



Results: good, but too local

Summary of the cross-section evaluation
Crisis Prevention and Peacebuilding

Standardised measurement – systematic assessment – institutional learning

GIZ’s Independent Evaluation Programme

Using results to learn for the future is the key aim of the Independent Evaluation Programme at the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH. On behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the Programme examines the effectiveness and sustainability of development projects and programmes and accounts for the money spent. It systematically measures and evaluates the relationship between development interventions and concrete results, in line with international standards.

Overarching meta-evaluations go far beyond individual projects and programmes. They summarise the results of individual evaluations by subject area and identify recurring strengths, weaknesses and success factors. Their aim is to produce recommendations for further action and thus initiate change processes at sectoral and company level. The results and findings are then fed back into reflection processes and learning events.

Relevance: Are we doing the right thing? Do the objectives of the development measure match the needs of the target group, the country’s requirements, global priorities and the policies of partners and donors?

Effectiveness Have the objectives of the development measure been achieved; has the target group derived specific benefits?

Efficiency What is the measure’s cost/benefit ratio? Were the results of the development measure achieved through cost-effective use of funding, expertise and time?

Overarching development results (impact) Do the development measures help to achieve the overarching development objectives (e.g. poverty reduction, stable political conditions)?


Sustainability Are the partners in a position to continue the project activities independently with positive results once the financial, organisational or technical support has ended?

I. ‘Successful overall’

Evaluation of ‘Crisis prevention and peacebuilding’

As part of the Independent Evaluation Programme, GIZ’s Monitoring and Evaluation Unit arranged for eight crisis prevention and peacebuilding programmes to be evaluated in 2010/11 on behalf of BMZ.

As a federal enterprise, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH supports the German Government in achieving its objectives in the field of international cooperation for sustainable development.



GIZ presents the results of its work to commissioning parties and clients, partners and the general public, all of whom want to see reliable proof that GIZ achieves the agreed objectives and contributes to sustainable development.

Subject areas of the programmes:

- Reintegration of ex-combatants (Nepal, Rwanda, Sierra Leone)
- Peace education (Sri Lanka)
- Transitional justice/conflict transformation/police reform (Guatemala)
- Promoting food security, regional cooperation and stability (South Caucasus)
- Promoting dialogue between the state and civil society (Colombia)
- Conflict-sensitive socio-economic development (Senegal)

Result: relevant and efficient, but of limited sustainability

Overall, the programmes were rated as 'successful', with an average of 2.3 (where 1 is the top rating and 6 the lowest). The programmes scored high on relevance and efficiency – proof of the sound quality of their design and implementation. However, the ratings for effectiveness, overarching development results (impact) and sustainability were less positive. The evaluations show that, while crisis prevention and peacebuilding programmes may contribute at local level to reducing violence, resolving conflict peacefully and improving the living conditions of the population, they have almost no influence on the dynamics of conflict at national level. This is due especially to the poor political framework conditions in the regions and the low level of interest shown by most governments in driving change. Despite good design, careful planning and efficient project management, it has not been possible to achieve the desired results to the intended degree and with the intended level of sustainability.

II. Substantial results at local level – hardly any influence nationally

The most important results

Have the political framework conditions in the partner country been correctly assessed? Do they offer scope for change? These questions constitute a major challenge for crisis prevention and peacebuilding. The predominantly positive assessment at the start of a measure does not hold up on rigorous examination. Political frameworks play a crucial role when planning and implementing peacebuilding projects and programmes, and to a large extent determine their scope for action and chances of success. A measure that originally made a great deal of sense may thus turn out to be irrelevant in the long term, or even pose real problems, due to the extremely dynamic development of the political conditions in conflict situations.

The evaluations clearly show that the projects and programmes themselves cannot influence these overall conditions, nor are they able to change local, much less national, power structures. That also means they must be able to adjust to swiftly changing conditions in order to retain their development policy-relevance and harness special opportunities for change. Peace projects and programmes therefore need both a clear strategy and a large measure of flexibility and process orientation. On the other hand, this must not lead to a random or opportunistic approach. For peacebuilding, it is therefore particularly important to formulate clear objectives and a convincing strategy that go beyond everyday political action.

Precisely in the field of crisis prevention and peacebuilding, the sustainability of projects and programmes largely depends on whether reform initiatives receive institutional support. If it is possible to link up peace measures at an early stage with other support measures, or attach them to strong partners and incorporate them into national programmes, that improves the long-term development results of such projects and programmes.



1. Strong point: design

The programmes were all given a good or very good relevance rating. That means the programmes are in tune with the national priorities of the country concerned and with local peacebuilding needs and target group requirements. This is based on comprehensive conflict analyses in the programme planning phase. In some cases, however, these analyses should be more regularly updated in order to draw the corresponding conclusions and safeguard relevance.

Advantage: interaction between various sectors

Many of the programmes reviewed pursue a multisectoral approach. Results are intended to be achieved through the interplay of different approaches. Multisectoral programmes that are funded from different sources have clear advantages in this respect. The use of different types of funding enables them to react more flexibly to delays or newly identified needs.

Successful: a combination of economic and social measures

Many programmes successfully combine economic and social measures in order to stabilise (post-) conflict regions. The programmes show, however, that poverty reduction alone has little influence on the structural causes of political and social inequality. Although this inequality can be alleviated by higher income, that does not address the underlying structural force (e.g. expulsion, marginalisation).

Particularly when it comes to reintegrating ex-combatants into society, the most successful approaches have proved to be those that offer a wide range of psychosocial, social, cultural and economic services to the entire population of a community or region affected by the conflict. Joint attendance at training events and jointly organised village projects, along with social and cultural activities, promote mutual trust and give rise to a new, functioning community. At community level, it has proved highly successful to combine income-creation measures, vocational training, dialogue and reconciliation activities with psychosocial support for people still suffering from the aftermath of conflict in post-conflict situations. Approaches of a purely economic or psychosocial nature have proved less effective.

2. Efficient in terms of management and project steering

Crisis prevention and peacebuilding programmes are integrated into the national development strategies of the partner countries and the German development cooperation portfolio, but otherwise have few linkages with the activities of other actors. The potentials in this area have so far remained untapped. Better harmonisation and coordination with other international cooperation measures would enhance effectiveness.

Proven but not yet mainstreamed: use of conflict-sensitive instruments

Wherever conflict-sensitive instruments have been used in development measures, they have proved useful both in planning and implementing projects and in work with partners and target groups. Measures that make use of conflict analyses, such as peace and conflict assessments, designed to identify the requirements for peacebuilding measures, also show much better strategic orientation and relevance. By monitoring the project environment, projects can identify political risks for implementation and react at an early stage. Conflict-sensitive results monitoring improves institutional learning, but these instruments have not yet been systematically mainstreamed in the reviewed programmes. Use should be made of simple, standardised models wherever possible, and the quality of the input data and their evaluation should be regularly monitored. Deficits still exist in these areas.

3. Limitations in terms of results and sustainability

The way in which the programmes achieved their objectives was rated as good to satisfactory, even though some of the anticipated results were classed as over-ambitious. The relatively vague wording of objectives for some programmes was criticised ('successful integration', 'empowerment to live together', 'greater participation by the people' or 'peaceful coexistence'). There are only few cases in which specific criteria were derived from a conflict analysis. In order to be able to measure results, it is essential to have a more realistic and precise formulation of objectives and results indicators. The evaluations show that the programmes mainly expected, and in fact achieved, results at local, individual and institutional level. Many of them helped to defuse conflicts at local



level and promote peaceful coexistence. Few measures contribute to national peace processes, e.g. lawsuits based on circumstantial evidence in Guatemala.

Anticipated results too ambitious

The evaluations showed that the results expected of some programmes were too ambitious. Work at local level is not enough, especially if the programmes aim to achieve results at macro level related to the national peace process. Yet that is where most programmes start, with extensive measures to develop the capacities of the target groups, partners and multipliers. Target groups are usually trained by combining technical expertise (e.g. vocational training, agriculture, project management) with an introduction to the values and skills of peaceful conflict transformation (e.g. self-reflection, communication, mediation). To sum up, in order to formulate the anticipated results of a programme realistically, there has to be a clear understanding of the level at which action should, and especially, can, be taken.

III. Clearer objectives, more networking, different entry points

Key findings and recommendations

Sharpening the sectoral profile

Today's peacebuilding projects and programmes cover a broad range of subject areas: peace education, violence prevention, the reintegration of ex-combatants and coming to terms with the past, promoting democracy, judicial and police reform, vocational training, poverty reduction, and regional economic development approaches. It is still a future challenge to continue developing the sector profile and the requirements for the experts working in it.

Clearer outline of opportunities for and limits to working in (post-)conflict countries

In future, the results that can realistically be expected of projects and programmes must be stated more lucidly. This calls for a clear idea of what the relevant commissioning party or client expects from GIZ. On the other hand, in its offers to the commissioning party or client, GIZ must spell out more specifically where the opportunities for and limits to its work in (post-)conflict countries

lie. This also involves clearly stating the relevant objectives, indicators and cause/effect hypotheses.

More systematic use of conflict-sensitive instruments

Conflict-sensitive instruments must be used more consistently when planning and implementing projects and programmes. This includes systematic context analysis in (post-)conflict regions, for example by undertaking peace and conflict assessments at national, sectoral and regional level. Greater use should also be made of conflict-sensitive instruments when working with target groups and multipliers (e.g. the do-no-harm approach). These instruments make it possible to substantially reduce conflicts when conducting project measures

Greater (inter)national coordination and use of different entry points

Peacebuilding results at macro level can only be achieved in cooperation with like-minded actors. This means on the one hand that different entry points should continue to be used via a diversified partner structure that includes both governmental and civil-society actors. On the other hand, German contributions must be coordinated and harmonised to a greater extent with national programmes and the contributions of other donors.

Greater emphasis on combining development cooperation instruments

The effectiveness of the measures can be substantially enhanced by efficiently combining technical cooperation instruments with those of development-oriented emergency and transitional aid (DETA) and the Civil Peace Service (CPS). In (post-)conflict situations that call for integrated economic and social reconstruction, the synergy potentials offered by working together with financial cooperation are of great benefit.



Published by

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
Monitoring and Evaluation Unit

Registered offices

Bonn and Eschborn, Germany

Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 40	Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5
53113 Bonn, Germany	65760 Eschborn, Germany
T +49 228 44 60-0	T +49 6196 79 - 0
F +49 228 44 60-17 66	F +49 61 96 79- 1115
info@giz.de	
www.giz.de	

Editing

PFIFF - PresseFrauen In FrankFurt

Design

Iris Christmann, cmuk , Wiesbaden

Photographs

© GIZ

As at:

Eschborn, August 2012

GIZ is responsible for the content of this publication.

On behalf of

Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ);
Division Evaluation of Development Cooperation; Principles of Evaluation and Impact Measurement

Postal address of BMZ offices

Bonn office	BMZ Berlin im Europahaus
Dahlmannstraße 4	Stresemannstraße 94
53113 Bonn, Germany	10963 Berlin, Germany
T +49 228 99 535-0	T +49 30 18 535-0
F +49 228 99 535-3500	F +49 30 18 535-2501
poststelle@bmz.bund.de	
www.bmz.de	