

Evaluability Assessment and Formative Evaluation of the UNICEF Positioning to Achieve the Goals of the Strategic Plan 2022–2025

◆ ◆ Peacebuilding

The Strategic Plan 2022–2025 provides an important shift in the definition of UNICEF’s contribution to peacebuilding, building on the organization’s strong foundations to deliver in this area, given its unique operational capability based on a wide footprint, strong networks and its experience working with governments and communities in fragile contexts. However, significant impediments to readiness in this area remain, mainly due to the weak positioning of the organization at field level, with limitations related to the senior leadership positioning and staff skills to analyse and navigate conflict dynamics.

In the [Evaluability Assessment and Formative Evaluation of the UNICEF Positioning to Achieve the Goals of the Strategic Plan 2022–2025](#), peacebuilding is rated 2 (insufficient/poor) on a 4-point scale, with high confidence in the lines and levels of evidence.



The table below summarizes the main conclusions of the readiness assessment across the criteria (approach, positioning, technical capacities, resources and partnerships) for peacebuilding. It presents options for UNICEF during the implementation of the Strategic Plan to achieve better outcomes for children.

Conclusions	Action points
<p>Approach (rating: 3 sufficient/good; evidence confidence: 4 high)</p> <p>Globally, the approach is undergoing a major shift in the right direction. However, although the Strategic Plan clearly articulates UNICEF’s contribution to peacebuilding; the peacebuilding strategy is under development; field staff and leadership are not familiar enough with its content; and changes have yet to be operationalized in the field.</p>	<p>Finalize strategy; develop tools, skills and partnerships.</p> <p>Focus on conflict analysis, on programme design to address conflict drivers, and on interlinkages with resilience, systems strengthening, nexus and gender transformation.</p>

Conclusions	Action points
<p>Positioning (rating: 1 totally lacking/very poor; evidence confidence: 4 high)</p> <p>There is limited corporate understanding of how UNICEF [can] contribute to peacebuilding. Recent evaluations and lessons learned helped initiate an HQ-driven shift to reposition the cross-cutting programme. There is a gap between UNICEF's unique operational capability and expertise and its very limited leveraging of entry points. There is varying ability and willingness among country office leadership to engage on peacebuilding. The small team dealing with this at HQ has been moved from Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) to Programme Group.</p>	<p>Strengthen corporate commitment at highest level.</p> <p>Finalize strategy.</p> <p>Address staff mindset on UNICEF mandate.</p> <p>Focus on the country office leadership skills; define and leverage comparative advantages, United Nations system and World Bank positioning.</p> <p>Invest in advice on governance and policy.</p>
<p>Technical capacities (rating: 2 insufficient/poor; evidence confidence: 4 high)</p> <p>Limited technical expertise in conflict analysis, conflict-sensitive and peacebuilding programming; recent recruitment of experts at HQ.</p>	<p>Recruitment more experts; build staff skills on conflict analysis.</p> <p>Leverage United Nations system expertise and joint programming; promote staff exposure.</p>
<p>Resources (rating: 2 insufficient/poor; evidence confidence: 3 medium)</p> <p>Limited articulation of peacebuilding in planning processes and programmes, no clear indicators and outcomes. Underprioritized resource management; underutilized potential to draw on nexus/pooled-fund approaches. Small, dedicated team capacity at HQ; limited capacity at regional office/country office. Build on peacebuilding education and advocacy (PBEA) lessons learned.</p>	<p>Include peacebuilding in country programme documents.</p> <p>Define clear indicators to ensure accountability and flow of resources.</p> <p>Leverage funds from the peacebuilding fund (PBF) and World Bank; invest in holistic programming to address resilience at all levels.</p>
<p>Partnerships (rating: 2 insufficient/poor; evidence confidence: 4 high)</p> <p>There has been little involvement in programming with other United Nations agencies through the PBF. There has also been limited leverage of new avenues generated by United Nations reforms and to sustaining the peace agenda.</p>	<p>Define advantages of UNICEF vis-à-vis other United Nations agencies.</p> <p>Explore partnerships with Peacebuilding Support Office, World Bank and think tanks (evidence, resources, tools, etc.).</p>

Legend: 1 = Totally lacking/very poor: the element requires immediate adjustment to support the implementation of the SP. 2 = Insufficient/poor: the element is insufficiently ready to support the implementation of the SP. 2↑ = Insufficient/poor, but nascent: the element presents initial but insufficient evidence that shows readiness for supporting the SP. It demonstrates a contribution to outputs but not yet outcomes. 3 = Sufficient/good enough: the element is ready to support the delivery of output results but cannot demonstrate contributions to outcomes. 4 = Optimal/very good: the element presents a very good amount of evidence towards achieving outcomes/medium-term changes.

Evidence confidence: Level 4 = Multiple lines and levels of evidence with very strong triangulation; Level 3 = Multiple lines and levels of evidence, most of which triangulate; Level 2 = Limited lines and levels of evidence with limited triangulation; Level 1 = A single line of evidence and weak triangulation.