Was this support sufficient?

***Effectiveness***

1. How has the programme influenced the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe?
2. What capacities have been built within your ministry to support government’s peacebuilding efforts?
3. Prioritisation peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
4. What programmes is government implementing in advancing peacebuilding?
5. How has the programme complimented these programmes?
6. Are there any overlaps?
7. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
8. In your opinion what have been the major achievements of the programme for your ministry?
9. What factors facilitated success?
10. What was challenging to achieve and the reasons?
11. What remains outstanding to enhance your capacity to facilitate peacebuilding?
12. How could these be addressed?
13. How has the programme drawn from international best practice and examples of adoption?
14. What support has been provided in domestication of regional frameworks in support of peacebuilding?
15. How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?
16. What innovations were utilised in the programme by RUNOs?
17. What approaches could be highlighted as best practice and the reasons for such recognition?
18. What were the successes and challenges of these approaches and innovations

***Efficiency***

1. Were there any delays in implementation?
	1. Which activities were most affected?
	2. What was the major cause of delays?
	3. In future how can these be avoided?
2. What measures were put in place to ensure economical use of resources?
	1. Do you think the results justify the investment by the project?
3. Did the RUNOs have adequate staff?
	1. Did you receive sufficient support from the RUNOs
	2. What technical support did you receive?
	3. What support would have needed but was unavailable?
4. Besides support from the PBF, did you receive any other funding for governance and peace building and its focus?
	1. Who is funding and what is supporting?
	2. What linkages were there with funding under the PBF?
	3. Was there any duplication?

***Sustainability***

1. Will you continue with interventions in governance and peace building?
2. What measures have you put in place to sustain capacity from the project?
3. How will you maintain the scale of interventions?
4. What remains outstanding?
5. What support can be provided by RUNOs for the unfinished business?
6. What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term?
7. How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?
8. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
9. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication?
10. Are you aware of any exit strategy?
11. Do you understand your roles and responsibilities?
12. How have you prepared for project exit?
13. What factors constrain or support implementation of these measures?

***Partnership strategy***

1. Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context?
	1. What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships?
	2. Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?

***Human Rights, Gender and Cross-cutting issues***

1. How did the programme target the marginalised?
2. Was the project successful in reaching these groups and the successes?
3. How was gender incorporated in the programme
4. Was this supported by a gender analysis of the peacebuilding context?
5. Have gender issues been sufficiently addressed in the context of gender influences and impact on conflict?
6. What changes have been recorded on gender?
7. What are the intended effects?
8. How was poverty, environment, disability and human rights addressed in programme design, planning and management?

## Key Informant Guide Independent Commissions

**Time: 1 hour and 30 minutes**

***Introduction***

1. What support did you receive under the PBF?
	1. What activities did you implement?

***Relevance and Strategic Positioning***

1. What development challenge was the project addressing with your ministry?
	1. What was the Government of Zimbabwe doing to address it prior the project? What were you doing as a Commission?
	2. What value addition did the UN agencies bring?
	3. What is the comparative advantage for UN agencies’ involvement in governance vis a vis capacities and positioning?
2. In your opinion do you think the project design including its activities was sufficient to deliver on this development objective?
3. Overall, what is your Commission’s contribution to peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
	1. What influence has the project had on your Commission’s work with regards promotion of peacebuilding and good governance?
	2. How has the project contributed to prioritisation of peacebuilding within the Government?
	3. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
	4. How has this support contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts by your ministry?
4. In your opinion was the way the project activities were implemented appropriate to support the Commission deliver on peacebuilding and governance objectives?
5. Were the activities the right ones
6. Were they of sufficient scale and depth to effect the change required? Why do you say so?
7. What are your views on the strategic positioning of UN agencies to address governance and peace building in the Zimbabwean context in comparison with other international partners?

***Process***

1. Did you play any role in project design at the onset or in the activities you implemented?
2. What role did you play and was this sufficient?
3. Were there any modifications to the programme during implementation?
4. Was the Government of Zimbabwe involved in deciding on these modifications?
5. How did the project support the capacity of the Commission to effectively play its role in facilitating good governance and peacebuilding?
6. What capacity assessments were done and the gaps identified?
7. What measures were put in place to support capacity gaps of partners to facilitate programme implementation and success?
8. What technical support was provided by senior managers in RUNOs during implementation?
9. Was this support sufficient?

***Effectiveness***

1. How has the programme influenced the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe?
2. What capacities have been built within the Commission to support government’s peacebuilding efforts?
3. Prioritisation peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
4. What programmes is government and the Commission implementing in advancing peacebuilding?
5. How has the programme complimented these programmes?
6. Are there any overlaps?
7. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
8. In your opinion what have been the major achievements of the programme for your ministry?
9. What factors facilitated success?
10. What was challenging to achieve and the reasons?
11. What remains outstanding to enhance your capacity to facilitate peacebuilding?
12. How could these be addressed?
13. How has the programme drawn from international best practice and examples of adoption?
14. What support has been provided in domestication of regional frameworks in support of peacebuilding?
15. How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?
16. What innovations were utilised in the programme by RUNOs?
17. What approaches could be highlighted as best practice and the reasons for such recognition?
18. What were the successes and challenges of these approaches and innovations

***Efficiency***

1. Were there any delays in implementation?
	1. Which activities were most affected?
	2. What was the major cause of delays?
	3. In future how can these be avoided?
2. What measures were put in place to ensure economical use of resources?
	1. Do you think the results justify the investment by the project?
3. Did the RUNOs have adequate staff?
	1. Did you receive sufficient support from the RUNOs
	2. What technical support did you receive?
	3. What support would have needed but was unavailable?
4. Besides support from the PBF, did you receive any other funding for governance and peace building and its focus?
	1. Who is funding and what is supporting?
	2. What linkages were there with funding under the PBF?
	3. Was there any duplication?

***Sustainability***

1. Will you continue with interventions in governance and peace building?
2. What measures have you put in place to sustain capacity from the project?
3. How will you maintain the scale of interventions?
4. What remains outstanding?
5. What support can be provided by RUNOs for the unfinished business?
6. What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term?
7. How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?
8. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
9. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication?
10. Are you aware of any exit strategy?
11. Do you understand your roles and responsibilities?
12. How have you prepared for project exit?
13. What factors constrain or support implementation of these measures?

***Partnership strategy***

1. Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context?
	1. What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships?
	2. Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?

***Human Rights, Gender and Cross-cutting issues***

1. How did the programme target the marginalised?
	1. Was the project successful in reaching these groups and the successes?
2. How was gender incorporated in the programme
3. Was this supported by a gender analysis of the peacebuilding context?
4. Have gender issues been sufficiently addressed in the context of gender influences and impact on conflict?
5. What changes have been recorded on gender?
6. What are the intended effects?
7. How was poverty, environment, disability and human rights addressed in programme design, planning and management?

## Key Informant Guide CSO Partners

**Time: 1 hour 30 minutes**

***Introduction***

1. What support did you receive under the PBF?
	1. What activities did you implement?

***Relevance and Strategic Positioning***

1. What development challenge were you addressing with the project?
	1. Were the interventions appropriate to address this challenge?
	2. Were they of sufficient scale and depth to effect the change required? Why do you say so?
2. What influence did your activities on national debates on governance and peace issues?
	1. How has this influence contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts?
3. Were the implementation approaches appropriate for the desired change?
	1. Were they appropriate to reach the marginalised?
	2. How did you address gender in your activities?
4. Overall, what was your organisation’s contribution to peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
	1. What influence has the project had on your work with regards promotion of peacebuilding and good governance?
	2. How has the project contributed to prioritisation of peacebuilding within Zimbabwe?
	3. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
	4. How has this support contributed to policies on legal reforms, human rights protection, and peace and reconciliation efforts by your ministry?
5. What are your views on the strategic positioning of UN agencies to address governance and peace building in the Zimbabwean context in comparison with other international partners?

***Process***

1. Did you play any role in project design at the onset or in the activities you implemented as?
2. What role did you play and was this sufficient?
3. Were there any modifications to the programme during implementation?
4. Was the Government of Zimbabwe involved in deciding on these modifications?
5. How did the project support the capacity of your organisation to effectively play its role in facilitating good governance and peacebuilding?
6. What capacity assessments were done and the gaps identified?
7. What measures were put in place to support capacity gaps of partners to facilitate programme implementation and success?
8. Now I would like to discuss with you monitoring for the project
	1. In your opinion were the indicators appropriate and sufficient to measure the results of the programme – given time and scale of the programme?
		1. Did they allow to adequately measure performance of the project?
		2. Was any baseline conducted and has it helped to determine project performance?
	2. What monitoring activities were undertaken during implementation?
		1. Joint monitoring with partners?
		2. Use of monitoring results for project steering – give examples of decisions made based on monitoring information.
		3. What else could have been done to ensure an effective monitoring system?
	3. How were project reports prepared?
		1. Did this affect quality and timeliness of reports?
9. What technical support was provided by senior managers in RUNOs during implementation?
10. Was this support sufficient?
11. What support was provided to partners to ensure integration of do no harm principles?

***Effectiveness***

1. How has the programme influenced the governance and peacebuilding context in Zimbabwe?
2. What capacities have been built within government and civil society to support government’s peacebuilding efforts?
3. Prioritisation peacebuilding in Zimbabwe?
4. How has the programme transformed perceptions and acceptance of peace building support within the Governance and Peacebuilding sector?
5. How have independent commissions been strengthened to advance peacebuilding?
6. How have relationships and structures between state and non-state actors been transformed/established to address peacebuilding?
	1. How have the partnerships with civil society to promote peace and good governance in Zimbabwe contributed to current peacebuilding context?
	2. What have been the successes and challenges in partnering civil society for governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwe context?
7. In your opinion what have been the major achievements of your interventions in the programme?
	1. What were the factors that made it a success?
	2. What factors undermined results?
	3. Have you been able to achieve your targets, why?
8. What innovations were utilised in the programme?
9. What approaches could be highlighted as best practice and the reasons for such recognition?
10. What were the successes and challenges of these approaches and innovations?
11. What was is the extent of citizen engagement?
	1. How were marginalised and at-risk groups reached?
12. What remains outstanding to enhance state and non-state actors’ capacity to facilitate peacebuilding?
	1. How could these be addressed?
13. What support has been provided in domestication of regional frameworks in support of peacebuilding?

***Efficiency***

1. Were there any delays in implementation?
	1. Which activities were most affected?
	2. What was the major cause of delays?
	3. In future how can these be avoided?
2. What measures were put in place to ensure economical use of resources?
	1. Do you think the results justify the investment by the project?
3. Did the RUNOs have adequate staff?
	1. Did you receive sufficient support from the RUNOs?
	2. What technical support did you receive?
	3. What support would have needed but was unavailable?
4. Besides support from the PBF, did you receive any other funding for governance and peace building and its focus?
	1. Who is funding and what is supporting?
	2. What linkages were there with funding under the PBF?
	3. Was there any duplication?
5. What systems were put in place to ensure accountability and mitigate against mismanagement and/or corruption?
	1. Have these been consistently implemented and monitored?
6. What measures were put in place to ensure economical use of resources?
	1. What extent was efficiency in expenditure a key consideration?
	2. How were human resources and expertise allocated to maximise economy?
	3. To what extent do the results achieved justify the costs of the programme?
	4. Were there alternative ways the project activities could have been implemented?
7. What were the benefits of the Project Management Committee in relation to facilitating project efficiency and effectiveness?
	1. Were there any bottlenecks in its functioning and actioning of recommendations?

***Sustainability***

1. Will beneficiaries (local governments, civic society, communities) continue with interventions in governance and peace building?
2. What measures have you put in place to sustain capacity from the project?
3. How will you maintain the scale of interventions?
4. What remains outstanding?
5. What support can be provided by RUNOs for the unfinished business?
6. What are the emerging issues at central, local level and among civil society that need to be addressed to improve and maintain peace dividends over the long term?
7. How could these emerging issues be addressed by the peacebuilding programme?
8. What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
9. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of the Project outcomes and potential for replication?
10. Are you aware of any exit strategy?
11. Do you understand your roles and responsibilities?
12. How have you prepared for project exit?
13. What factors constrain or support implementation of these measures?

***Partnership strategy***

1. Was the structure and type of partnerships appropriate to deliver results in governance and peacebuilding in the Zimbabwean context?
	1. What successes were recorded as a result of these partnerships?
	2. Are there results that could not have been attained with these partnerships?
2. What partnerships did you establish in delivering your activities?
	1. Have these partnerships yielded specific results?
	2. What could be done to strengthen these partnerships in future?

***Human Rights, Gender and Cross-cutting issues***

1. How did you target the marginalised?
	1. Was the project successful in reaching these groups and the successes?
2. How was gender incorporated in the programme?
3. Was this supported by a gender analysis of the peacebuilding context?
4. Have gender issues been sufficiently addressed in the context of gender influences and impact on conflict?
5. What changes have been recorded on gender?
6. What are the intended effects?
7. How was poverty, environment, disability and human rights addressed in programme design, planning and management?

## Key Informant Guide Other Development Partners (FCDO, USAID and EU)

**Time: 20 – 30 minutes**

1. What support are you providing in the governance and peacebuilding sector?
2. What challenges are you aiming to address?
3. Who are you mainly working with?
4. What challenges have you experienced with these partnerships?
5. How are you overcoming these challenges?
6. Have you collaborated with other international partners in this support? In what ways?
7. Have you noticed any change/shifts in debates around peacebuilding and its prioritisation by the government? What have you noticed and why?
8. What are your views on the strategic positioning of UN agencies to address governance and peace building in the Zimbabwean context in comparison with other international partners?
	1. What specific value addition does the UN bring vis a vis other partners?

## Group/Key Informant Discussion Members of Provincial Peace Committees, Women Groups and Representatives

Time: 30minutes

***Relevance and positioning***

1. What are your roles and responsibilities as the PPC?
2. Would you say you are adequately equipped to perform these roles and responsibilities?
3. What training did you receive?
4. Was it adequate?
5. What other support have you received?
6. Would have required other support or more of the same? What were the gaps?
7. Since you were established what have you done as the PPC?
8. Could you have done more, why?
9. What made you successful or less successful?
10. How do you identify issues you need to handle as the PPC?
11. Do you undertake any conflict analysis?
12. What was the scope of consultations for the conflict analysis?
13. How was gender considered in the conflict analysis?
14. Was there a process of prioritising needs and mapping needs in various geographic areas?

***Effectiveness***

1. What has been your experience with working on issues of peacebuilding in your province?
2. What challenges have you experienced?
3. What conditions would you say make your work effective?
4. What can be done to ensure those conditions are present?
5. What would you say have been your greatest achievements?
	1. Why would you pick these?

***Sustainability***

1. What are your opinions on the ability for long term functioning of the PPC?
	1. What conditions will make it functional and remain effective in the long term?
	2. How can these conditions be supported?

***Gender, Human rights, Cross-cutting issues***

1. What guides your work?
2. How do you ensure women, children and the marginalised are incorporated?
3. Is there anything else you would like to say that we have not discussed?

## FGD Guide with Citizens

This questionnaire draws on communities’ experience with consultations for the development of the national development strategy as well as periodic review of the Transitional Stabilisation Programme (TSP)

**Time: 1 hour**

1. Have you participated in any meeting where you were asked about your views on national development issues?
2. Who called the meeting and what was discussed?
3. Who attended from your community?
4. What was discussed?
5. How confident were you to speak your mind during this meeting?
6. What held you back from speaking your mind?
7. What can be done to make you more open in such meetings?
8. Does this occur for all meetings? Explore: 1) community meetings; 2) other social meetings.
9. Are women and men equally vocal in these meetings? Why do you say so?
10. Did youth come to the meeting? Both young women and young men?
	1. Were they able to air their views?
11. What about the elderly?
12. What women with and without children?
13. What about those that live far from the meeting place?
14. After the meeting were you confident that your views were being considered?
15. What made you think this way?
16. Was there any feedback you have ever received after the meeting(s) you attended seeking your views as a community?
17. Would attend such a meeting again? Why?
18. If not what would make you attend it again.

# Annex 4: List of Potential Stakeholders

| **Name**  | **Position** | **Institution** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Maria Ribeiro | UN Resident Coordinator | UNRCO |
| Georges van Montfort | Resident Representative | UNDP |
| Madelena Monoja | Deputy Resident Representative - Programmes | UNDP |
| Moreblessing Chirombe | PA to the UNDP Resident Rep's | UNDP |
| Tafadzwa Muvingi | Head of Governance  | UNDP |
| William Tsuma | Project Manager (Now with UNDP Nigeria) | UNDP |
| Takunda Make | Project Manager | UNDP |
| Amina Mohamed | Country Representative | UNICEF |
| Tawanda Chinembiri | Head Social Policy | UNICEF |
| Dominic Muntanga | Project Manager (education) | UNICEF |
| Jolanda Van Westering | Chief of Child Protection | UNICEF |
| Lloyd Muchemwa | Child Protection Officer | UNICEF |
| Sam Phiri | Project Manager (social protection) | UNICEF |
| Andrew Kardan | Social Protection Specialist | UNICEF |
| Ms. Ophilia Zava | Director  | Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education |
| Dr. Patrick Ngandini  | Director  | Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education  |
| Delphine Serumaga | Country Representative | UN Women |
| Maureen Shonge | Project Manager (Now with UN Women ESARO) | UN Women  |
| Reverend Paul Damasane | Permanent Secretary  | Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC) |
| Clive Mphambela | Deputy Director Ministry of Finance | Ministry of Finance and Economic Development |
|  | Permanent Secretary  | Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare (MoPSLSW) |
|  | Director Social Development | Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare (MoPSLSW) |
|  | Director Women Affairs | Ministry of Women Affairs, Community, Small and Medium Enterprise Development |
| Lorraine Mbodza  | Principal Gender Programme Officer | Ministry of Women Affairs |
| Virginia Muwanigwa | Chief Executive Officer | The Zimbabwe Gender Commission (ZGC) |
| Caroline Matizha | Director of Programs | ZGC |
| Elasto Mugwadi | Executive Secretary | The Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission (ZHRC) |
| Sibusisiwe Zembe | Executive Secretary | National Peace and Reconciliation Commission (NPRC) |
| Egnes Nhengo | GM Victim Support, Gender & Diversity | NPRC Victim Support, Gender, Diversity Unit |
| Priscilla Makotose | Commissioner/Chair Person | Zimbabwe Republic Police Women Network |
| Leornard Mandishara | Director | The National Association of NGOs (NANGO) |
|  |  | The National Association of Youth Organisation (NAYO) |
| Sally Ncube | National Coordinator | Women’s Coalition of Zimbabwe (WCoZ) |
| Fadzai Traquino | National Director | Women and Law in Southern Africa |
|  |  | The Zimbabwe Heads of Christian Denominations (ZHOD) |
| Reverende Sikhalo Cele |  | ELCF |
|  |  | Women’s University in Africa (WUA) |
| Dr Kudakwashe Chirambwi | Coordinator | National University of Science of Technology, Department of Peace and Leadership |
| Dr Ashton Murwira | Lecturer | University of Zimbabwe, Department of Political and Administrative Studies |
| Miriam Siun | National Coordinator | African Women’s Leadership Network (AWLN) |

# Annex 5: Guidance for Results Workshop

**Introduction**

A results workshop will be held as part of the evaluation process for the Peace Building Fund joint UN programme in Zimbabwe. The results workshop, attended by staff from the three RUNOs in the programme, staff from Office of the President and Cabinet, independent commissions (National Peace and Reconciliation Commission and the Zimbabwe Gender Commission) and civil society receiving funding under the programme, will be held either virtually or physically depending on preference of stakeholders. The programme that follows has been designed to allow this flexibility.

**Objectives**

The Results Workshop aims to:

* Clarify the Theory of Change for the programme
* Discuss results along the TOC causality chain
* Identify the main success factors and challenges for further investigation during the data collection

Given the nature of the programme, and the timeframe available for implementation, this process will help clarify tangible and non-tangible results within the TOC. Relying on the results framework indicators alone may understate the performance of the programme. It will therefore seek to identify any new linkages that are forming as a result of the interventions. The project has had a short time frame of implementation because of delays in expenditure and the impact of COVID-19. It is therefore important to take stock of early results and determine their possibility of reaching maturity including additional support needed to transform to outcomes. The Results will help do this by reviewing and interrogating the activity to outcome pathways.

If conducted online, the results workshop will need two days of 3 hour sessions but will require one full day is a physical option amenable to stakeholders.

**Programme Concept**

**Session 1: Mapping the Theory of Change**

**Time: 2 hours**

This session will map the activity to impact pathways asking the questions “how does change happen”, “how do we move from this level to the next” and “what are the underlying assumptions” as illustrated with an example below. Assumptions for the linkages will be important to identify to inform partly the success of failure of some linkages during Session 2. Since the outcomes and outputs are already defined in the project document, the purpose of this session is to identify how we move from outputs to outcomes and from outcomes to impact.



 It will in mixed groups over a period of 1 hour.

This will be followed with plenary discussions for an hour.

**Session 2: Harvesting the results achieved**

**Time: 1 hour and 30 minutes**

During this session participants will use the TOC agreed in session 1 to map what has been achieved. No evidence is required as yet.

In a physical session the process will be done as follows:

* All programme outcomes will be given a specific colour.
* Participants will be provided multi-coloured paper representing the outcomes of the programme.
* Using the “how change happens”, outputs and outcomes discussed in session 1, participants will be asked to write results aligned to each outcome area with the colour paper for corresponding outcome. The results will be guided by outputs, “how change happens” and the outcome statements themselves – all agreed on during Session 1.
* These “harvested results” will then be posted on the wall under the corresponding outcome.

A discussion will follow to agree on the results pasted on the wall against each outcome. Once this process is done, we will move to Session 3.

In a virtual workshop (on Zoom) two options will be used:

* The first will be the use of white boards for each corresponding outcome where participants can annotate their views. Once one board is complete the facilitator will move to the next board (outcome) until all outcomes are sufficiently covered.
* Second option will be a group discussions according to outcomes with a guided completion template that can be completed Realtime across the different groups (the template can be placed on google docs for example allowing for collaborative working).

The first option works if all participants are using computers as there are limitations with annotations on some phones and tablets.

The second option is able to accommodate all types of devices.

All options will be explored as part of the preparatory phases for the workshop.

**Session 3: Finding the evidence for results**

**Time: 1 hour**

Session 3 is about mapping the evidence for the result mentioned. For each agreed result, participants will be asked to state evidence (or where it can be found).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Results** | **Evidence (or where it can be found)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Programme**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time | Activity | Responsibility |
| 8.30-9.00 | Arrival | All |
| 9.00-9.05 | Introduction and objectives | UNDP |
| **Session 1: Mapping the Theory of Change** |
| 9.05-9.20 | Presentation on results and Theory of ChangeThe presentation will aim to provide a quick orientation on results and the Theory of Change. It will also provide details for the Exercise 1 | Consultant |
| 9.20 – 10.20 | Group discussions on the Theory of Change Guided by Exercise 1 template | All |
| 10.20-10.50 | **Tea** |
| 10.50-11.50 | Plenary discussions on the group outputs | Consultant |
| **Session 2: Harvesting the results achieved** |
| 11.50-12.00 | Introduction to Session 2 Exercise 2 | Consultant |
| 12.00-13.00 | Participatory results harvesting and discussions | All |
| 13.00-14.00 | **Lunch** |
| 14.00-14.30 | Participatory results harvesting and discussions | All |
| 14.30-14.40 | Introduction to Exercise 3 | Consultant |
| 14-40-15.30 | Participants complete Exercise 3 | All |
| 15.30-16.00 | Plenary discussion on Exercise 3 | Consultant |
| 16.00-16.20 | Closing remarks and way forward | UNDP |
| 16.20 | Departure |  |
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