

## United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)

Multilateral Aid Review (MAR) Update 2013 progress rating:



MAR 2011: *Good Value for Money for UK Aid*

Progress assessment	
Summary	<b>Taking reform seriously. Instigated procedures to improve performance and focus on results. Taking steps to increase value for money. Some measures have taken effect in developing countries.</b>
Baseline	
<p>The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) is a central, system-wide UN fund that fills critical funding gaps and supports catalytic peacebuilding interventions.</p> <p>The MAR highlighted several strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Fund fills a crucial gap in the international system's response to conflict and the PBF's interventions are strongly in line with major UK priorities, including those in the Strategic Defence and Security Review.</li><li>• The PBF is a flexible, predictable funding source.</li><li>• There is national government and civil society involvement in developing countries.</li></ul> <p>The MAR also highlighted several weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conflict analysis and reporting were not systematic.</li><li>• There was evidence of low performing projects and weak management.</li><li>• There were difficulties in measuring results.</li><li>• Value for money and cost control were not as strong as DFID would like.</li></ul> <p>DFID's reform priorities for the MAR Update were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Securing effective results based management and reporting on outputs and outcomes at a country and organisation level – assessed under <u>contribution to results</u>;</li><li>• Reporting demonstrating catalytic contributions to peacebuilding, and improved and consistent delivery in developing countries – assessed under <u>contribution to results</u>;</li><li>• Flexibility and risk management allowing the PBF to deliver against strategic peacebuilding objectives – assessed under <u>cost and value consciousness</u>.</li><li>• Country systems<sup>1</sup> and conflict-sensitive review criteria being used and supported consistently – assessed under <u>partnership behaviour</u>.</li></ul> <p>These reform priorities are largely focussed on the 'contribution to results' component of the MAR assessment framework but weaknesses also exist across the 'cost and value consciousness' and 'partnership behaviour' components, and therefore these components have also been assessed.</p>	

<sup>1</sup>Refers to existing mechanisms for coordinating and prioritising international support to peacebuilding in a given country.

### Summary of overall progress

Evidence indicates that the PBF is taking the need for change seriously and is working to address the MAR reform priorities. In the past year, the PBF has instigated a number of initiatives to improve its overall performance in line with DFID's expectations. The quality of work undertaken to deliver organisational reforms is high. In particular:

- Strong steps have been taken to improve reporting at a global level.
- New procedures have been designed to improve reporting in developing countries and will be rolled out in the coming year.
- New guidelines have been drafted that should require UN organisations and partners to more strongly consider value for money and strategic contributions to peacebuilding.
- PBF staff have adopted a more hands-on approach to influencing programme and project design including looking at cost effectiveness.
- The PBF has identified the need to urgently strengthen the Joint Steering Committees (upon which so much of the PBF's mandate depends) but is still deciding how this priority will be taken forward.

### Progress against reform priorities

MAR reform component	MAR 2011 score	Progress rating	MAR Update score, if any change
<b>Contribution to results</b> PBF initiated reforms to reporting and developed new templates and procedures. A new Performance Management Plan exists and stronger focus on results based management, with a stronger focus on outcomes.	2	 Reasonable progress	
<b>Cost and value consciousness</b> To the extent that it is able, the PBF is maximising its leverage of recipient UN organisations and partners to influence procurement and spending decisions. They are exercising greater oversight and have instigated new procedures that will be rolled out in the coming year.	2	 Reasonable progress	
<b>Partnership behaviour</b> PBF continues to work hard to convene the World Bank, the UN and national stakeholders around peacebuilding. Success is limited by weak fund management structures at national level.	3	 Some progress	