

# 3.50 Monitoring and Evaluation of DDR Programmes

## Contents

<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Module scope and objectives</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Terms, definitions and abbreviations</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3. Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>4. Guiding principles</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>5. Developing an M&amp;E strategy and framework for DDR</b> .....	<b>3</b>
5.1. M&E and results-based management .....	3
5.2. Integrating M&E in programme development and implementation .....	5
5.3. The M&E work plan .....	5
5.4. Development of M&E indicators .....	6
<b>6. Monitoring</b> .....	<b>7</b>
6.1. Monitoring mechanisms and tools .....	7
6.2. Monitoring indicators .....	7
6.3. Use of monitoring results .....	9
<b>7. Evaluations</b> .....	<b>9</b>
7.1. Establishing evaluation scope .....	9
7.2. Timing and objectives of evaluations .....	10
7.3. Selection of results and indicators for evaluation .....	11
7.4. Use of evaluation results .....	12
7.5. Planning evaluations .....	12
<b>Annex A: Terms, definitions and abbreviations</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Annex B: Balanced scorecard for DDR in Afghanistan</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex C: Examples of monitoring mechanisms for DDR in Afghanistan</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Endnotes</b> .....	<b>18</b>

**NOTE**

Each IDDRS module is current with effect from the date shown on the cover page. As the IDDRS is periodically reviewed, users should consult the UN DDR Resource Centre web site for updates: <http://www.unddr.org>.

**COPYRIGHT NOTICE**

This document is an Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standard (IDDRS) and is copyright-protected by the United Nations (UN). Neither this document, nor any extract from it, may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, for any other purpose without prior written permission from UN DPKO, acting on behalf of the UN.

This document is not to be sold.

© UN 2006 – All rights reserved

# 3.50 Monitoring and Evaluation of DDR Programmes

## Summary

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has been one of the weakest areas of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programme management in the past, partly due to a lack of proper planning, a standardized M&E framework, and human and financial resources specifically dedicated to M&E. Past experiences have highlighted the need for more effective M&E in order to develop an effective, efficient and sustainable DDR programme that will achieve the objectives of improving stability and security.

M&E is an essential management tool and provides a chance to track progress, improve activities, objectively verify the outcomes and impact of a programme, and learn lessons that can be fed into future programmes and policies. This module outlines standards for improving inter-agency cooperation in designing and conducting effective M&E. It further shows how M&E can be planned and implemented effectively through a creation of a DDR-specific M&E work plan, which consists of a plan for data collection, data analysis and reporting. It also provides some generic M&E indicators within a results-management framework, which can be modified and adapted to each programme and project.

## 1. Module scope and objectives

These guidelines cover the basic M&E procedures for integrated DDR programmes. The purpose of these guidelines is to establish standards for managing the implementation of integrated DDR projects and to provide guidance on how to perform M&E in a way that will make project management more effective, lead to follow-up and make reporting more consistent.

## 2. Terms, definitions and abbreviations

Annex A contains a list of terms, definitions and abbreviations used in this standard. A complete glossary of all the terms, definitions and abbreviations used in the series of integrated DDR standards (IDDRS) is given in IDDRS 1.20.

In the IDDRS series, the words 'shall', 'should' and 'may' are used to indicate the intended degree of compliance with the standards laid down. This use is consistent with the language used in the International Organization for Standardization standards and guidelines:

- a) 'shall' is used to indicate requirements, methods or specifications that are to be applied in order to conform to the standard.
- b) 'should' is used to indicate the preferred requirements, methods or specifications.
- c) 'may' is used to indicate a possible method or course of action."

### 3. Introduction

Traditionally, M&E in DDR programmes has focused on assessing inputs and implementation processes. Today, the focus is on assessing how various factors contribute to or detract from the achievement of the proposed outcomes and programme objectives, and measuring the effectiveness of outputs, partnerships, policy advice and dialogue, advocacy, and brokering/coordination. The main objectives of results-oriented M&E are to:

- increase organizational and development learning;
- ensure informed decision-making;
- support genuine accountability and ensure quality control;
- contribute to the further development of best practice and policy;
- build country capacities, especially in M&E.

In order to enable programme managers to improve strategies, programmes and other activities, M&E aims to generate information in several key areas to allow the measurement of:

- *programme performance*, which indicates whether programme implementation is proceeding in accordance with the programme plan and budget;
- *programme effectiveness*, which answers such questions as whether and to what extent the programme has achieved its objectives, and on what external conditions it depends;
- *programme efficiency*, which determines whether programme outputs and outcomes were produced in the most economical way, i.e., by maximizing outputs and/or minimizing inputs.

### 4. Guiding principles

When developing an M&E strategy as part of the overall process of programme development, several important principles are relevant for DDR:

- Planners shall ensure that baseline data (data that describes the problem or situation before the intervention and which can be used to later provide a point of comparison) and relevant performance indicators are built into the programme development process itself. Baseline data are best collected within the framework of the comprehensive assessments that are carried out before the programme is developed, while performance indicators are defined in relation to both baseline data and the outputs, activities and outcomes that are expected;
- The development of an M&E strategy and framework for a DDR programme is essential in order to develop a systematic approach for collecting, processing, and using data and results;
- M&E should use information and data from the regular information collection mechanisms and reports, as well as periodic measurement of key indicators;
- Monitoring and data collection should be an integral component of the information management system for the DDR process, and as such should be made widely available to key DDR staff and stakeholders for consultation;
- M&E plans specifying the frequency and type of reviews and evaluations should be a part of the overall DDR work planning process;
- A distinction should be made between the evaluation of UN support for national DDR (i.e., the UN DDR programme itself) and the overall national DDR effort, given

- the focus on measuring the overall effectiveness and impact of UN inputs on DDR, as opposed to the overall effectiveness and impact of DDR at the national level;
- All integrated DDR sections should make provision for the necessary staff, equipment and other requirements to ensure that M&E is adequately dealt with and carried out, independently of other DDR activities, using resources that are specifically allocated to this purpose.

## 5. Developing an M&E strategy and framework for DDR

M&E is far more than periodic assessments of performance. Particularly with complex processes like DDR, with its diversity of activities and multitude of partners, M&E plays an important role in ensuring constant quality control of activities and processes, and it also provides a mechanism for periodic evaluations of performance in order to adapt strategies and deal with the problems and bottlenecks that inevitably arise. Because of the political importance of DDR, and its potential impacts (both positive and negative) on both security and prospects for development, impact assessments are essential to ensuring that DDR contributes to the overall goal of improving stability and security in a particular country.

M&E is far more than periodic assessments of performance. Particularly with complex processes like DDR, with its diversity of activities and multitude of partners, M&E plays an important role in ensuring constant quality control of activities and processes, and it also provides a mechanism for periodic evaluations of performance in order to adapt strategies and deal with the problems and bottlenecks that inevitably arise.

The definition of a comprehensive strategy and framework for DDR is a vital part of the overall programme implementation process. Although strategies will differ a great deal in different contexts, key guiding questions that should be asked when designing an effective framework for M&E include:

- What objectives should an M&E strategy and framework measure?
- What elements should go into a work plan for reporting, monitoring and evaluating performance and results?
- What key indicators are important in such a framework?
- What information management systems are necessary to ensure timely capture of appropriate data and information?
- How can the results of M&E be integrated into programme implementation and used to control quality and adapt processes?

The following section discusses these and other key elements involved in the development of an M&E work plan and strategy.

### 5.1. M&E and results-based management

M&E is an essential part of the results-based approach to implementing and managing programmes. It allows for the measurement of progress made towards achieving outcomes and outputs, and assesses the overall impact of programme on security and stability. In the context of DDR, M&E is particularly important, because it helps keep track of a complex

In the context of DDR, M&E is particularly important, because it helps keep track of a complex range of outcomes and outputs in different components of the DDR mission, and assesses how each contributes towards achieving the goal of improved stability and security.

range of outcomes and outputs in different components of the DDR mission, and assesses how each contributes towards achieving the goal of improved stability and security. M&E also gives a longitudinal assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the strategies, mechanisms and processes carried out in DDR.

For the purposes of integrated DDR, M&E can be divided into two levels related to the results-based framework:

- measurement of the performance of DDR programmes in achieving outcomes and outputs throughout its various components generated by a set of activities: disarmament (e.g., number of weapons collected and destroyed); demobilization (number of ex-combatants screened, processed and assisted); and reintegration (number of ex-combatants reintegrated and communities assisted);
- measurement of the outcomes of DDR programmes in contributing towards an overall goal. This can include reductions in levels of violence in society, increased stability and security, and consolidation of peace processes. It is difficult, however, to determine the impact of DDR on broader society without isolating it from other processes and initiatives (e.g., peace-building, security sector reform [SSR]) that also have an impact.

Table 1 **Differences between monitoring and evaluation**

	<b>MONITORING</b>	<b>EVALUATION</b>
<b>Objective</b>	To track changes from baseline conditions to desired outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ To validate the outcomes and objectives that were achieved</li> <li>■ To determine how and why outcomes and objectives were or were not achieved</li> </ul>
<b>Focus</b>	Measures the outputs of projects, programmes, partnerships, and assistance activities, and their contribution to outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Compares planned with intended outcome achievement</li> <li>■ Focuses on how and why outputs and strategies contributed to achievement of outcomes</li> <li>■ Focuses on questions of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology</b>	Tracks and assesses performance and process (progress towards outcomes) through analysis and comparison of indicators over time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Evaluates achievement of outcomes by comparing indicators before and after the intervention</li> <li>■ Relies on monitoring data on information from external sources</li> <li>■ Time-bound, periodic, in-depth</li> </ul>
<b>Carried out by</b>	Continuous and systematic by programme managers, project managers and key partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Internal evaluators, external evaluators and partners</li> </ul>
<b>Use</b>	Alerts managers to problems in performance, provides options for corrective actions and helps demonstrate accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Provides managers with strategy and policy options</li> <li>■ Provides basis for learning and demonstrates accountability</li> </ul>

Source: Adapted from UNDP, *Who Are the Question-makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook*, UNDP, New York, 1997

## 5.2. Integrating M&E in programme development and implementation

Provisions for M&E, and in particular the key elements of a strategy and framework, should be integrated into the programme development and implementation process from the beginning. This should occur in the following ways:

- Performance indicators relevant for M&E should be identified, together with the development of a baseline study and indicators framework for the comprehensive assessment, as well as the results framework for the DDR programme itself (see IDDRS 3.20 on DDR Programme Design for advice on the development of a results framework);
- Requirements for establishing and implementing an M&E system should be taken into consideration during the identification of programme requirements, including dedicated staff, material and information management systems;
- Key aspects of the M&E system and activities should be developed and harmonized with the overall programme implementation cycle and included in the corresponding work plans;
- Programme implementation methods should be designed to permit the analysis and incorporation of M&E results into planning and coordination of activities in order to provide programmes with the capacity to modify the implementation approach based on M&E results and lessons learned.

3.20 ◀▶

## 5.3. The M&E work plan

An M&E work plan can be integrated into general or specific programme implementation work plans, or can be designed separately. In general, implementing and supervising the implementation of such a work plan is the basic responsibility of the M&E officer responsible for this process.

Key elements of an M&E work plan include the following, which are usually arranged in the form of a matrix:

Table 2 **M&E work plan matrix**

WORK PLAN COMPONENT	DESCRIPTION
1. Report type	Category of M&E instrument used (for monitoring) for daily, monthly or quarterly progress reports; annual reports; field visit reports; etc; and (for evaluation) periodic internal evaluations, mid-term evaluations, terminal evaluations and ex-post evaluations, among others
2. Objective	Describes the purpose of the monitoring or evaluation tool used, referring to how the results will be used, including review and improvement of performance, ensuring conformity with procedures, generating lessons learned, investigating serious problems, etc.
3. Frequency	Explains how often, or at what point in programme implementation, a monitoring or evaluation tool is used
4. Outputs covered	Description of the project outputs measured by the M&E instrument. In general, monitoring measures outputs and outcomes of specific activities (e.g., number of weapons collected, number of ex-combatants discharged, etc.), while evaluations measure overall impact and effectiveness of the overall DDR programme or individual components, such as disarmament
5. Definition of indicators	Describes the indicators used to measure performance for an M&E tool (see below for a description of indicators)
6. Information sources and data collection methods	Describes the information collection mechanisms used to gather information on specific indicators, e.g., field surveys, registration data, field visits, review of documentation, etc.
7. Responsibility	Defines the person or unit responsible for managing and implementing each M&E tool

### 5.3.1. M&E tracking systems

Given the potentially large number of reports and documents generated by M&E activities, the development and maintenance of a report-tracking system is essential in order to provide a 'history' of M&E results and make them accessible to managers. This provides the DDR programme with institutional memory that can be drawn from to monitor progress and ensure that emerging best practices and problems are identified.

## 5.4. Development of M&E indicators

Indicators are variables (i.e., factors that can change, e.g., number of weapons collected) that should be measured to reveal progress (or lack thereof) towards the achievement of objectives, outcomes or outputs, and should provide information on what has been achieved in either quantitative or qualitative terms, or changes over time. In order for indicators to be meaningful, measurement must be made against a baseline, or baseline data, both of which are collected either in the context of the pre-programme comprehensive assessment or during programme implementation. In general, most indicators should be developed together with the definition of programme activities, outputs, outcomes, objectives and goals. In general, indicators can be classified as follows:

- *Performance indicator:* A particular characteristic or dimension used to measure intended changes defined by a programme results framework. Performance indicators are used to observe progress and to measure actual outputs and outcomes compared to those that were expected. They indicate 'how', 'whether' or 'to what extent' a unit is progressing towards its objectives, rather than 'why' or 'why not' such progress is being made. Performance indicators are usually expressed in quantifiable terms, and should be objective and measurable (e.g., numeric values, percentages, scores and indices);
- *Impact indicator:* A variable or set of variables used to measure the overall and long-term impact of an intervention, i.e., overall changes in the environment that DDR aims to influence. Impact indicators often use a composite set (or group) of indicators, each of which provides information on the size, sustainability and consequences of a change brought about by a DDR intervention. Such indicators can include both quantitative variables (e.g., change in homicide levels or incidence of violence) or qualitative variables (e.g., behavioural change among reintegrated ex-combatants, social cohesion, etc.). Impact indicators depend on comprehensive and reliable baseline data, and should be as specific as possible in order to isolate the impact of DDR on complex social and economic dynamics from other factors and processes;
- *Proxy indicators:* Cost, complexity and/or the timeliness of data collection may prevent a result from being measured directly. In this case, proxy indicators — which are variables that substitute for others that are difficult to measure directly — may reveal performance trends and make managers aware of potential problems or areas of success. This is often the case for outcomes in behavioural change, social cohesion and other results that are difficult to measure.

### 5.4.1. Balanced scorecards

The balanced scorecard is a useful tool for capturing key indicators for M&E activities. It lists the main indicators used to measure progress in the implementation of different programme components, as well as overall effectiveness. Annex B provides an example of a balanced scorecard used in the Afghanistan DDR programme.

## 6. Monitoring

Monitoring is the systematic oversight of the implementation of an activity, and establishes the extent to which input deliveries, work schedules, other required actions and targeted outputs are proceeding according to the actual plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct deficiencies. The application of monitoring mechanisms and tools, the reporting of outcomes, and subsequent adjustments in the implementation process are an integral part of the programme cycle and a key management tool.

### 6.1. Monitoring mechanisms and tools

Three types of monitoring mechanisms and tools can be identified, which should be planned as part of the overall M&E work plan:

- *reporting/analysis*, which entails obtaining and analysing documentation from the project that provides information on progress;
- *validation*, which involves checking or verifying whether or not the reported progress is accurate;
- *participation*, which involves obtaining feedback from partners and participants on progress and proposed actions.

The table below lists the different types of monitoring mechanisms and tools according to these categories, while Annex C provides illustrations of monitoring tools used for DDR in Afghanistan.

Table 3 **Monitoring tools and mechanisms**

REPORTING AND ANALYSIS	VALIDATION	PARTICIPATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Annual project report</li> <li>■ Progress and/or quarterly reports</li> <li>■ Work plans</li> <li>■ Project/programme delivery reports</li> <li>■ Combined delivery reports</li> <li>■ Substantive project documentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Field visits</li> <li>■ Spot-check visits</li> <li>■ External assessments/monitoring</li> <li>■ Client surveys</li> <li>■ Evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Outcome groups</li> <li>■ Steering committee mechanisms</li> <li>■ Stakeholder meetings</li> <li>■ Focus group meetings</li> <li>■ Annual review</li> </ul>

Source: UNDP Evaluation Handbook

### 6.2. Monitoring indicators<sup>1</sup>

Although the definition of monitoring indicators will differ a great deal according to both the context in which DDR is implemented and the DDR strategy and components, certain generic (general or typical) indicators should be identified that can guide DDR managers to establish monitoring mechanisms and systems. These indicators should aim to measure performance in terms of outcomes and outputs, effectiveness in achieving programme objectives, and the efficiency of the performance by which outcomes and outputs are achieved (i.e., in relation to inputs). (See IDDRS 5.10 on Women, Gender and DDR, Annex D, sec. 4 for gender-related and female-specific monitoring and evaluation indicators.) These indicators can be divided to address the main components of DDR, as follows:

Table 4 **Generic monitoring indicators**

DDR COMPONENT	GENERIC INDICATORS
<p><b>Disarmament</b></p> <p>Baseline should include estimated total weapons available in relation to total ex-combatant pool</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ % of weapons collected from ex-combatants</li> <li>■ Quality and condition of weapons</li> <li>■ % of weapons disabled upon collection</li> <li>■ % of weapons destroyed</li> <li>■ % ratio of weapons surrendered to ex-combatants registered</li> <li>■ % of weapons surrendered by armed groups versus civilians</li> <li>■ % of weapons remaining outside possession of ex-combatants</li> <li>■ Market prices and values for weapons</li> <li>■ Number of disarmament sites and facilities for storage and destruction</li> </ul>
<p><b>Demobilization</b></p> <p>Baseline should include total number of eligible combatants and existence of formal military structures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Number of demobilization facilities established</li> <li>■ Number of ex-combatants demobilized per demobilization facility</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants successfully demobilized over time</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants demobilized in different geographic locations over time</li> <li>■ Inclusivity and reach of the process, categorized by sex and age of ex-combatants</li> <li>■ Level and type of security incidents in demobilization camps</li> <li>■ Average length of stay versus total processing time for demobilization</li> <li>■ Cost of demobilization facilities versus processed caseload</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants fully registered, profiled and provided with necessary documentation</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants meeting formal eligibility and screening criteria</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants receiving transitional assistance in demobilization facilities (health, food, living allowance, etc.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Reintegration</b></p> <p>Baseline should include economic, social and security conditions in areas of return</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ % of ex-combatants receiving skills and vocational training</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants receiving no further support beyond training</li> <li>■ Average length of time spent in training courses</li> <li>■ Patterns of resettlement of ex-combatants in areas of return</li> <li>■ Perceptions of host communities of ex-combatants and reintegration</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants receiving employment creation assistance (into new or existing jobs)</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants receiving assistance to establish individual or small-group projects (e.g., microenterprises)</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants integrated into local or community-based development projects</li> <li>■ Incidence of violence in areas of return</li> <li>■ Existence and degree of community mobilization to manage and facilitate reintegration of ex-combatants in areas of return</li> <li>■ % of ex-combatants achieving results in their reintegration activity over time</li> <li>■ % of special needs groups provided with reintegration assistance</li> <li>■ % of special needs reintegration projects succeeding relative to other reintegration projects over time</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sensitization</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Popular opinion polls on DDR</li> <li>■ Number and scope of sensitization activities at national level</li> <li>■ Inclusivity, by age, sex and location, of sensitization activities</li> <li>■ Number of reports on DDR in national and local media</li> <li>■ % of host communities targeted for sensitization activities</li> <li>■ Degree of local community participation and mobilization in sensitization activities</li> <li>■ Number of national and local non-governmental organizations voluntarily participating in awareness-raising and sensitization</li> <li>■ Degree of comprehension among ex-combatants of the DDR process</li> <li>■ Perceptions of ex-combatants among national and local populations</li> <li>■ Ex-combatants' attitudes to livelihoods and reintegration</li> </ul>

### 6.3. Use of monitoring results

In general, the results of monitoring activities and tools should be used in three different ways to improve overall programme effectiveness and increase the achievement of objectives and goals:

- *Programme management:* Monitoring outputs and outcomes for specific components or activities can provide important information about whether programme implementation is proceeding in accordance with the programme plan and budget. If results indicate that implementation is 'off course', these results provide DDR management with information on what corrective action needs to be taken in order to bring implementation back into conformity with the overall programme implementation strategy and work plan. These results are therefore an important management tool;
- *Revision of programme strategy:* Monitoring results can also provide information on the relevance or effectiveness of an existing strategy or course of action to produce specific outcomes or achieve key objectives. In certain cases, such results can demonstrate that a given course of action is not producing the intended outcomes and can provide DDR managers with an opportunity to reformulate or revise specific implementation strategies and approaches, and make the corresponding changes to the programme work plan. Examples include types of reintegration assistance that are not viable or appropriate to the local context, and that can be corrected before many other ex-combatants enter similar schemes;
- *Use of resources:* Monitoring results can provide important indications about the efficiency with which resources are used to implement activities and achieve outcomes. Given the large scale and number of activities and sub-projects involved in DDR, overall cost-effectiveness is an essential element in ensuring that DDR programmes achieve their overall objectives. In this regard, accurate and timely monitoring can enable programme managers to develop more cost-effective or efficient uses and distribution of resources.

## 7. Evaluations

As described earlier, evaluations are a method of systematically and objectively assessing the relevance, efficiency, sustainability, effectiveness and impact of ongoing and completed programmes and projects. Evaluation is carried out selectively to answer questions that will guide decision makers and/or programme managers. It is a valuable strategic management tool enabling DDR managers and policy makers to assess the overall role and impact of DDR in a post-conflict setting, make strategic decisions, generate important lessons for future programmes and contribute to the refinement of international policy.

### 7.1. Establishing evaluation scope

The scope or extent of an evaluation, which determines the range and type of indicators or factors that will be measured and analysed, should be directly linked to the objectives and purpose of the evaluation process, and how its results, conclusions and proposals will be used. In general, the scope of an evaluation varies between evaluations that focus primarily on 'impacts' and those that focus on broader 'outcomes':

- *Outcome evaluations:* These focus on examining how a set of related projects, programmes and strategies brought about an anticipated outcome. DDR programmes, for instance, contribute to the consolidation of peace and security, but they are not the sole programme or factor that explains progress in achieving (or not achieving) this outcome, owing to the role of other programmes (SSR, police training, peace-building activities, etc.). Outcome evaluations define the specific contribution made by DDR to achieving this goal, or explain how DDR programmes interrelated with other processes to achieve the outcome. In this regard, outcome evaluations are primarily designed for broad comparative or strategic policy purposes. Example of an objective: “to contribute to the consolidation of peace, national security, reconciliation and development through the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants into civil society”;
- *Impact evaluations:* These focus on the overall, longer-term impact, whether intended or unintended, of a programme. Impact evaluations can focus on the direct impacts of a DDR programme — e.g., its ability to successfully demobilize entire armies and decrease the potential for a return to conflict — and its indirect impact in helping to increase economic productivity at the local level, or in attracting ex-combatants from neighbouring countries where other conflicts are occurring. An example of an objective of a DDR programme is: “to facilitate the development and environment in which ex-combatants are able to be disarmed, demobilized and reintegrated into their communities of choice and have access to social and economic reintegration opportunities”.

## 7.2. Timing and objectives of evaluations

In general, evaluations should be carried out at key points in the programme implementation cycle in order to achieve related yet distinct objectives. Four main categories or types of evaluations can be identified:

- *Formative internal evaluations* are primarily conducted in the early phase of programme implementation in order to assess early hypotheses and working assumptions, analyse outcomes from pilot interventions and activities, or verify the viability or relevance of a strategy or set of intended outputs. Such evaluations are valuable mechanisms that allow implementation strategies to be corrected early on in the programme implementation process by identifying potential problems. This type of evaluation is particularly important for DDR processes, given their complex strategic arrangements and the many different sub-processes involved. Most formative internal evaluations can be carried out internally by the M&E officer or unit within a DDR section;
- *Mid-term evaluations* are similar to formative internal evaluations, but are usually more comprehensive and strategic in their scope and focus, as opposed to the more diagnostic function of the formative type. Mid-term evaluations are usually intended to provide an assessment of the performance and outcomes of a DDR process for stakeholders, partners and donors, and to enable policy makers to assess the overall role of DDR in the broader post-conflict context. Mid-term evaluations can also include early assessments of the overall contribution of a DDR process to achieving broader post-conflict goals;
- *Terminal evaluations* are usually carried out at the end of the programme cycle, and are designed to evaluate the overall outcomes and effectiveness of a DDR strategy and programme, the degree to which their main aims were achieved, and their overall effectiveness in contributing to broader goals. Terminal evaluations usually also try to

answer a number of key questions regarding the overall strategic approach and focus of the programme, mainly its relevance, efficiency, sustainability and effectiveness;

- *Ex-post evaluations* are usually carried out some time (usually several years) after the end of a DDR programme in order to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the programme, mainly the sustainability of its activities and positive outcomes (e.g., the extent to which ex-combatants remain productively engaged in alternatives to violence or military activity) or its direct and indirect impacts on security conditions, prospects for peace-building, and consequences for economic productivity and development. Ex-post evaluations of DDR programmes can also form part of larger impact evaluations to assess the overall effectiveness of a post-conflict recovery strategy. Both terminal and ex-post evaluations are valuable mechanisms for identifying key lessons learned and best practice for further policy development and the design of future DDR programmes.

### 7.3. Selection of results and indicators for evaluation

Given the broad scope of DDR programmes, and the differences in strategies, objectives and context, it is difficult to identify specific or generic (i.e., general) results or indicators for evaluating DDR programmes. A more meaningful approach is to identify the various types of impacts or issues to be analysed, and to construct composite (i.e., a group of) indicators as part of an overall methodological approach to evaluating the programme. The following factors usually form the basis from which an evaluation's focus is defined:

- *Relevance* describes the extent to which the objectives of a programme or project remain valid and pertinent (relevant) as originally planned, or as modified owing to changing circumstances within the immediate context and external environment of that programme or project. Relevance can also include the suitability of a particular strategy or approach for dealing with a specific problem or issue. A DDR-specific evaluation could focus on the relevance of cantonment-based demobilization strategies, for instance, in comparison with other approaches (e.g., decentralized registration of combatants) that perhaps could have more effectively achieved the same objectives;
- *Sustainability* involves the success of a strategy in continuing to achieve its initial objectives even after the end of a programme, i.e., whether it has a long-lasting effect. In a DDR programme, this is most important in determining the long-term viability and effectiveness of reintegration assistance and the extent to which it ensures that ex-combatants remain in civilian life and do not return to military or violence-based livelihoods. Indicators in such a methodology include the viability of alternative economic livelihoods, behavioural change among ex-combatants, and so forth;
- *Impact* includes the immediate and long-term consequences of an intervention on the place in which it is implemented, and on the lives of those who are assisted or who benefit from the programme. Evaluating the impact of DDR includes focusing on the immediate social and economic effects of the return of ex-combatants and their integration into social and economic life, and the attitudes of communities and the specific direct or indirect effects of these on the lives of individuals;
- *Effectiveness* measures the extent to which a programme has been successful in achieving its key objectives. The measurement of effectiveness can be quite specific (e.g., the success of a DDR programme in demobilizing and reintegrating the majority of ex-combatants) or can be defined in broad or strategic terms (e.g., the extent to which a DDR programme has lowered political tensions, reduced levels of insecurity or improved the well-being of host communities);

- *Efficiency* refers to how well a given DDR programme and strategy transformed inputs into results and outputs. This is a different way of focusing on the impact of a programme, because it places more emphasis on how economically resources were used to achieve specific outcomes. In certain cases, a DDR programme might have been successful in demobilizing and reintegrating a significant number of ex-combatants, and improving the welfare of host communities, but used up a disproportionately large share of resources that could have been better used to assist other groups that were not covered by the programme. In such a case, a lack of programme efficiency limited the potential scope of its impact.

#### 7.4. Use of evaluation results

In general, the results and conclusions of evaluations should be used in several important and strategic ways:

- A key function of evaluations is to enable practitioners and programme managers to identify, capture and disseminate lessons learned from programme implementation. This can have an immediate operational benefit, as these lessons can be ‘fed back’ to the programme implementation process, but it can also contribute to the body of lessons learned on DDR at regional and global levels;
- Evaluations can also provide important mechanisms for identifying and institutionalizing best practice by identifying effective models, strategies and techniques that can be applied in other contexts; innovative approaches to dealing with outstanding problems; or linking DDR to other processes such as local peace-building, access to justice, and so forth;
- Evaluation results also enable practitioners and managers to refine and further develop their programme strategy. This is particularly useful when programmes are designed to be implemented in phases, which allows for the assessment and identification of problems and best practice at the end of each phase, which can then be fed into later phases;
- Evaluations also contribute to discussions between policy makers and practitioners on the further development of international and regional policies on DDR, by providing them with information and analyses that influence the way key policy issues can be dealt with and decisions reached. Evaluations can provide invaluable support to the elaboration of future policy frameworks for DDR.

#### 7.5. Planning evaluations

The complexity of DDR and the specific skills needed for in-depth and comprehensive evaluations usually means that this activity should be carried out by specialized, contracted external actors or partners. Because an external team will be brought in, it is essential to draw up precise terms of reference for the carrying out of the evaluation, and to be clear about how the overall objective and coverage of issues will be defined/expressed. An evaluation terms of reference document includes the following sections:

- *Introduction:* Contains a brief description of the rationale and focus of the evaluation (outcome, programme, project, series of interventions by several partners, etc.);
- *Objectives:* Describes the purpose of the evaluation, e.g., “to analyse strategic programmatic and policy dimensions”;

- *Scope*: Defines which issues, subjects and areas the evaluation will cover, and the period of the programme's life it will examine;
- *Expected results*: Defines what results the evaluation is expected to produce (e.g., findings, recommendations, lessons learned, rating on performance, an 'action item' list, etc.);
- *Methodology or approach*: Defines how data is collected and analysed for the evaluation;
- *Evaluation team*: Defines the composition of the staff involved and their areas of expertise;
- *Management arrangements*: Defines how the evaluation will be managed and organized, and how interactions with the DDR programme management will be structured.

## Annex A: Terms, definitions and abbreviations

### Terms and definitions

**Evaluation** is a management tool. It is a time-bound activity that systematically and objectively assesses the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and completed programmes and projects. Evaluation is carried out selectively, asking and answering specific questions to guide decision makers and/or programme managers. Evaluation determines the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of a programme or project.

**Monitoring** is a management tool. It is the systematic oversight of the implementation of an activity that establishes whether input deliveries, work schedules, other required actions and targeted outputs have proceeded according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct deficiencies.

### Abbreviations

ANA	Afghanistan National Army
ANBP	Afghanistan's New Beginnings Programme
C	combatant
DDR	disarmament, demobilization and reintegration
IDDRS	integrated disarmament, demobilization and reintegration standard/ standards
HW	heavy weapon
IP	implementation partner
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
RVC	regional verification committee
SSR	security sector reform
UN	United Nations
XC	ex-combatant

## Annex B: Balanced scorecard for DDR in Afghanistan

OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR
<b>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES</b>	
Break down the complex web of existing divisive and destructive power structures and dependencies	■ No. of instances of factional fighting per quarter
	■ No. of explosives attacks (bomb, suicide, improvised explosive device, grenade, rocket) per quarter
<b>SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES</b>	
Sustainable reintegration of up to 100,000 ex-combatants (XCs) into civilian life	■ No. of XCs finishing reintegration programmes
	■ % of XCs finishing reintegration programmes compared to XCs demobilized
	■ No. of XCs working in civilian professions and police/Afghanistan National Army (ANA) for a minimum of 6 months after completion of reintegration package
	■ % of XCs working in civilian professions and police/ANA for a minimum of 6 months after completion of reintegration package compared with XCs demobilized
<b>OUTPUTS</b>	
<b>VERIFICATION</b>	
Agreement on combatants (Cs) to be demobilized	■ No. of Cs Ministry of Defence submits to Afghanistan's New Beginnings Programme (ANBP) for demobilization
Verification of submitted lists	■ No. of Cs verified by regional verification committee (RVCs)
	■ % of submitted names verified by RVCs
<b>DISARMAMENT</b>	
Disarmament of combatants	■ No. of Cs disarmed
	■ No./Type of weapons received by ANBP
Community-based disarmament	■ No. of weapons volunteered
<b>HEAVY WEAPONS CANTONEMENT</b>	
Heavy weapons (HWs) cantoned before presidential elections October 2006	■ No. of HWs surveyed
	■ % of weapons surveyed and cantoned
	■ % of corps with 100% of HWs cantoned <sup>2</sup>
<b>DEMOBILIZATION</b>	
Demobilization of combatants	■ No. of combatants decommissioned
	■ % of Cs who are officers
	■ % of XCs disarmed but not demobilized
Decommissioning of military formations	■ % of targeted units decommissioned
	■ % of targeted formations only downsized
	■ No. of targeted formations declared non-compliant
<b>REINTEGRATION OF XCs</b>	
Provide timely reintegration programmes for up to 100,000 XCs	■ No. of XCs entering reintegration programmes <sup>3</sup>
	■ % of XCs who demobilized but did not appear for reintegration
	■ % of demobilized XCs declining reintegration package
	■ % of XCs temporarily in wage labour
	■ Average no. of days between demobilization and start of reintegration programmes
	■ % choosing agriculture programme
	■ % choosing vocational training programme
	■ % choosing small business programme
	■ % choosing demining programme
	■ % choosing ANA and police
	■ % choosing contracting teams programme
	■ % of reintegration drop-outs <sup>4</sup>
	■ No. of new employment positions filled by ex-soldiers and officers

Provide interim support to XCs	■	% of XCs provided with interim wage labour
Provide support to under-aged XCs	■	No. of under-aged XCs processed
<b>REINTEGRATION OF COMMANDERS</b>		
	■	No. of commander profiles completed <sup>5</sup>
<b>ANBP PERFORMANCE</b>		
<b>HUMAN RESOURCES</b>		
Level of staffing	■	No. of total ANBP staff employed
Nationalization of ANBP staff	■	% of international staff relative to total staff
Decentralization of ANBP staff	■	% of total staff based in regional offices
<b>IMPLEMENTATION PARTNERS (IPs)</b>		
	■	No. of active contracts with IPs
	■	\$ committed to IPs
	■	% of IP reports currently delayed
	■	Average no. of days IP reports are delayed
	■	Average score of quality of IP reports
<b>REGIONAL OFFICE</b>		
Effective monitoring of XCs	■	Ratio of monitoring sheets to total caseload in regional office
<b>PUBLIC INFORMATION</b>		
Generate international interest in ANBP	■	No. of hits on <a href="http://www.undpafg.org">http://www.undpafg.org</a>
<b>INPUTS</b>		
Programme fully funded	■	Overall funds pledged for ANBP
	■	Funds received so far
	■	% of funds received compared with funds pledged
Current expenses	■	Total expenses in \$ millions
Monthly expenses	■	Monthly expenses in \$ millions
Operating expenses	■	% of monthly operational expenses
Average cost per XC	■	Average cost per XC for reintegration package in \$

## Annex C: Examples of monitoring mechanisms for DDR in Afghanistan

### MONTHLY REPORTS

Monthly reports must summarize the particulars of each former combatant, and list components of reintegration packages, such as toolkits, agricultural packages and training materials. They must summarize the type of support provided, and the location of the training or implementation site. Monthly reports must be submitted together with a financial report and invoices. Where direct inputs were delivered to former combatants, these need to be listed with either signature or fingerprints of former combatants from the caseload list affirming receipt of inputs.

Monthly reports are descriptive reports, and should include five elements:

- tracking table for ex-combatants;
- activities and accomplishments;
- problems encountered and lessons learned;
- planning ahead;
- financial report with invoices attached.

### QUARTERLY REPORTS

The quarterly report is more detailed than the monthly report. In addition to the consolidated numerical facts, this report is supposed to present some qualitative aspects as well.

The quarterly report should include a detailed description of methods of implementation, the procedures for internal M&E, and details about cooperation with other organizations.

Quarterly reports are descriptive reports, and should include seven elements:

- assessment of IMPACT;
- assessment of RELEVANCE;
- assessment of EFFECTIVENESS;
- assessment of EFFICIENCY;
- assessment of APPROPRIATENESS;
- assessment of ATTRACTIVENESS and QUALITY;
- analysis of BEST PRACTICES.

### FINAL REPORTS

The final report is far more detailed than the monthly or quarterly report. It summarizes and analyses the cumulative information over the period covered by the contract. The focus of the final report is on the overall impact of the project, and on lessons learned for a possible similar operation in the future. The final report should cover the following areas:

- assessment of IMPACT and SUSTAINABILITY;
- assessment of RELEVANCE;
- assessment of EFFECTIVENESS;
- assessment of EFFICIENCY;
- assessment of APPROPRIATENESS;
- assessment of ATTRACTIVENESS and QUALITY;
- analysis of BEST PRACTICES;
- contribution to CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT.

Source: ANBP programme, Afghanistan

## Endnotes

- 1 The term 'ex-combatants' in each indicator include supporters and those associated with armed forces and groups. Indicators for reintegration also include dependants.
- 2 Total number of corps: 11.
- 3 No. of XCs who started the reintegration package (excluding those who are in temporary wage labour and those who chose not to participate).
- 4 Number of XCs who started but did not finish the reintegration package.
- 5 Includes deputy commanders and chief of staff of corps and divisions.