REPORT

CONFLICT PREVENTION, PEACEBUILDING AND RESPONSIVE INSTITUTIONS (CPPRI) GLOBAL PROGRAMME (GP) MIDTERM REVIEW

United Nations Development Programme

Lawrence Robertson
Independent Contractor/Consultant

22 December 2023

PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions (CPPRI) Global Programme	
Atlas ID	00121667, 00121669, 00121670, 00121671	
Corporate outcome and output	Signature solution 3: Enhance national prevention and recovery capacities for resilient societies. UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021	
Country	Global	
Region		
Date project document signed	5 November 2020	
Project dates	**Start**	**Planned end**
	Nov. 2020	Dec. 2025
Project budget	5.57m USD	
Project expenditure at the time of review	18,109,565 USD	
Funding source	Government of Sweden, Government of Switzerland	
Implementing party	UNDP	

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS LIST

BPPS	Bureau of Policy and Programme Support (UNDP)
CGF	Core Government Functions
CO	Country Office
COP	community of practice
CP	Conflict Prevention
CPPRI	Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions
CS	climate security
CSM	Climate Security Mechanism
CSO	civil society organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DPO	Department of Peace Operations (UN)
DPPA	Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (UN)
EU	European Union
GE	gender equality
GP	Global Programme
GPN	Global Policy Network
HRBA	human-rights based approach
IDPS	International Dialogue for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding
JP	Joint UNDP-DPPA Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention
JPO	Junior Professional Officer
KM	knowledge management
LG	local governance
MHPSS	Mental Health and Psychosocial Support Services
MTR	mid-term review
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PB	Peacebuilding
PDA	Peace and Development Advisor
PVE	prevention of violent extremism
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SDGi	SDG Integration
SG	Secretary General
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SOP	standard operating procedure
SP	Strategic Plan
TL	Team Leader
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSG	United Nations Secretary-General

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) commissioned a review of the Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions (CPPRI) Global Programme (GP) to support learning and provide information on its achievements over the past 3 years, 2021-2023. The mid-term review (MTR) is tasked with reviewing progress towards achieving objectives as well as assessing the challenges faced in working towards these objectives, any gaps that remain in reaching planned objectives, and lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations that flow from CPPRI's experience to date. The information and analysis in the MTR aims to be useful for the CPPRI team, UNDP, CPPRI GP partners, donors, and stakeholders.

POLITICAL AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT FOR THE CPPRI GP

The CPPRI GP was developed in 2020 through the guidance and direction of the head of the team, to reorganize UNDP HQ capacities in the areas of crisis prevention, peacebuilding, and responsive institutions. The CPPRI team fit within the UNDP strategic plan and support the UN's Sustaining Peace resolutions.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CPPRI GP

The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) supported the GP through funding of USD 3.4 million for two years, and CHF 2,970,000 from the Swiss Government was used to begin programming and support additional resource mobilization. The GP also draws in support through Junior Professional Officers (JPOs) from UN member states.

The CPPRI GP was developed to work on systemic, structural, and operational dimensions of conflict and peace through four outputs, each with a team to work towards achieving them. The four are

- *Output 1: Conflict Prevention (CP) and Peacebuilding* - Evidenced based and gender sensitive policy, programme and partnerships strengthened at global, regional and country level on conflict prevention and peacebuilding.
- *Output 2: Climate related security risks* - UNDP and partner capacity on climate security risks assessment and response strengthened.
- *Output 3: Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE)* - Capacities strengthened in building civic resilience and institutional safeguards for communities to prevent violent extremism through acceptance and effective governance building.
- *Output 4: Responsive, Accountable and Inclusive Core Governance Functions (CGF) at the National and Local Levels* - Restore and/or strengthen responsive, accountable and inclusive core governance functions at the national and local levels in fragile and crisis-affected settings to help (re)build an inclusive social contract, ensure effective service delivery and restore public trust in core governance institutions that leave no one behind.

The CPPRI GP also developed four key services for delivering the GP through work within UNDP HQ, with regional hubs, and with country offices (COs), as well as within the UN more broadly and with partners outside of the UN:

- Analytics – generating and analysing data to advance prevention and peacebuilding in integrated programme design, research, key areas of interest (context, political-economy, conflict and early warning) and M&E;
- Knowledge management – gathering and managing knowledge towards strengthening preventative action and programming through partnerships, guidance, and management systems;
- Human and financial resources – to deploy human resources and provide integrated and predictable medium-term financing streams for sustained and catalytic prevention and peacebuilding outcomes; and
- Technical Accompaniment - deliver human resources that can provide cross-thematic technical assistance support services.

MID-TERM REVIEW METHODS

The consultant worked with the CPPRI team managers to scope the MTR, including through a draft and final inception report that proposed general questions and outlined plans to answer all of the evaluation questions from the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the review. The consultant has then implemented these approved plans to use document review and interviews with CPPRI managers and staff as well as some key partners and stakeholders to gather and analyse data for the review.

KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Relevance: The relevance of the CPPRI GP to UNDP is clear through the work of the CPPRI team at the headquarters level, with regional hubs, and with country offices; the GP has funded key people, processes, and products of the CPPRI team which has supported UNDP. The services and products of the team have been central to positioning UNDP in CP and peacebuilding, PVE, governance in crisis, and climate security. Relevance to partners has been achieved through the GP supports to policymaking, regional hubs and COs which have then reached UNDP partners in countries - as well as a set of CPPRI partners, and stakeholders?

CPPRI was developed to be relevant towards supporting 2030 Agenda; this relevance has been maintained over the period of the GP 2020-2023. The CPPRI team was part of the processes of developing the UN Strategic Plan and including team areas and insights into the SP in conflict prevention and peacebuilding. The CPPRI team has also had direct roles in influencing the visions of the Secretary-General (SG) and furthering the SG's priorities in the four output areas of the CPPRI GP.

A more coherent CPPRI within greater coherence at the CB and UNDP HQ levels would be able to develop and use a GP to increase its relevance. Having a larger, stable source of funding for a number of years would be able to support and deliver a more strategic, coherent set of services along with the CB to UNDP, UNDP partners, and stakeholders.

Coherence: Coherence is challenging for the CPPRI team. UNDP HQ and CB organization, structure, and services are difficult to understand for CPPRI team members. And UNDP HQ, CB, and CPPRI are difficult to understand for partners within UNDP and especially for those outside the agency. The GP, as a support mechanism for the CPPRI team, has served to fund key staff and support products and services. Under these conditions it is challenging to provide coherence between the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme and other support providers, including other services delivered through the CB and UNDP GPN.

CPPRI can increase the coherence of its service delivery through greater internal coherence between teams within CPPRI and in external communications outside of CPPRI. Measures to increase information flow and sharing within CPPRI can be used to reach outside of CPPRI as well. These measures can include simple things like sharing a comprehensive organigram that explains who does what in CPPRI as well as standard operating procedures to guide staff (and consumers of CPPRI services).

Effectiveness: CPPRI reporting and interviews with staff noted effectiveness in reaching programme goals in general and outputs in particular. Effectiveness came through the work of the strong, professional staff, with key staff funded through the CPPRI GP helping to reduce challenges of instability and frequent turnover of staff with other less stable funding and hiring mechanisms. The CPPRI Global Programme appears to have met its output targets under each output from the Programme Document (ProDoc) but did not establish results for the broad outputs. The meaning of these outputs is difficult to assess in the headquarters (HQ) context and challenging in the complex areas of CPPRI work.

Efficiency: CPPRI needs space and management to work towards specific outputs and has done so successfully. On the other hand, CPPRI needs to consider how to support efficiencies across the CPPRI team, UNDP, and its partners. This integration and coherence has been more challenging. To increase efficiency of the CPPRI GP, CPPRI cod strengthen its integration, communications, and knowledge management, as well as strengthen staffing through longer, more certain tenure and ways to integrate new staff into the CPPRI team and help them operate effectively in the UNDP and UN contexts.

Impact: Impact is difficult to precisely identify from the CPPRI GP as the programme has had only a few years of implementation and other processes contribute to the evident progress made in CPPRI areas. The main impacts of the CPPRI GP was the work of CPPRI-funded staff as well as CPPRI products that had notable influence on UNDP and partners. The combination of staffing, support for policy development and research, and seed funding for pilots all produced results – but there is not a readily apparent way to identify some results as more important than another. To increase impact, the CPPRI GP consider resource mobilization to support sustained staffing and CPPRI engagement, as well as more integration across CPPRI.

Sustainability:

The CPPRI GP has a solid sustainability strategy based on working through UNDP and other partners, that will endure and use CPPRI products and practices. CPPRI needs to continue to engage to encourage use of this work. To increase the sustainability of CPPRI GP benefits, CPPRI should consider more sustained strategies for engaging and developing partnerships, knowledge management, and communications strategies to further sustainability.

Cross-cutting issues: The CPPRI GP has covered Human rights, Gender equality, and climate risk through mainstreaming these approaches within the work of the CPPRI GP, through working with other teams in the CB, and through dedicated focused initiatives, particularly in climate security with the CS team.

LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

- The CPPRI GP can and does have high-level influence within the UN

- CPPRI can and does have extensive reach through UNDP.

- CPPRI has used experienced leadership to good effect.

- CPPRI would benefit from internal systems and processes to extend effectiveness

- UNDP and CPPRI would also benefit from clarity on offers by CPPRI teams.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: UNDP and the CB should have and support strong, permanent leadership to manage the issue areas aggregated under the CPPRI GP and the CPPRI team.

Recommendation 2: CPPRI also needs a clear, consistent structure and support from CB and within UNDP towards helping CPPRI meet CB and UNDP goals and CPPRI's own outcomes.

Recommendation 3: UNDP, the CB, and CPPRI management should seek, identify, and obtain additional resources to lead in CPPRI issue areas for a sustained period of time.

Recommendation 4: CPPRI managers should develop and use strategies that prioritise CPPRI engagements towards maximizing impact and help staff balance current work with anticipating future needs/opportunities.

Recommendation 5: CPPRI should consider ways to move towards institutionalizing both what CPPRI the team does and how the team pursues tasks towards these goals, including developing procedures and systems to better collaborate within CPPRI.

Recommendation 6: CPPRI should consider developing and publicizing throughout UNDP clear, consolidated offers that outline the services offered to UNDP Bureaus and Country Offices from each team and how to access them (and thus also delineate where teams do not offer support).

Recommendation 7: CPPRI should consider developing procedures and systems to better communicate with partners and stakeholders outside of CPPRI.

1.   INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) formed the Crisis Bureau and the Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions (CPPRI) Team in 2020 as part of revamping UNDP's prevention and peacebuilding capacities at the headquarters (HQ) level. The CPPRI team developed the CPPRI Global Programme (GP) as a vehicle to implement UNDP's Prevention offer. The CPPRI GP has been implemented from 2021.

The **purpose** of the mid-term review (MTR) is to support learning and inform UNDP and its partners of the achievements of the CPPRI GP over the past 3 years, 2021-2023. The review has been guided by the Terms of Reference (ToR) and discussions with CPPRI managers (Annex 1: Terms of Reference). The MTR is tasked with assessing the performance of the CPPRI Global Programme through progress towards achieving objectives as well as assessing the challenges faced in working towards these objectives, any gaps that remain in reaching planned objectives, and lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations that flow from CPPRI's experience to date. The information and analysis in the MTR aims to be useful for the CPPRI team, UNDP, CPPRI GP partners, donors, and stakeholders.

The CPPRI GP was developed over 2020; the 26 August 2020 draft Programme Document (ProDoc) proposed a USD 57.5 million effort for 2.5 years and asserted that funding for the initiative of USD 12.5 million had been secured. The April 2020 project initiation plan towards finalizing the ProDoc suggested that the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) had provided funding of USD 3.4 million for two years, and that USD 3 million from the Swiss Government would be used to begin programming and support additional resource mobilization. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) provided CHF 2,970,000 towards CPPRI – Core Government Functions and Local Governance for July 2020 to August 2022.

The **scope** of the review is thus the CPPRI global programme covered by SIDA and Switzerland through the UNDP Funding Window. The MTR focuses on activities towards objectives from the start of 2021 through July 2023 through these resources, plus support for CPPRI staffing provided by Canada and the European Union (EU) as well as other funding that supports staffing in the CPPRI team through Junior Professional Officer (JPO) positions. The review examines the connections between the GP with other separately funded initiatives within the CPPRI team. The CPPRI team has a joint programme (JP) and three other GPs with it. These four are:
- The Joint UNDP-DPPA Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention (referred to as the JP);
- International dialogue for peacebuilding and statebuilding (IDPS);
- UN Transitions; and
- Climate Security Mechanism (CSM)

The MTR does not review these other four programmes and progress towards their objectives; each of these initiatives has recently had larger, longer independent reviews or evaluations of their own. The MTR instead looks at how the CPPRI GP does or does not work with and support these other four programmes and considers where the work of these four programmes fits with and supports the work of the CPPRI GP.

The MTR examines the different modalities used in the CPPRI GP to deliver key services. CPPRI draws on services to respond to needs identified by the CPPRI team and internal or external partners. CPPRI GP is tasked with responding to priority prevention and peace settings or issues for UNDP. The GP has four sets of tools to bring to these challenges and opportunities: Analytics; Knowledge management (KM); Human

and financial resources; and Technical Accompaniment. These four modalities are further explained in the CPPRI GP Overview below and then the findings and conclusions of the MTR.

2.   POLITICAL AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT FOR THE CPPRI GP

As part of UN system reform within UNDP, the CB was created at the start of 2019. The tasking for senior managers in the CB was to restructure and organize their areas of responsibility towards future viability. Viability was defined as meeting UN and UNDP needs through what was feasible and fundable. This led to reshuffle of people, projects, programmes, and thematic areas. The CPPRI team and GP emerged out of these processes that led to the development of the CB and Global Policy Network (GPN). The CPPRI GP was developed under the guidance and direction of the head of the CPPRI team in 2020, who then led the GP's conceptualization and resource mobilisation through funding from SIDA and the Swiss.

The Global Programme was designed to contribute to the achievement of UNDPs Strategic Plan 2017-2022 Outcome 3: "Build Resilience to shocks and crises" and support the development and implementation of UNDP's prevention offer (which was under development) to support operationalisation of the Sustaining Peace Resolutions within the vision of Agenda 2030

3.   DESCRIPTION OF THE CPPRI GP

The goal of the GP, expressed in the ProDoc, is to contribute to an over-arching development impact that:

> People live in increasingly inclusive and peaceful societies that are becoming more resilient to the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of violence and conflict and moving towards pathways for recovery, reconstruction and sustainable development.

The Theory of Change (ToC) was:

> Operating through both whole-of-government and whole-of-society processes, **if** national stakeholders—e.g. governments, civil society, local/national actors/leaders—were supported to:
>> Prioritise and address those drivers of conflict and opportunities for sustaining peace that transcend national borders;
>> Strengthen and deepen state-society 'social contracts' through more effective, responsive, accountable and inclusive core governance functions, systems and service delivery at both national and local levels; and
>> Increase, strengthen and deepen the dynamic interdependent capacities of national and local stakeholders to prevent violence and address sources of conflict and build peace;
> **Then** societies will become increasingly inclusive, peaceful and more resilient to the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of violence and conflict.

The programme strategy in the in the 26 August 2020 draft ProDoc frames the CPPRI GP within UNDP's Strategic Plan 2018-2021 as a central UNDP prevention offer to support operationalisation of the Sustaining Peace Resolutions within the vision of Agenda 2030. The ProDoc outlines five components of the programme strategy that describe how the GP planned to work.

1. The strategy operates from the fundamental premise that conflict prevention and sustaining peace should be broadly understood as a goal and an ongoing process in all settings.
2. The Global Programme is not confined to 'conflict' contexts but tailors and delivers its preventive responses across all development settings in the UNDP Strategic Plan.

3. The Global Programme designs and implements risk informed, conflict sensitive and analysis-based solution packages for prevention and peacebuilding at the global, regional and country levels.
4. The Global Programme employs an inclusive partnership-based approach to leverage the maximum range of stakeholders, skills and resources for appropriate and effective solutions.
5. The Global Programme will make significant investment in Impact assessment and measurement of conflict prevention and peacebuilding interventions.

The GP thus articulated an ambitious broad domain for possible engagement across all the settings where UNDP works; CPPRI has focused on where conflict prevention and crisis are readily apparent – where there is substantial demand for CPPRI engagement from UNDP and other actors. Where to work in practice was left to be determined in the ProDoc; The ProDoc noted this would be determined as UNDP developed preventative responses based on particular contexts with unspecified partners based on needs and opportunities.

The GP planned to work at three levels of outcomes. Towards systemic dimensions of conflict/peace, CPPRI was to prioritise and address drivers of conflict and opportunities for sustaining peace that transcend national borders. Towards structural dimensions of conflict/peace, CPPRI was to strengthen effective, responsive, accountable and inclusive core governance functions, systems and service delivery to enhance state-society 'social contracts.' And towards operational dimensions of conflict/peace, CPPRI was to strengthen and deepen national and local stakeholders' capacity and their dynamic and interdependent networks and resources for preventing conflict.

The CPPRI GP is organized by and has focused on supporting partners and stakeholders through four outputs. Each output has a team within CPPRI towards this work; each output has a single output statement in the Programme Document.

- *Output 1: Conflict Prevention (CP) and Peacebuilding* - Evidenced based and gender sensitive policy, programme and partnerships strengthened at global, regional and country level on conflict prevention and peacebuilding.
- *Output 2: Climate related security risks* - UNDP and partner capacity on climate security risks assessment and response strengthened.
- *Output 3: Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE)* - Capacities strengthened in building civic resilience and institutional safeguards for communities to prevent violent extremism through acceptance and effective governance building.
- *Output 4: Responsive, Accountable and Inclusive Core Governance Functions (CGF) at the National and Local Levels* - Restore and/or strengthen responsive, accountable and inclusive core governance functions at the national and local levels in fragile and crisis-affected settings to help (re)build an inclusive social contract, ensure effective service delivery and restore public trust in core governance institutions that leave no one behind.

The ProDoc developed outputs under each output through the Results Framework. Resource estimates were not included in the ProDoc for how much to invest in each output or output or prioritise them with scarce resources.

The ProDoc notes that CPPRI has four key services at the centre of delivering the GP:

- Analytics – generating and analysing data to advance prevention and peacebuilding in integrated programme design, research, key areas of interest (context, political-economy, conflict and early warning) and M&E;
- Knowledge management – gathering and managing knowledge towards strengthening preventative action and programming through partnerships, guidance, and management systems;
- Human and financial resources – to deploy human resources and provide integrated and predictable medium-term financing streams for sustained and catalytic prevention and peacebuilding outcomes; and
- Technical Accompaniment - deliver human resources that can provide cross-thematic technical assistance support services.

Some presentations of the CPPRI team's work discuss CPPRI in five parts instead by separating out the other GPs and the JP from the issue-area based division of CPPRI. This way of outlining the team's work suggests management of GPs/the JP and integration across UN and external actors can be thought of as an independent area of CPPRI work separate to some extent from the other work of CPPRI in the four issue areas. One of these other programmes are in the Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding team, which leads engagement and collaboration with the UN system's peacebuilding architecture, global think-tanks, academic institutions, networks and platforms by hosting the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and State-building (IDPS) Secretariat since 2022. In climate risk, CPPRI (for UNDP) together with DPPA, UNEP and DPO convenes the Climate Security Mechanism (CSM). And UNDP management of the secretariat of the UN Transitions Project was brought into CPPRI to the Core-Government Functions and Local Governance team in 2022. The CPPRI Team Leader also oversees the UNDP DPPA Joint Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention.

Other partnerships are less formal and not separately funded in CPPRI. This includes work with partners from member states and civil society to build national and local capacities for prevention and peace through dialogue, consensus building, infrastructures for peace, peace in the HDP nexus and social cohesion. CPPRI leads the Prevention Academy as part of the Crisis Academy infrastructure furthering UNDP's engagement.

The CPPRI GP encompasses only a part of the CPPRI team, which when including people and projects funded through the other GPs and JP that report to the head has varied between 50 and 60 people working in nine different duty stations. Importantly, the heads of governance and peacebuilding in four regional hubs report as one of their lines to the head of CPPRI. The CPPRI ProDoc results framework details individual outputs for seven staff funded through the GP. These staff are in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding (Team Leader- Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding P5; Policy Specialist- Conflict Prevention P3; Policy Specialist- Peacebuilding P3), in Climate Security (Policy Specialist Climate Security P4; Policy Specialist P3), and in Core Government Functions and Local Governance (Policy Specialist – CGF; Policy Specialist- Local governance). The GP was not envisioned to be used for PVE staffing needs.

Towards Output 1, the Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding team in CPPRI strengthens risk informed national capacities for conflict prevention, engagement of national processes and actors/networks in mediation, negotiation and consensus building, fostering social cohesion and strengthening institutions. The output 1 team works towards building UNDPs core prevention and peacebuilding capacity, conducts policy research and dialogues to influence policymaking, develops knowledge and manages this knowledge, provides a CP and PB offer through programmes to partners, and engages in advocacy to influence non-UN PB and CP policies and actions. One of the four other programmes within CPPRI team are under output 1: the IDPS GP.

Towards Output 2, the Climate Security team in CPPRI focuses on climate-proofing prevention and peacebuilding, ensuring peace-positive mitigation and adaptation, delivering integrated approaches to climate action and sustaining peace, and strengthening the capacity of regional entities and cross-border approaches to address climate-related security risks. The team provides the core UNDP advisory capacity of the UN Climate Security Mechanism (CSM) and leads the UN Community of Practice on Climate and Security. UNDP's offer on climate security brings together its experience on climate change, conflict prevention, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods to offer data, analytics and early warning but also integrated policy, planning and programming to support countries affected by the dual burden of climate and conflict. The CSM GP is located within the Climate Security team.

Towards Output 3, the Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE) team in CPPRI invests in thought leadership grounded in analysis of global trends of violent extremism and provide evidence-based PVE policy and programming support to assist local, national, regional and global partners in 41 countries across five regions. These efforts engage diverse partners and actors–national governments for support of the development and implementation of PVE National Action Plans. The team has supported evidence-based conflict prevention and peacebuilding through application of Behavioural Insights in PVE, integration of Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) in peacebuilding and working towards addressing hate speech and information pollution. Towards Output 3, the Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE) team designs and implements risk-informed, conflict sensitive and analysis-based development solutions for the prevention of violent extremism at the global, regional and country levels, to meet the priorities set out in the UN Secretary-General's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and through participation in the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Coordination Compact. The CPPRI PVE team's work also covers interconnected thematic workstreams of Mental Health and Psychosocial Support Services (MHPSS) and Addressing Hate Speech as they all relate to sustaining peace and security. The PVE team directly oversees the implementation (Output 3) of the Joint EU-UN Strengthening Resilience Against Violent Extremism in Asia (STRIVE Asia) regional programme in partnership with UNOCT and UNODC across five countries in Central Asia.

And towards Output 4, the Responsive, Accountable, and Inclusive Core Government Functions team in CPPRI supports the whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach with a prevention lens in its commitment to restoring and strengthening core governance institutions nationally and locally. The team focuses on supporting executive management at the centre of government; civil service reform, public financial management; aid management and coordination; and local governance (and service delivery) in crisis-affected settings. The UN Transitions GP has been placed within CGF team.

4. MID-TERM REVIEW METHODS

The MTR was developed by an independent consultant through consultations with CPPRI team managers. The MTR falls somewhere in between a review of a funded programme and a participatory review of a team of professionals working together at headquarters. The consultant worked to operationalize the ToR for the review through analysis of CPPRI GP and other materials (Annex 2: Documents). Document review was supported by introductory briefings and conversations with managers and staff of CPPRI from each of the four workstreams. This initial document review and briefings/conversations was used to scope the review through a draft inception report. The ToR organized the MTR around UNEG and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria that UNDP uses, which has been used for discussions and the review of documents as well as to structure the review report. Comments on the draft inception report were addressed through the revision and finalization of the inception report, which included a list of informants to interview from the CPPRI

team, UNDP, and other stakeholders to gather primary data to analyse for the review (Annex 3: List of Interviews). The inception report also developed questions to ask informants in semi-structured interviews (Annex 4: Evaluation Instruments). The consultant then implemented this approved plan in fall 2023.

Explicit oral informed consent was obtained all interviews; interviewees were assured that all information provided in discussions and interviews will not be linked to any specific person and that all information provided will be kept confidential. Documents reviewed include the CPPRI GP Document, work plans, annual reports, and other materials produced by the GP. The consultant used and triangulated data gathered through these two methodologies and from different categories of informants for validating findings, identifying best practices and making conclusions and recommendations.

The Mid-Term Review design is based on the independence of the consultant, a focus on evaluating the most important activities toward reaching the GP objectives, purposive sampling, triangulation, and comparison. The MTR is independent of UNDP. However, the consultant has collaborated closely with CPPRI GP managers and staff to identify the most relevant informants for interviews. Focus has emphasised considering what has been funded by the GP and the connections between these resources and the other activities and achievements of the CPPRI team. Purposive sampling has been used to select individuals for interviews; selection has focused on the people who are the most well-informed about the CPPRI GP to best learn from the activities, achievements and challenges of the GP. Triangulation has been used in gathering data through different methods as well as in comparing information gathered from different types of informants (e.g. from different teams, different levels of experience, and inside or outside of CPPRI).

The consultant made a presentation on the draft report to CPPRI and has brought comments from the session into the draft. Next steps in the MTR are the review and comment on this draft by UNDP. The consultant will then revise the draft review report to address all comments and submit a final review report to UNDP for review and approval.

5. KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Relevance
Relevance is the extent to which programme objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, regional, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

How relevant is the CPPRI GP to UNDP, UNDP partners, and stakeholders?

Conclusion 1: The CPPRI GP's work has been relevant to UNDP and other UN agencies and member states as well as other organisations working in conflict, peacebuilding and crisis through the work of the team with partners inside and outside of UNDP.

GP documents convincingly assert the relevance of the GP. The ProDoc, reporting of the GP, and products produced by CPPRI note the relevance of the GP and stress the main argument for prevention and peacebuilding in development - that the costs of violent conflict and fragility continue to grow worldwide, which the UN notes makes it unlikely that the targets of the SDGs can be met. Spending on crisis response, humanitarian assistance, and recovery continue to be massive – while the promise of prevention and addressing issues early in peacebuilding, climate risk, PVE, and CGF can instead save lives and support

development at much lower costs. Staff interviewed noted that 60% of NDP's work is in countries in crisis and conflict.

CPPRI managers and staff in interviews noted the clear relevance of the areas the GP covers and the CPPRI team to UNDP, key partners across the UN and member states, and to other organisations working in conflict, peacebuilding, and crisis. CPPRI support for addressing the multi-dimensional risks that countries face through the GP extends through UNDP HQ to the UNSG as well as through UNDP regional hubs to UNDP COs to develop approaches at these levels in many specific areas.

The CPPRI GP was knit together by managers in 2020 to link in a coherent way the sets of the different people and projects inherited in the UN restructuring that created the CB in 2019 and open up opportunities to work within these workstreams. The write up was intentionally broad to give the CPPRI team lots of room to address the many topics in CP, PB, and responsive institutions. The GP was paralleled to a Country Programme Document for a UNDP country office; the point was to leave open opportunities to do the kinds of work needed. The GP was put together to situate the CB in terms of people, projects, and positioning in conflict prevention and peacebuilding. This positioning was both within UNDP and in other partnerships beyond UNDP. This positioning was recognized as relevant by Sweden through their commitment of funding to the GP after resource mobilization work by the CPPRI head. Ambitions of CPPRI management to expand the donor base and funding beyond this initial SIDA commitment were not achieved; additional funding was seen by managers and staff interviewed as having the potential to make the GP more relevant. The CPPRI design was wide enough, and management had sufficient flexibility in the use of funds to maintain this funding as Swedish priorities changed with a change of government. Having CS within CPPRI provided ways to continue to use SIDA funds as Swedish government priorities changed. CPPRI's different objectives and teams could absorb funds in ways consistent with changing government interests.

Now with four years of experience, the workstreams have evolved a lot within this broad leeway to work in CPPRI. The broad scope of the ProDoc was seen as important as enabling the CPPRI team to work flexibility in ways not envisioned in 2019, such as working more on non-state actors (NSA) and area-based development within responsive institutions. CPPRI stayed relevant with the ability to adapt with the flexibility in the design. Staff and managers did note that CPPRI and the specific four workstreams could be organized and divided in a number of different ways.

CPPRI relevance was most clear in the support for staffing. The GP was seen as what allowed CPPRI to operate as a team; few CPPRI staff were funded by UNDP Targets for Resource Assignments from Core (TRAC) funds, with most staff project funded – and CPPRI GP providing five staff. The CPPRI GP was particularly important for CGF, with the vast majority of funding to the team coming through CPPRI. The modalities used in CPPRI GP delivery were recognized as relevant towards reaching across UNDP and to external partners.

Some staff noted CPPRI was very or extremely relevant but noted that the CPPRI team was then challenged with a disconnect - with the large gulf between these huge global problems and the limits on what CPPRI with a small team with few resources can practically do in the complicated UNDP landscape and the range of countries in crisis or conflict worldwide.

How relevant is the CPPRI GP to the 2030 Agenda, the UN Strategic Plan, and the visions the Secretary-General has expressed in the four output areas of the CPPRI GP?

Program staff noted using and the value of the ToC. Program managers explained the ToC was developed to knit together the issues, staff, and programming inherited at the start of the GP and for coherence of

the GP. Interviews with staff noted that the ToC remained relevant. Interviewees from CPPRI and stakeholders agreed that relevance had been maintained, pointing in particular to work with the SG crafting messaging for the SG on conflict prevention and peacebuilding. CPPRI GP support for UNDP towards implementing the UNDP SP, supporting progress towards the 2030 agenda, and supporting the visions of the SG in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, climate security, PVE, and restoring/strengthening core government functions in conditions of crisis and fragility.

What can the CPPRI GP do to increase its relevance to UNDP, UNDP partners, and stakeholders?
Addressing challenges of leadership, staffing, and funding that would increase coherence, effectiveness, and efficiency within CPPRI would in addition increase impact and sustainability- and thus also increase the relevance of the CPPRI GP for UNDP, its partners, and stakeholders. These efforts would advance CPPRI in CB and UNDP positioning in development work in crisis and fragility. A sustained period of permanent rather than acting leadership is needed to provide strategic direction and coherence (within the CB and UNDP context) and raise funds to staff CPPRI on a sustainable, long-term basis. However, there have been measures to work towards more coherence across the teams including regular communication and team meetings and joint work planning. CPPRI team interviewees varied in how comfortable they were with the positioning and mandates of CPPRI within the diverse, huge organization that is UNDP, including with the complex set of Bureaus and teams (like the Country Management Support Team) at headquarters that are avenues for CPPRI to work with in reaching across UNDP. With busy staff engaged in many tasks, some CPPRI staff emphasized a need for contextual stability to focus on priority strategic tasks in a context when there are always immediate crises that CPPRI is part of responding to as part of UNDP.

Coherence
Coherence is the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or Institution.

How and how well is coherence between the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme and other support providers assured, including other support services delivered through the CB and UNDP GPN?

Conclusion 2: The CPPRI GP provides the coherence for CPPRI as it aggregates people, themes, programmes in the operationalization of the CPPRI team's work.

Interviews with managers noted the CPPRI GP was developed as part of the creation of the CB. The ProDoc was developed to provide the integration of ideas and then the CPPRI team and teams are tasked to provide internal coherence in practice. The composition of CPPRI was deliberate, with the merging of four teams under this common umbrella and seen to make sense now and at that time. The framework of the GP and the organization of teams on these lines worked to deliver support to HQ, hubs, and COs as well as work with UN and external partner in a coherent way. The frameworks/organization of the team has led to successful delivery of services and products. That noted, there were a number of ways that coherence was a challenge for the UN, UNDP, the CB, and CPPRI.

Conclusion 3: CPPRI team members as well as UNDP and other partners find it challenging to understand the full picture of CPPRI's capabilities and offers within those of the CB in practice - as staff, UNDP, and partners focus on their particular priorities and needs within conflict prevention, peacebuilding, and responsive institutions.

Interviews with the CPPRI team noted that it was sometimes a challenge to be clear and transparent across UNDP and with partners about what can CPPRI do and how the CPPRI team could deliver. Some staff and managers stressed that it was difficult to decide on priorities in evolving contexts; this leads to needs for team and team leader guidance and direction. The move to remote work and the partial return to the office has made it more difficult to link with UNDP HQ and the CB. At the time of the review, leadership for CPPRI was in transition as well, which some CPPRI and UNDP interviewees noted created some uncertainties about priorities and more broad uncertainty about future actions.

The CB was noted by interviewees as sometimes a challenge to coherence, as different teams outside CPPRI have capacity and experience that gets linked into some shared work and sometimes are the source of service and delivery rather than CPPRI. The evolving structure and units of the CB were seen as a challenge to understand for new staff; more experienced HQ staff knew more about the CB and knew how to work with other teams (such as the Rule of Law team). Again this was more challenging with remote work and a far-flung team.

The multiple strategies and offers within which CPPRI is embedded in in the CB and UNDP are challenging to interpret and have substantial overlaps – for example between the UNDP SP, the Crisis Offer, and the Prevention Offer. These different strategies also frame who is providing these services in different ways – UNDP for the first two and the GPN for prevention. These different presentations provide conceptual framing for what UNDP, the CB and CPPRI do. But then how to operationalize them becomes more cluttered with all of the different concrete initiatives and examples of specific work from particular contexts included in the frameworks. CPPRI and its teams are tasked with using these frameworks to support an integrated UNDP approach through their own work in their areas of focus. The Prevention Offer takes an important step towards ease of use by including a specific focal point, the former head of CPPRI, and contact information in the offer. However the focal point now needs to be updated.

The CB has an organigram that sketches the units and provides team leaders for each. This does not include the team members in each unit. CPPRI has an organigram, but staff and managers noted that a full organigram could be usefully shared more widely within CPPRI and with units and people that CPPRI engages with, including regional hub staff.

The CPPRI GP ProDoc outlines four distinct areas of work for the CPPRI and four general ways of working. Interviews with CPPRI managers and staff found that staff knew and understood the distinct tasks and functions each had and felt that demarcations were clear between teams and staff on teams. Staff differed in the extent to which they felt it was clear where and how to collaborate or potentially work together across workstreams. Some staff noted lots of cross cutting functions, integrated workstreams, with focal points designed within CPPRI to manage the collaboration, while others noted working more "in silos". A cross-cutting example noted was the ongoing work on environmental governance, with CPPRI working towards drafting an integrated offer from UNDP on environmental governance that engaged across CPPRI teams and the CB.

Questions of how and how much to work together across workstreams was noted as a key set of questions. These questions were not only for CPPRI, staff felt – but were entire UNDP questions where it

is not clear how and how much to interlinking workstreams across the organization. The challenges were clear – for efficiency to make teams and teams work, separation and clarity on boundaries were assets. But then it was a challenge for UNDP, the CB, and CPPRI to avoid silos. As one staff noted, we are "supposed to be one big team complementing each other – but we cannot even do that within the office; this huge systemic challenge is not a CPPRI challenge, but for all of the UN, all UNDP." This was relevant, as another staff person put it, "the challenge has been to make sure that [conceptual coherence] translates into a more collaborative way of doing our work day to day."

Institutional memory was also noted as a challenge to coherence. UNDP, CB, and CPPRI systems and organization of CPPRI products did not provide for KM in a unified way across the CPPRI team to provide coherence this way. Instead institutional memory was noted as residing within staff that had been on the team for years. This did not translate quickly or systematically to provide institutional knowledge to new staff to CPPRI – or carry this knowledge to users outside CPPRI. For CPPRI coherence, some interviewees noted "some of the glue has to be stronger." The CPPRI team and CB policy team have developed an onboarding package to support new staff.

Some staff noted that lines were "blurry" within UNDP, in the CB, and in CPPRI in ways that were a challenge on who CPPRI would and should work with outside of the team and how CPPRI can and does support the rest of UNDP, with CPPRI as kind of in the "middle" between doing policy and central work for UNDP and providing technical and CO support. Providing both was seen as often difficult, which led to some strategic products and processes taking longer to complete as immediate tasks arose and took priority. CPPRI staff had different views about whether and how CPPRI could and did support COs directly; most noted that they usually work with and through the regional hubs to then reach COs. Some staff emphasized that this was required with others noting this was not always required (although always good to keep the hubs in the loop). The regional hubs were noted to have at least one person that was the primary point of contact for CPPRI, in charge usually of both governance and conflict, as well as a dedicated climate security person for that workstream.

Another way the limited clarity was noted was from the perspective of the CO. Many layers could be seen in how many steps in might take to for a CO to reach to a CPPRI team member. Some staff interviewed noted that this might have five layers – starting through CMST – and that these pathways were not necessarily clear to COs. CO requests were noted as not promoting coherence; Requests that covered different teams of CPPRI from COs were reported in interviews to be "rare". Instead requests were usually for particular expertise and people, rather than for cross-cutting and integrated support that crossed teams and people's specializations in CPPRI. Staff noted that with more integration across CPPRI and awareness raised across UNDP of more integrated CPPRI solutions, it was possible that more requests would come in for more integrated support from CPPRI from regional hubs and COs. Requests made, some staff noted, were defined by what the requesting unit in UNDP thought the supply was within HQ, the GPN, and CPPRI. Area-based development support in crisis and conflict had the potential to be more encompassing and further this integration in CPPRI support, some staff noted.

What can the CPPRI GP do to increase the coherence of its service delivery with that provided by other providers, including other programmes within the CPPRI team?

Conclusion 4: CPPRI has been and is working towards increasing coherence within the team and in delivery, with additional stress on these efforts over the last six months.

CPPRI managers and staff noted that it was a priority for the team to be more coherent across teams. CPPRI management was increasing the effort to link and knit CPPRI together. Some processes and products were helpful in this effort. The Community of Practice was a way for teams to come together in joint initiatives, and clarify work across UNDP with the participants in the COP. The possibility of using the VIVA artificial intelligence as an initiative to try a logic platform to show and update who does what was noted. More room was noted both for digital ways to bring together a unified approach, as well as to do so in human terms through mechanisms like meetings. A CPPRI retreat was widely noted as a good idea for coherence (among other things).

CPPRI team members interviewed noted that the successes of UN, including UNDP, the CB, and CPPRI ultimately comes down to the people in the organization. The conclusion that followed from this was that is up to the individual team members to increase transparency and sharing with other staff, in teams, and across the whole team in CPPRI. This was noted as more challenging across the CB, in issues like addressing hate speech and misinformation/disinformation which is covered within CPPRI but also sits with governance and elections and the governance team, thus needing cross-CB collaboration to get a coherent, unified way of working on these issues.

Some practices were noted as important in supporting coherence. Pulling together CPPRI GP reporting aggregated the work of the team in a single location to support learning and sharing. The PVE team has pulled together global annual reports on PVE on all of UNDP work in this area, which strengthens coherence in this field. The PVE team reported planning and conducting M&E on a continuous basis, which made it easier to report on summary achievements. Some specific work was noted as having been done intentionally to cross teams, such as the policy brief on the nexus between climate security and PVE.

CPPRI also had examples of linking the other programmes within CPPRI with CPPRI GP supported products, such as using the IDPS GP to bring in through their funding resources to youth, peace and security that were then connected to the Prevention Academy to get a larger resonance. The ongoing effort to link a PVE, CS, and LG was another example in the design of a regional dialogue for costal West Africa. And expectations were that through hosting the IDPS secretariat, CPPRI would have opportunities to add substantially to and influence the New Agenda for Peace with IDPS. IDPS also had mechanisms to amplify CPPRI, such as through the IDPS Twitter account.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is the extent to which the programme achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

Conclusion 5: CPPRI has achieved the specific objectives from its Programme Document and more importantly make progress toward the broad programme goals that the CPPRI GP contributes to.

CPPRI reporting and interviews with staff noted effectiveness in reaching programme goals in general and outputs in particular. Programme reports to SIDA demonstrate these achievements. Staff noted reaching specific goals in interviews. Staff interviews stressed broader progress made towards programme goals in each of the teams within CPPRI.

The broad outputs of the CPPRI GP were not developed to be measured, but to be integrative, interviews with drafters of the GP noted. The CPPRI GP did not develop output indicators for the four outputs or the main sub-outputs of the GP, nor targets for them. This suggests that aggregating the sub-output targets below each of the sub-outputs (e.g. 1.1.1 or 3.2.5), which were set with indicators, can be part of

measuring broader sub-output and output achievements. The Output statements area also useful in considering the broader achievements of the CPPRI GP, of which there are many.

Conclusion 6: The CPPRI team's effectiveness came through the work of the strong, professional staff, with key staff funded through the CPPRI GP helping to reduce challenges of instability and frequent turnover of staff with other less stable funding and hiring mechanisms.

CPPRI managers and team members stressed in interviews that reaching programme goals came through their work. Staff quality was noted as high. Key staff were funded through the CPPRI GP, and were specific sub-outputs of the GP. positions of the Team Leader for Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in New York, the Policy Specialist for Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in Geneva, and the Policy Specialist for Local Governance in New York are fully funded by SIDA.

Challenges to effectiveness centered on the difficulties of working on the many huge issues CPPRI covers in the changing UNDP ecosystem with few staff and many staff coming to the team through less stable, shorter-term mechanisms. CPPRI has immense potential since working at HQ can directly influence key decisionmakers and decisions. CPPRI has challenges in delivering in this context through the 4 key services, particularly in balancing policy engagement with technical accompaniment to support regional hubs and COs.

To what extent has the CPPRI Global Programme met its output targets under each output?
Effectiveness is at the core of evaluations of conventional development programmes and projects. Effectiveness questions are much more challenging for less conventional programmes like CPPRI GP that provide support to UNDP headquarters as well as to regional hubs and COs through different modalities towards complex goals in a changing UNDP ecosystem. Indicators and targets are difficult to specify and set ex ante in the workstreams within CPPRI, particularly on conflict prevention, especially over a four year period. And CPPRI managers when they developed the ProDoc sought to maintain flexibility to respond to evolving situations by not specifying targets in a restrictive way.

Nevertheless, the ProDoc developed indicators and set targets for them by sub-outputs for the CPPRI GP and some targets were quite specific. Some staff reported knowing and working towards these targets, while other staff focused on different targets (such as ones in other GPs or the JP).

Indicators under outputs also vary in the extent to which a team has the authority to meet them on their own or whether the indicator measured the successful adoption of CPPRI-produced products by UNDP or others. In climate security for example, CPPRI GP indicators included developing UNDP's climate-related security risk offer and its roll out, both of which go beyond CPPRI. This offer, while under development, has yet to come out through UNDP. And teams may choose to pursue outputs in a variety of ways, including choosing to work through more collaboration with partners towards larger results, which might have greater utility and effectiveness but take longer and involve more processes, including ceding sole authority for finalizing a product that would be counted towards an indicator. This for example may be the case for the CS team, for whom working with the CSM on a scenario exercise for the participatory exploration of climate-related security risks means completing the analytic framework that would fit indicator 2.1.3 of the GP is under the CSM and out of the CPPRI CS teams control, although something they have chosen towards influence towards larger effects.

Interviews with CPPRI team members noted working towards outputs and targets – but that the focus of staff was on the broader goals behind these targets that the outputs specified rather than hitting the numbers set as targets for these indicators. The ways that the ProDoc was written broadly in order to

capture opportunities and potential opportunities to contribute to CP and PB encouraged general outputs and indicators that were not precise. The indicators used did not define or specify the content concretely; for example, what constitutes establishing "a research agenda", "flagship research", or "influencing policy" (Indicators 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 1.2.3 respectively). Other indicators were more concrete; it is clear in the UN context what a guidance product or a prevention offer is - although the content of these products varies (indicators 1.3.2 and 1.3.5 respectively).

Reports to SIDA on the CPPRI GP were organized through the outputs but did not systematically use the outputs and did not address the indicators outlined in the ProDoc. These reports did an admirable job pulling together the many strands of CPPRI's work within the four workstreams. As with this review, the number of initiatives and activities organized through the four teams is challenging to draw larger conclusions from.

Most CPPRI funding went to fund CPPRI staff. CPPRI staff noted that they also did not have a detailed picture of funds available from CPPRI or in general, although staff working on other GPs and the JP knew those budgets. Project managers for each output had their own budgets and responsibilities for managing them. Interviews noted that the lack of clarity on resource availability made it difficult for staff to initiate and follow through on some initiatives. This left a sense that initiatives could be strengthened through longer-term engagement of the CPPRI team in work with COs and partners as initiatives were implemented, as well as from learning from them towards broader change through CPPRI. Although staff did not know the details, staff knew that the level of resources from the CPPRI GP was modest to fund initiatives. Staff understood that funding for technical accompaniment through missions was expected to come from COs. This system worked, as COs have had sufficient resources to fund CPPRI team members travel to support their missions out to COs over 2021-2023.

Some CPPRI interviewees suggested that CPPRI needed ways to be more effective in working through HQ to reach key countries effectively, particularly for the bigger country crises over the past few years (e.g. Afghanistan, Ukraine, Sudan, and now Israel and Palestine). More awareness raising, communications and partnerships were identified as ways to be more effective on these huge crises.

Relevance, coherence, effectiveness, and efficiency are challenged by uncertainties and shifts in staffing, as the people and positions change with and the lack of core funding for staff leading to reliance on project funds and JPOs for staff. These realities have led to using relatively junior staff with limited exposure to UNDP HQ within CPPRI. While staff are well qualified and experienced in crisis and UNDP, relatively junior staff interviewed noted that the learning curve for working in headquarters, within the CB, and in CPPRI was substantial. Some noted that it took substantial time or took a year to really understand UNDP HQ and ways of working.

What can be considered to support CPPRI teams to help them meet GP output targets?
CPPRI documents note achieving GP output targets. Managers and staff interviewed also noted that the CPPRI team and its teams have met and exceeded GP output targets. That said, managers and staff noted that results-based management and indicators did not work well in capturing the effectiveness of CPPRI's work within HQ, towards outcomes, and in larger impact.

Conclusion 7: CPPRI managers and staff suggested ideas to strengthen effective delivery in CPPRI's context.

Areas suggested in interviews for stronger effectiveness largely centred on the challenges of addressing the huge outcomes in CPPRI within UPDP and other partners with a small, headquarters team that are largely under one-year contracts funded through different modalities. Some staff noted stronger

effectiveness could be done through a more focused, targeted approach with more concrete, specific goals and targets. Impact more than effectiveness was the real goal – and CPPRI HQ work was noted to be clearly several steps removed from the effects of UNDP and partner interventions on the ground in fragile and crisis countries to prevent conflict, succeed in peacebuilding, and work towards responsive institutions.

Managing the challenges of staff on what were often three year assignments (like JPOs) was a challenge to effectiveness. Often, interviewees noted, it takes a year to know the organization and mission, then in year two staff are more effective and independent, but then they will leave in year three. Under these circumstances, staff noted that it was even more important to have the thinking behind the CPPRI programme and organization, including how it fits with the CB and UNDP, explained in conceptual and operational terms. Some JPOs noted that there were sometimes gaps between the idea that JPOs were meant to specialize and respond to their country's policy priorities and their roles filling positions in CPPRI and gaps in offices. More need for KM was also noted as critical with this extent of personnel change and injections of relatively junior staff into CPPRI. CPPRI managers noted working to improve KM and set up an information repository towards addressing these needs.

Another approach towards more effectiveness advocated and worked on by some staff was further HQ work connecting policy development, resource mobilization from donors, and on the ground activity development in countries through work with COs. CPPRI staff noted this was one of the areas where CPPRI could bring all parts together – the policy/research work and the operational work with countries, as well as use broader engagement with funders than can be done at the CO level.

Efficiency
Efficiency is the extent to which the programme delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way)

What has the GP done to manage efficiently and support efficiencies across the CPPRI team, UNDP, and its partners?

Conclusion 8: CPPRI managers face trade-offs in managing the small, busy CPPRI team between supporting efficient delivery towards particular sub-outputs and priorities across the huge domain covered by CPPRI and working to support broader effectiveness and efficiencies across CPPRI through greater collaboration and integration.

The CPPRI team and the context of the CB and UNDP also pose challenges for conventional ways to think about and measure efficiency. These issues were noted by CPPRI managers and staff in interviews. On the one hand, CPPRI staff need the space and a modicum of management support to focus on and work independently to deliver specific assignments. On the other hand, CPPRI staff needs ways to understand the broader CB, UNDP, and UN landscape in which they do this work and the work of colleagues in their teams and across CPPRI both to make the most of these concrete assignments and to expand out from this work through connections with other staff and workstreams within CPPRI, the CB, and UNDP.

Towards management support for staff and particular assignments, interviews noted highly useful support and guidance from the CPPRI Team Leader and OiCs as well as team leaders in the thematic areas.

CPPRI (and the CB) reportedly have less success in supporting understanding across CPPRI and the CB. Staff, especially relatively junior staff and ones with less time in CPPRI, noted in interviews that it was difficult to know what other teams in CPPRI were doing and how to consider and build upon potential synergies. The COVID-19 pandemic and remote work have made building personal connections between team members more challenging, particularly during all remote work periods. This has carried over to 2022 and 2023, with a slow return to the office (but busy travel schedule) for CPPRI team members. CPPRI team members with more "outward" facing responsibilities or backgrounds in partnerships had a greater understanding of the UN system and how to work with UN agency and other partners.

Weekly team meetings were reported for teams in the thematic areas. All CPPRI meetings were less common. CPPRI has had monthly meetings for all staff since July 2023. Team leaders also meet as the CPPRI team and convey learning to members of their teams. But this was not seen by many staff as delivering enough information or direction to support working across the team or across the CB.

Some of the broader challenges with communications and organization in UNDP and the CB were seen as undermining the accessibility of CPPRI services within UNDP, the UN, and with external partners. UNDP web sites are not clear and difficult to use to identify what is available in particular issues areas or to find particular products and people, particularly for partners outside of UNDP. CPPRI teams have taken workarounds to some of these challenges in some areas, by forming a dedicated web-site focused on PVE for example. But there is not a repository of CPPRI products that is readily accessible within UNDP or to external audiences in the other workstreams or for CPPRI as a whole. CPPRI is working towards a repository with the SDG Integration (SDGi) team and has reportedly provided all the information for the repository to SDGi.

Some staff interviewed felt a lack of support staff for operations. The CPPRI GP funded one staff person through Climate Security. The CPPRI team uses and relies on this one support staff and one support staff position funded by each of IDPS, the UN Transitions Project, and the JP for CPPRI operations. This was criticized in interviews as not so efficient. This lack of dedicated support was noted to slow processes and sometimes raise costs. For example, it was noted to take a long time to have anything approved, with examples of taking six weeks for some contracts to be approved through the express roster. Logistics backlogs were also noted. An example was not being able to book flights for missions in advance, when cheaper. Instead, booking was not possible until it was time sensitive and urgent as the UNDP staff in this area are overburdened and prioritise (and get to) only requests for travel that is immediate, which drives up airfare costs.

What can be considered to increase the efficiency of CPPRI GP implementation and better support efficiencies across the CPPRI team, UNDP, and its partners?

CPPRI staff and teams were noted as efficient in their work towards targeted outputs. Suggestions from managers and staff to increase efficiency centered around ways to work more effectively on assignments on the one hand and how to work more effectively across teams and the CB on the other. With the high variance in experience and connections of staff, more tools and techniques (like standard operating

procedures to use as a guide) were sought to support sharing within CPPRI and CB to support both efficiency and effectiveness.

SOPs could be crafted to provide guidance on strategies to use towards different access points within many priorities in CPPRI. SOPs would need to consider several different assumptions in providing guidance. This would include guidance on checking the extent Bureau positions are filled or open as an early step, which then determines different ways to proceed in a realistic manner. More clarity on resource availability would also support effective actions.

Impact

Impact is a result or effect that is caused by or attributable to a project or program. Impact is often used to refer to higher level effects of a program that occur in the medium or long term. Impact may be difficult to identify from the CPPRI GP as the programme has had only a few years of implementation.

Conclusion 9: The CPPRI GP has made a difference in conflict prevention, peacebuilding and supporting responsive institutions with inward-facing work within UNDP supporting policy and initiatives with regional hubs and countries, and in outward-facing work shaping and developing the UNDP administrator's voice on peacebuilding.

CPPRI managers and team members asserted that the work was impactful and noted important ways that CPPRI products and processes contributed to progress across its domains – as well as that three years was a short time period for broad impact. CPPRI GP funding, some reporting and interviews noted, was a "pre-investment" towards bringing together key UNDP human resources in CPPRI and connecting the team with additional funding and programming, particularly the JP and the other three GPs in CPPRI.

While CPPRI reporting has focused on sub-outputs, staff stress the broader progress that CPPRI has contributed to. CPPRI reporting also notes that CPPRI has made a difference in conflict prevention, peacebuilding and supporting responsive institutions through its work within UNDP supporting policy and initiatives with regional hubs and countries in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, in PVE, towards climate security, and in supporting central and local government institutions in crisis and recovery. CPPRI has also made important inputs that have had a direct influence in shaping and developing the UNDP Administrator's voice on peacebuilding, which led to shifts in what the Administrator has said in speeches and interviews on CP and BP.

It remains inherently difficult to assess the impact of headquarters work, especially in the short time frame of a few years. CPPRI has clearly had important influences on processes, actors, and projects within UNDP and with partners in UN agencies and outside them, but there has been limited time for impact, especially with COVID challenges to operations since March 2020.

CPPRI has worked towards having a stronger way to gather evidence on conflict prevention and peacebuilding impact through better measurement. The PVE team developed an impact measurement tool and guide. The Conflict Prevention team has worked to extend this impact measurement tool with more engagement across CPPRI that is promising in keeping more of a focus on impact going forward across UNDP's work in conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

What have been the main impacts of the GP?

The main impacts of the CPPRI GP were the work of CPPRI-funded staff as well as CPPRI products that had notable influence on UNDP and partners. The combination of staffing, support for policy development and research, and seed funding for pilots all produced results – but there is not a readily apparent way to identify some results as more important than another, especially in the short-term (one or two years after an intervention, product or activity).

What can the CPPRI GP consider doing to increase the magnitude and prospects of positive impacts from its activities?

Sustained CPPRI GP engagement through staff, support for initiatives, and policy influence were seen by managers and staff as the way to increase impact, which could also be boosted by greater coherence. More clarity in funding and staffing for a sustained period would increase prospects for impact. Having the space to develop more integration across CPPRI, in addition to doing the work within particular positions and teams, was also noted as a way towards larger influence and impact.

Sustainability

Sustainability is the extent to which the net benefits of the programme continue or are likely to continue after completion.

How sustainable are the outputs of the GP achieved to date?

Conclusion 10: CPPRI GP has been embedded in UNDP, which has supported the sustainability of practices promoted by CPPRI and the products produced by CPPRI.

CPPRI practices and products are designed for use within UNDP and other partners. This work through organisations that endure like UNDP supports sustained use. However, CPPRI needs to continue to be active and engage to keep people, products, and processes "live" and visible within UNDP to maintain sustainability. This is even more important for continuing the engagement and supporting sustainability with partners outside of UNDP. KM, active management and networking are continuous processes needed to keep CPPRI relevant and support the sustainability of CPPRI's achievements.

CPPRI GP outputs also contribute to key UNDP, CB, and external partner products and processes; sustainability of these contributions depends on support for their sustainability by these other units and partners. Staff of the CPPRI team noted that CPPRI had lot of sustainability potential, based on the ideas of the team to contribute to conflict prevention, peacebuilding, and responsive institutions, PVE, and climate security. But sustainability could "rarely" be driven directly by CPPRI. Instead CPPRI could and did encourage adoption of examples, policies and procedures by others in ways to make these sustainable; Challenges of staff retention, the complex organization of UNDP, and KM mean that some things get lost In bureaucratic processes in ways that reduce sustainability. CPPRI staff noted that the team needs the space to refine and review approaches and push for sustainability. A portfolio approach instead of a project approach was thought of as promising, as projects are hard to track on impact and from a sustainability perspective. Assessing and following a family of activities and initiatives was noted as more promising by some staff.

What can the CPPRI GP consider doing to increase the sustainability of its benefits?

17

Conclusion 11: CPPRI's partnership strategy supports sustainability but could be strengthened by increasing the engagement of the CPPRI team at the end of CPPRI's work with partners within UNDP.

The challenges noted from interviews on CPPRI GP impact in findings are also issues for sustainability. There has been limited time to see sustainability, and a longer-time period of sustained implementation of the GP was expected to be more sustainable.

CPPRI was noted as having promising strategies toward sustainability, through working within longstanding, enduring institutions (UNDP) that develop and use long-term approaches to development in fragile and crisis contexts. UNDP COs stay and deliver, even when political contexts drive out key bilateral development partners (as in Syria, Myanmar, or Afghanistan). And CPPPRI's partnership strategy furthered sustainability through working with other UN agencies and departments, national government and CSO partners through COs, as well as external partners, like the Government of Sweden and the FBS. More focus on KM was noted as a way to keep products and processes live for use, and more communications within UNDP and to external partners can strongly encourage the use of CPPRI products and processes for more sustainability.

CPPRI team engagement was often a challenge for staff interviewed to assess in terms of sustainability, as CPPRI engagement was noted to often be more on in the beginning of UNDP engagements and contribute to the design and conceptualization of programming that at the point of impact or sustainability. The CPPRI team was frequently less involved at the end of the engagements, which sometimes leaves a lack of analysis and learning from implementation and the end, particularly on sustainability. SOPs were noted as one of the ways that CPPRI could work towards back-end engagement and tracking; this was seen by some staff interviewed as especially important for assignments pursued through consultants that has less sustainability than drawing on other stand-by capacity through institutional mechanisms (like the FBS). Some of the products of CPPRI like the impact measurement guides were recognized as working towards increasing not only impact but also sustainability. Attention to the impact and sustainability of pilot initiatives was noted as especially important – as well as needing more time to demonstrate with respect to CPPRI.

Some CPPRI staff noted that CPPRI planning frameworks could move towards a more continuous circular set of results, which spirals onwards to continue to build on achievements, instead of the current RF log frame that substantially stops at outputs (as noted in the effectiveness section above). Resources would be needed to refine targets and results as well as build monitoring systems to manage and learn from CPPRI if moving towards such a results framework

Cross-cutting issues
Cross-cutting issues are specific development issues important to programming but which may not clearly fit into the objectives of programmes. Per the ToR, three cross cutting issues are assessed with respect to the CPPRI GP: human rights, gender equality, and climate risk. The CPPRI GP team approached these issues along with UNDP and the Crisis Bureau, with some similar approaches and challenges for the CPPRI team's engagement in these areas through the GP, CB, and UNDP.

Human rights

How has the GP engaged to support human rights?

Conclusion 12: The CPPRI GP has mainstreamed human rights into its approaches and work.

CPPRI GP documents are attentive to HR in a variety of ways. Attention includes explicit focus on LNOB. A mainstreaming approach was also outlined, as key HR principles of inclusion and equality are central to the ToC of the programme and for workstreams within CPPRI. Interviews found CPPRI managers and staff thought of and used a human-rights based approach (HRBA) as inherent to UNDP, CB, and CPPRI GP work. A HRBA was seen by most staff as central to the GP, required as part of what UNDP, the CB, and CPPRI do, and incorporated aspect of everything done through the CPPRI GP. And a focus on HR is clearly within the mandate and focus of another unit within the CB, the ROL team. CPPRI reports communicating and collaborating with the ROL team on initiatives that focused on HR. PVE had a particular stress of HR as part of the teams engagement across the UN in PVE that engaged with units that took a counter-terror rather than a development approach like UNDP. Mental health was recognized as important in PVE as well, with outreach through partners to difficult to reach categories of people to support resilience. The CS team has worked towards developing UNDP's environmental justice offer because of the importance of climate risk for rights. And human rights has been a component of Prevention Academy training modules.

What can the CPPRI GP consider doing to more strongly support human rights?
CPPRI managers and staff noted ways that the team could engage towards more support for HR. These suggestions came in the context of being asked specifically for ideas for more support for HR. CPPRI leadership could choose to focus more products explicitly on HR, through making the connections between workstreams in CPPRI in language (through titles and HR language) and in development through closer connections with ROL team HR engagements. It is not obvious that CPPRI should further focus on HR beyond the ways the team already employs a HRBA. Findings suggest conclusions that more strongly supporting HR should be considered by CPPRI leadership in the context of deciding on future priorities as a whole for the team.

Gender equality

How has the GP engaged to support gender equality?

Conclusion 13: The CPPRI GP has mainstreamed gender into its approaches and work.

As with the HRBA, gender equality (GE) is mainstreamed into the work of the CPPRI GP; interviews with team leaders and staff noted both mainstreaming and particular initiatives that focused on gender.

CPPRI team and team produced documents explicitly noted gender within and across workstreams because of the disproportionate effects that fall on women and importance of women in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, climate security, PVE, and government service delivery in crisis. These materials bring in women as why there is and needs to be policies as well as in targeted engagements that CPPRI has contributed to in particular crises countries. Modalities like the Prevention Academy specifically focused on incorporating gender into training and activities. The CS team had extensive analysis of and consideration for women in the analysis and recommendations of the Climate Finance for Sustaining Peace –Making Climate Finance Work for Conflict-Affected and Fragile Contexts study. The CGF team researched the gender-transformative potential of local governance towards evidence-based guidance for GE through local governance for UNDP. CPPRI worked towards getting this product out through an all

UNDP mechanism, the Development Futures Series, towards wider reach rather than through its own work or the CB. The PVE team noted having a strong reach on gender, and using the Women, Peace and Security National Action Plan (NAP) processes to work with CSOs on PVE, particularly when governments were reticent to consider PVE. CSOs provided important ways to discuss and work towards addressing grievances at local levels that can contribute to VE, which then has worked to become an entry point for working with some governments.

The ProDoc noted that the GP expected to allocate 15% of all its budget towards gender equality. In the CB, gender is the mandate of another unit, the Gender and Crisis Facility, which CPPRI has collaborated with.

What can the CPPRI GP consider doing to more strongly support addressing gender equality?
Interviews did not identify a need for greater attention to gender equality. As part of developing SOPs for how CPPRI works, specific ways to ensure gender equality is mainstreamed into CPPRI's work could be included in SOPs.

Climate risk

How has the GP engaged to address climate risk?

Conclusion 14: The CPPRI GP has both a mainstreaming approach to addressing climate risk through the work of the CPPRI team and a dedicated Output 2 on climate-related security risks.

The ProDoc developed climate security as one of the key sub-outputs in CPPRI. CPPRI managers interviewees noted that in their work in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, PVE, and responsive institutions, they have mainstreaming approach to addressing climate risk to some extent. Climate risk work within CPPRI was mainly through the work of the CPPRI sub team and dedicated Output 2 on climate-related security risks, with the objective "UNDP and partner capacity on climate security risk assessment and response strengthened." CPPRI staff interviewed noted attentiveness to climate security in work towards CP and PB, PVE, and in CGF and LG, while CS staff focused on the area, including through the dedicated focus of the CSM GP on climate risk.

What can the CPPRI GP consider doing to more strongly support addressing climate risk?
Broad CPPRI work towards strengthening coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability across the team were expected to have specific benefits for strengthening CPPRI's work in climate risk. Interviews suggested more integration across teams in CPPRI had promise to bring more understanding of and attention to climate risk to the other teams in CPPRI for the benefit of both the CS team and all of CPPRI.

6. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

The CPPRI GP can and does have high-level influence within the UN. CPPRI managers worked effectively to inform the UN Secretary General's work and statements on conflict prevention and in human security, influence the huge UN flows in climate action through climate security, to inform UN work on PVE with evidence and ideas, and keeping continued attention on the critical roles of inclusive governance in crisis-affected settings. Specific areas noted where this reach was noted in documents and interviews included the SG's report "Our Common Agenda" and enlisting SG support for guidance notes published with the

endorsement of the SG (Strengthened Social Cohesion; Engaging with Insider Mediators; and UN System-Wide Community-Engagement Guidelines on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace).

CPPRI can and does have extensive reach through UNDP. CPPRI staff at HQ and in regional hubs have been able to work effectively on agency-wide reach through policy, region-wide engagement through the hubs, and in particular engagements with a host of country offices. Specific areas noted where this influence was noted in documents and interviews included coordinating CB engagement in the UNDP Interagency Working Group on Human Security, guidance notes that have wide resonance within UNDP, engagement with all of the regional hubs in a systematic manner, and on-demand at the request of UNDP country offices.

CPPRI has used experienced leadership to good effect. CPPRI has been able to be agile in support across the UN system and UNDP based on strong networking and institutional knowledge by experienced CPPRI leaders. Specific areas where CPPRI leadership had taken the initiative based on their understanding of the context and ways of working effectively within it noted in documents and interviews included acquiring other responsibilities and funds for the International Dialogue of Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS) Secretariat and the Insider Mediation project.

CPPRI would benefit from internal systems and processes to extend effectiveness. In tremendously complex contexts of UN and UNDP reform and issues of crisis and fragility, with staffing solutions that have frequent turnover and bring in relatively junior staff, CPPRI would benefit from ways to on-board staff systematically, have standard operating procedures to guide staff as well as strong knowledge management systems to explain the years of work of the team and make materials accessible in an easy to use and understand way. CPPRI needs ways to make CPPRI engagement easier, through more coherence and integration as well as clarity on how CPPRI will engage at UNDP HQ, with regional hubs, with COs, with other UN agencies and units, and with external stakeholders. Measures like the organigram and an enduring accessible library of products could be used more widely to help CPPRI team members know the work of the whole team, including earlier work, as well as consumers of CPPRI services.

UNDP and CPPRI would also benefit from clarity on offers by CPPRI teams. CPPRI teams and consumers of CPPRI services within UNDP and across the UN system could have a clear understanding of what capabilities CPPRI can deliver in support of offers (e.g. the Prevention offer). CPPRI teams would also benefit from bounding their offers and limiting the kind and extent of support available, to help them focus scarce resources on priorities of UNDP and where CPPRI has comparative advantages to bring in support. CPPRI has an extremely wide mandate relative to the small sized CPPRI team. Staff interviewed noted many ways that they were stretched – some noted over-stretched – in working towards their parts of this broad mandate in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, climate security, PVE, and responsible, accountable, and inclusive core government functions (including in local governance).

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are based on the conclusions (from the analysis of findings) and lessons learned and best practices, and CPPRI GP team management and staff suggestions when in accordance with the findings.

It is difficult to make recommendations for the GP and CPPRI team as many of the issues and challenges as well as solutions are related to UNDP or the CB and may be beyond CPPRI control or bounds of the subset of CPPRI that is the GP. Review and analysis of CPPRI GP and CB materials and interviews do provide recommendations for CPPRI team consideration. Recommendations in the draft will benefit from CPPRI team review and comment, perhaps particularly to add detail and for potential operationalization.

CPPRI, through the GP, has contributed to important advances in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, climate security, preventing violent extremism, and supporting core government functions and local governance through work at HQ with UNDP, with regional hubs and COs, with other UN agencies, and with external partners. Recommendations target how CPPRI can engage productively further on the four sets of issues covered by the team and how to operationalize them fit within CB and UNDP HQ, as well as in relationships with regional hubs and COs.

Recommendation 1: UNDP and the CB should have and support strong, permanent leadership to manage the issue areas aggregated under the CPPRI GP and the CPPRI team. (Conclusions 6 and 8)
CPPRI needs leadership and vision along with funding to more strongly support UNDP and other partners. Management should consider a president/CEO model, with the many roles of leading the team potentially split between more than one person. A head that focuses on CPPRI's relationships outside the team who develops the strategy for the team, positions CPPRI and its services to serve UNDP and partners and represents CPPRI within UNDP and with partners (particularly for resource mobilization) could be productively paired with a deputy head who focuses internally and actively manages across sub-teams for coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. This external and internally-facing management could strengthen the external-facing and internal operations of CPPRI.

Recommendation 2: CPPRI also needs a clear, consistent structure and support from CB and within UNDP towards helping CPPRI meet CB and UNDP goals and CPPRI's own outcomes. (Conclusion 3)
CPPRI does not stand alone, but works within HQ. The Bureau also needs clear, long-term leadership and mobilization to support CPPRI, all of UNDP, and partners which is particularly challenging in the dynamic areas of crisis and crisis prevention that CPPRI works in.

Recommendation 3: UNDP, the CB, and CPPRI management should seek, identify, and obtain additional resources to lead in CPPRI issue areas for a sustained period of time. (Conclusion 3)
Ideally, core resources from UNDP would be used for core services, like HQ policymaking and support for regional and country offices. Realistically, support is likely needed through donors to keep staff positions and workstreams going with the constrained funding for TRAC resources. Multiple donors are needed to have a larger, longer-term base that is more stable to support UNDP HQs roles in the crisis offer through CPPRI. Support is needed for CPPRI's roles in policy, to support work with regional bureaus and COs, and partnerships beyond UNDP within and outside of the UN system.

Recommendation 4: CPPRI managers should develop and use strategies that prioritise CPPRI engagements towards maximizing impact and help staff balance current work with anticipating future needs/opportunities. (Conclusions 7 and 8)
CPPRI managers should regularly assess how to allocate priorities across workstreams and products within implementing this strategy (e.g. balancing research/policy and CO support). These strategies and thinking should be clear and shared across staff to help them make these choices – and not push all decisions onto management.

Recommendation 5: CPPRI should consider ways to move towards institutionalizing both what CPPRI the team does and how the team pursues tasks towards these goals, including developing procedures and systems to better collaborate within CPPRI. (Conclusions 7 and 10)

Strengthening CPPRI internally could have both a human side and a technological aspect. CPPRI would benefit from a retreat to bring the New York-based staff together and build mutual understanding around CPPRI issues and opportunities, as well as build ways of working. A retreat should contribute to networking the team, and to sharing of the different networks that teams and individuals have outside of CPPRI. Ways of working could be specified through SOPs. This guidance to support staff is particularly important with the rapid pace of staff turnover with unstable funding for CPPRI staff; new staff, especially staff brought in through mechanisms that support hiring relatively junior staff like JPOs, would benefit from a structured introduction to CPPRI and the CB, broad guidance on how to work to support policy development and implementation, and concrete SOPs for how to develop relationships and work with CB, Regional, and CO colleagues in particular issue areas.

Recommendation 6: CPPRI should consider developing and publicizing throughout UNDP clear, consolidated offers that outline the services offered to UNDP Bureaus and Country Offices from each team and how to access them (and thus also delineate where teams do not offer support). (Conclusions 4 and 7)

Clear communication across UNDP on what CPPRI does and does not do can help streamline CPPRI support and make it more likely that potential users of CPPRI services within UNDP are able to get assistance, including knowing what policies and priorities of UNDP are in CPPRI areas.

Recommendation 7: CPPRI should consider developing procedures and systems to better communicate with partners and stakeholders outside of CPPRI. (Conclusions 4 and 7)

Clarity is also needed on CPPRI to support UNDP's work in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, climate security, PVE, and CGF and LG with partnerships outside of the CB and UNDP. CPPRI should develop overview products and make them highly visible on UNDP web sites to raise awareness of UNDP's work in these areas and how interested parties outside of UNDP can benefit from CPPRI's work and engage with the right members of the team on shared priorities.

ANNEX 1: MID-TERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project Evaluation specialist for CPPRI Global Programme midterm review: Roster Profile / Deployment Description

Background

Violent conflict continues to rise globally with around 2 billion people living in countries affected by conflict - and this number is growing every day. The number of coups, failed transitions, and political deadlocks continues to rise, as do the challenges of building and keeping peace. Violence is becoming more complex, shifting from civil wars to local or subnational conflicts and instability driven by political and criminal violence, and involving more non-state groups as well as regional and international actors. The rise of radicalization and violent extremism is one of the most pressing threats to peace and stability, pushing back development gains by decades. Unless these trends can be reversed in the Decade of Action, more than 80% of the world's poor are expected to live in countries affected by fragility and high levels of violence by 2030. In addition, climate risks extend beyond the domains of the environment and development into the political and social realm. While not all fragile situations are violent, the risk of violence is often high in fragile situations with fractured governance institutions that can risk derailing development gains. Violent conflicts shatter the capacity of core governance institutions to cope with, recover from and prevent future crises, leaving the public progressively more vulnerable to increased inequality and exclusion.

Given these dynamics, traditional development programmes will not be enough going forward as they are not making the changes required to influence conflict drivers and risk factors and reach the most vulnerable in conflict and fragile settings. Development actors need to strengthen their prevention interventions in fragile contexts working across silos to address root causes, development deficits and reduce vulnerabilities. The UNDP-World Bank Report 'Pathways to Peace' report suggests that, over the medium to long term, development partners would save anywhere between US$2 and US$7 for each US$1 invested in prevention-related activities.

In this context, it is as important as ever for UNDP to continue supporting Member States and societies confronted by complex and multi-dimensional risks and consequences of violence and conflict. Through the implementation of the CPPRI Global Programme, UNDP envisions fulfilling its role as a leading development organization, contributing to Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding. The Global Programme is a critical vehicle to implement UNDP's Prevention offer- fully aligned with the Strategic Plan, and support of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). With the formation of the Crisis Bureau and the Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions (CPPRI) Team, UNDP has revamped its prevention and peacebuilding capacities at the HQ and the Regional Hub levels and the CPPRI Global Programme is directly linked to the overall vision of the Global Policy Network (GPN). It will draw upon capacities across the GPN for more preventive action, as needed.

UNDP's conflict prevention, peacebuilding and responsive institutions work aims to deliver conflict-sensitive development through a comprehensive range of services in **<u>4 interconnected thematic work streams</u>** in countries impacted or most vulnerable to crisis and fragility, including violent conflicts and/or natural disasters.

The 4 areas of capacities/expertise include the following:

- Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding, including the DPPA-UNDP Joint programme on building national capacities for Conflict Prevention

- Prevention of Violent Extremism

- Restoration and/or Strengthening of Core Government Functions, including Local Governance

- Climate Security

Scope of work, responsibilities and description of the proposed work

The mid-term review is being undertaken by an independent consultant with the purpose to inform UNDP and its partners of the achievements over the past 3 years, challenges faced, and of the remaining gaps. It will assess the performance of the Global CPPRI Programme in making progress towards achieving its objectives applying the criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and integrating the cross-cutting issues of human rights, gender equality and climate risk.

Expected outputs and deliverables

Deliverable 1: Inception report outlining the evaluation methodology and suggested report outline including review of relevant project documents - Within 2 weeks of the commencement of the assignment (10%)

Deliverable 2: Presentation of the initial findings of the mid-term evaluation to the (CPPRI) Global Programme Team - Within 2.0 months of the commencement of the assignment (15%)

Deliverable 3: Submission of evaluation draft report for review by CPPRI Global Project - Within 3.0 months of the commencement of the assignment (15%)

Deliverable 4: Submission of final report based on feedback received from the Joint Programme team, which will then be shared with the Co-Chairs before its release - Within 4 months of the commencement of the assignment (60%)

Management Arrangements and Reporting:

The evaluation specialist will liaise and work with the acting Evaluations Manager/Evaluations Focal Point and report to the Head of Programme during the assignment.

Duty Station and travel:

This consultancy is a home-based assignment with potential for HQ visit, therefore, there is no envisaged travel cost to join duty station/repatriation travel.

ANNEX 2: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

UN Documents

Quality Checklist for Evaluation ToR and Inception Report. New York: United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), June 2010.http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/608

Norms and Standards for Evaluation. New York: UNEG, June 2016. http://www.unEvaluation.org/document/detail/1914

UNEG Handbook for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Perspectives in Evaluations. New York: UNEG, August 2014. http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616

UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports. New York: UNEG, June 2010. http://www.unEvaluation.org/document/detail/608

Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict. New York: United Nations/World Bank, 2018. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28337

United Nations Sustainable Development Group (UNSDG). Good Practice Note on Conflict Sensitivity, Peacebuilding, and Sustaining Peace. New York: UNSDG. 3- September 2023. https://unsdg.un.org/download/6329/77081

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Documents

Brisset, Emery. Evaluation of the Climate Security Mechanism. New York: UNDP, September 2022.

UNDP Strategic Plan. 2018-2021. New York: UNDP, October 2017. https://undocs.org/DP/2017/38

UNDP Strategic Plan. 2022-2025. New York: UNDP, September 2021. https://www.undp.org/publications/undp-strategic-plan-2022-2025#

UNDP's Crisis Offer: A Framework for Development Solutions to Crisis and Fragility. New York: UNDP, September 2022. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2022-09/UNDP%20Crisis%20Offer%202022.pdf

Prevention Offer: Crisis prevention and increased resilience. New York: UNDP, n.d.. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/Prevention_Offer.pdf

Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). UNDP Evaluation Guidelines. Revised edition June 2021. New York: UNDP, 2021. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/UNDP_Evaluation_Guidelines.pdf

IEO. Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries. New York: UNDP, 2020.

GP Documents

Draft Project Document (Global Programme), Project Title: Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions (CPPRI). New York: UNDP, 2020.

Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions (CPPRI) Global Programme including Climate Security Annual Report July 2021 – December 2022: Prepared for Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. New York: UNDP, 2023.

Presentation - Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions Team (CPPRI), Crisis Bureau, UNDP. May 2023

2020 Annual Work Plan (AWP)

2021 AWP

Annual Progress Report

Semi-annual Progress Report

Supporting Core Government Functions to Address Fragility and Build Resilience, Annual Report June 2021 – August 2022 [Report to Swiss Development Cooperation]

CPPRI – Core Government Functions and Local Governance Report, Annual Report July 2020 – June 2021, 2 November 2021 [Report to Swiss Development Cooperation]

Draft UNDP Prevention and Peacebuilding Theory of Change and Impact Measurement Tool

Strengthening Social Cohesion: Conceptual framing and programming implications. New York: UNDP, February 27, 2020. https://www.undp.org/publications/strengthening-social-cohesion-conceptual-framing-and-programming-implications#

Guidance Note on Conflict Sensitivity, Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace. New York: UNDP, 2020.

Management Response to the Evaluation of the Climate Security Mechanism

UNDP Guidance Note: Community infrastructure works in crisis settings. New York: UNDP, 13 June 2023. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2023-06/community_infrastructure_works_in_crisis_settings.pdf

Policy Brief, From Pilots Toward Policies: Utilizing Online Data for Preventing Violent Extremism and Addressing Hate Speech. New York: UNDP, 2022. https://www.undp.org/publications/pilots-toward-policies-utilizing-online-data-preventing-violent-extremism-and-addressing-hate-speech#

Guidance Note, Integrating Mental Health and Psychosocial Support into Peacebuilding. New York: UNDP, 2022. https://www.undp.org/publications/integrating-mental-health-and-psychosocial-support-peacebuilding

Enhancing Efforts to Prevent Violent Extremism by Leveraging Behavioural Insights: Lessons Learned from Practical Experiments. New York: UNDP, 2022. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2022-03/UNDP-Enhancing-Efforts-to-Prevent-Violent-Extremism-by-Leveraging-Behavioural-Insights.pdf

Applying Behavioural Science to Support the prevention of violent Extremism: Experiences and Lessons Learned. New York: UNDP, April 9, 2021. https://www.undp.org/publications/applying-behavioural-science-support-prevention-violent-extremism-experiences-and-lessons-learned#

Other Documents

OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. Better Criteria for Better Evaluation Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use. Paris: OECD DAC, June 2019. revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf (oecd.org)

ANNEX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

CPPRI
Samuel Rizk, Former Head of Team
Amita Gill, Officer in Charge
Conflict Prevention
Helena Sterwe, Team Leader
Musa Ibrahim, Policy Specialist
Sunao Hachiri, Programme Analyst
Doruk Ergun, IDPS Specialist
Isabella Caravaggio, IDPS Analyst
Johan Fredborn Larsson, Policy Specialist
Laura Wenz
Climate Security
Catherine Wong, Team Leader
Anab Grand, Programme Analyst
Valentin Hervouet, Programme Management Specialist
Eri Yamasumi, Policy Specialist
PVE
Nika Saeedi, Team Leader
Joelle Seme Park, Programme Specialist
Heesu Chung, Programme Analyst
Core Government Functions and Local Governance
Amita Gill, Team Leader
Naysan Adlparvar, Consultant
Zoe Pelter, Policy Specialist
Pelle Lutken, Senior Consultant
Celina Menzel, Policy Analyst
Monica Sepka, Policy Analyst
Giacomo Negrotto, LG Specialist
Adela Pozder-Cengic, CGF Specialist
Joint UNDP-DPPA Programme
Sanna Tasala, Programme Manager
Risa Fujimura, M&E and Programme Specialist
UN Transitions
Jascha Scheele, Project Manager

UNDP Regional Hubs
Giordono Segneri, Arab States, Regional Governance and Peacebuilding TL
Nirina Kiplagat, Africa, Regional Governance and Peacebuilding TL a.i

UNDP

Sarah Lister	Bureau of Policy and Programme Support (BPPS)	
Ezgi Ozturk	COP Governance	Community of Practice

ANNEX 4: MID-TERM REVIEW INSTRUMENTS
INTRODUCTION AND SOLICITATION OF INFORMED CONSENT

The introduction and consent note was used introduce the consultant, the Mid-Term Review, and methods to participants in the Mid-Term Review to gather the explicit consent of people participating in the Mid-Term Review. The consultant recited or summarized the following to all prospective interviewees and received their explicit oral consent to participate under conditions of anonymity and non-attribution.

Introduction and Informed Consent

Thank you for talking with me today.

My name is Lawrence Robertson. I am working independently for the United Nations Development Programme to conduct a Mid-Term Review of the work conducted by UNDP Crisis Bureau and its partners through the Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Responsive Institutions Global Programme, referred to as the CPPRI GP or CPPRI team. The goal of the review is to learn about what has been accomplished through the CPPRI GP and team, what has worked well, and what has not worked as well. Questions cover conventional categories of programme activities through criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. Lessons from this review will be used to help the UN and its partners in future work around the world.

I hope to learn from your knowledge and experience with the CPPRI GP, the team implementing the CPPPI, and its activities. The information collected today will only be used for the review. I will not use this information in a way that identifies you as an individual in the report.

I would also like to clarify that this interview is entirely voluntary and that you have the right to withdraw from interview at any point without consequence.

Are you willing to participate in this study? [Ensure that participant(s) verbally agree to participate]

Do you have any questions for me before I ask a list of questions about your work with the CPPRI GP and team?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

[NOTE THAT NOT ALL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED IN INTERVIEWS; INTERVIEWS FOCUSED ON THE AREAS AND QUESTIONS MOST RELEVANT TO EACH INFORMANT'S KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE WITH THE CPPRI GP]

Questions for CPPRI GP staff.
Please answer the questions with respect to your and your team's work with the CPPRI GP.

How relevant do you see are the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme towards the outputs you work on with partners and stakeholders?

How and how well is coherence between the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme and other providers within and outside of UNDP managed?

To what extent has the CPPRI Global Programme met its output targets (under your output)?

Have and how have any funding and services provided through the CPPRI Global Programme supported work towards the outputs you work on with partners and stakeholders?

What has the GP done to manage efficiently and support efficiencies across the CPPRI team, UNDP, and its partners?

What have been the main impacts of the GP (in your output area)?

Have there been policy-level achievements as a result of GP implementation (in your output area)? Why or why not?

How sustainable are the outputs of the GP (in your output area)?

What has the GP done towards making outputs sustainable (in your output area)?

How has the GP engaged to support human rights (in your output area)?

How has the GP engaged to support gender equality (in your output area)?

How has the GP engaged to address climate risk (in your output area)?

Best Practices, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations

What do you identify as best practices – things that have worked particularly well– that you learned from the CPPRI GP's design, activities, or results?

Can you identify any lessons learned – new knowledge from your experience working with the CPPRI GP – from the its design, activities, or results?

What would you recommend based on your experience with the CPPRI GP for future UNDP work in this area?

Questions for UNDP, UN, and partner staff.

Please answer the questions with respect to your and your team's work with the CPPRI GP.

How relevant are the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme towards your Bureau/Country office/team/organisation's work?

How and how well has the coherence between the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme and other providers managed?

Do you know the outputs of the CPPRI GP? If so, to what extent has the CPPRI Global Programme met its output targets?

Have and how have any funding and services provided through the CPPRI Global Programme supported your work?

What have been the results of this support to your Bureau/Country office/team/organisation to date?

What has the GP done to manage efficiently and support efficiencies in its work with your Bureau/Country office/team/organisation?

What have been the main impacts of the GP that you know of?

How sustainable are the outputs of the GP and its work with your Bureau/Country office/team/organisation?

What has the GP done toward making this work sustainable?

How has the GP engaged to support human rights in its work with your Bureau/Country office/team/organisation?

How has the GP engaged to support gender equality in its work with your Bureau/Country office/team/organisation?

How has the GP engaged to address climate risk in its work with your Bureau/Country office/team/organisation?

Best Practices, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations

What do you identify as best practices – things that have worked particularly well– that you learned from the CPPRI GP's design, activities, or results?

Can do you identify any lessons learned – new knowledge from your experience working with the CPPRI GP – from its design, activities, or results?

What would you recommend based on your experience with the CPPRI GP for future UN work in this area?

Questions for Donors

Please answer the questions with respect to your and your organisation's work with the CPPRI GP.

How relevant do you see the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme?

How and how well has the coherence between the services provided by the CPPRI Global Programme and other providers managed?

Do you know the outputs of the CPPRI GP? If so, to what extent has the CPPRI Global Programme met its output targets?

Have and how have the funding and services provided through the CPPRI Global Programme targeted working towards the outputs of the GP?

What has the GP done to manage efficiently and support efficiencies in its work towards GP outputs?

What has the GP done to communicate effectively?

What has the GP done to build partnerships?

What have been the main impacts of the GP that you know of?

How sustainable are the outputs of the GP and its work with Bureaus, Country offices, teams, and organisations?

What has the GP done toward making this work sustainable?

To what extent do you think that the GP has been successful in addressing human rights?

To what extent do you think that the GP has been successful in addressing gender equality?

To what extent do you think that the GP has been successful in addressing climate risk?

Best Practices, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations

What do you identify as best practices – things that have worked particularly well– that you learned from the CPPRI GP's design, activities, or results?

Can do you identify any lessons learned – new knowledge from your experience working with the CPPRI GP – from its design, activities, or results?

What would you recommend based on your experience with the CPPRI GP for future UNDP work in this area?