Monitoring and evaluation of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration programmes are often under-prioritized and perceived as secondary, cumbersome and time-consuming. However, M&E is not only desirable, it is integral to successful programme planning and implementation. It contributes to programme effectiveness and accountability for all stakeholders, which, in turn, support resource mobilization. By clearly identifying simple, practical steps to establish and manage an M&E system for DDR programmes, this How to Guide will make M&E more accessible to DDR managers, planners and other programme staff.
HOW TO GUIDE
Monitoring and Evaluation for DDR Programmes

Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
2009
Acknowledgements

UNDP would like to thank all the staff in the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) who contributed to the development of the guide. We would like to thank Thomas Winderl who drafted the document; and Desmond Molloy, Maximo Halty, Adriaan Verheul, Daniel Ladouceur and Basil Massey who provided critical review.

Finally, UNDP would like to thank the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands for their generous financial contribution which made possible the development of this guide.

For further information please contact:
United Nations Development Programme
Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Châtelaine
Geneva, Switzerland

Tel: +41.22.917.8393
Fax: +41.22.917.8060
www.undp.org/bcpr
Table of Contents

Foreword v

Chapter 1. Introduction 1
M&E, the IDDRS and this How to Guide 2
Who should use this guide? 3
What is ‘managing for results’ for DDR? 3
‘Managing for results’ and gender 3

Chapter 2. How to integrate M&E into DDR programme design
(for DDR programme planners) 7
Step 1: Define the result chain 9
Step 2: Define what needs to be monitored and evaluated 16
Step 3: Develop an M&E strategy 19
Step 4: Define the indicators 26
Step 5: Agree on indicator baselines and targets 29
Step 6: Bring it all together in an M&E Plan 31
Step 7: Define capacities, conditions and budget needed 34
Developing national capacities for M&E 36

Chapter 3. How to set up and run a DDR M&E system
(for DDR programme managers and M&E staff) 39
Step 1: Make sure all requirements for meaningful M&E are in place 41
Step 2: Set up the information system 43
Step 3: Set up the monitoring system 45
Step 4: Monitor DDR results 50
Step 5: Monitor DDR risks 54
Step 6: Manage DDR evaluations 56
Step 7: Report on progress 62

Chapter 4. How to close and hand over an M&E system
(for DDR programme managers and M&E staff) 65

Conclusion 69

Annexes:
1. Examples of DDR indicators 71
2. Terms of Reference for DDR evaluations 75
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM</td>
<td>Enterprise Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDDRS</td>
<td>Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foreword

Through disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) interventions, UNDP seeks to support peace processes and enhance security to facilitate recovery and development. During the transition from conflict to peace, UNDP supports the economic and social reintegration of ex-combatants. Further, UNDP works towards enhancing the stability of communities and states with programmes on community security. Support is provided to DDR programmes in close coordination with other partners in and outside the UN system.

One of the typical weaknesses of DDR interventions has been that the overall impact and the relative merits of specific approaches are difficult to assess. In the past, DDR interventions often lacked meaningful indicators and a systematic approach to track progress in the implementation. DDR practitioners have generally been more familiar with monitoring and evaluation (M&E) that views performance in terms of concrete deliverables. Focusing on results, however, requires UNDP to track credibly and systematically how successful DDR is in integrating ex-combatants and in contributing to the stabilization of communities and societies.

DDR practitioners are usually under considerable pressure to plan, design and implement programmes quickly. These pressures, however, do not free UNDP from the obligation of carefully monitoring and evaluating progress. Beneficiaries and the international community can only hold DDR programmes accountable if they have access to sufficient, credible and objective information about the progress and the impact of DDR interventions.

The How to Guide provides guidance on how to plan and manage better the M&E of DDR programmes. The guide identifies simple, practical steps for DDR programme planners to integrate M&E into DDR programme design. In addition, it offers advice for DDR programme managers and M&E staff on how to set up and run a DDR M&E system.

It is hoped that this How to Guide will prove to be useful in supporting the M&E components of DDR programmes in all the countries where UNDP works.

Jordan Ryan
Assistant Administrator and Director
Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, UNDP
Monitoring and evaluation are often under-prioritized in crisis prevention and recovery settings, where pressure to deliver quick results is greater than in normal development contexts. In such cases, M&E tends to be perceived as secondary, cumbersome and time-consuming. M&E, however, is not only desirable, it is integral to successful programme planning and implementation, contributing to programme effectiveness, lesson learning, and accountability for all stakeholders, which, in turn, support resource mobilization. Thus, investment in M&E at the planning stage will reap dividends later on, and can do much to ensure smooth and effective implementation, assurance of donor support, and success in achieving results. Given its centrality to effective programming, M&E should be budgeted for at the start of the programme, and adequate capacity factored into staffing.

In the context of DDR, the M&E system will:

- facilitate effective management of programmes
- enhance organizational learning on DDR
- enable the assessment of progress and success in reintegrating ex-combatants and associated groups
- allow the credible demonstration of impact.

**Conflict sensitivity**

Conflict sensitivity is the capacity of an organization:

- a) to understand the conflict context in which it operates;
- b) to understand the interaction between its operations and the context;
- and c) to act upon the understanding of this interaction in order to avoid negative impacts and maximize positive impacts on the conflict context.

**Conflict sensitivity** in conducting M&E is vital in order to avoid creating or exacerbating tensions. Therefore, M&E frameworks and mechanisms should:

- a) use participatory methods to agree on expected results and measures of success (with all main stakeholders and relevant parties to any conflict represented in the discussion);
- b) identify results and indicators which are unlikely to cause offence;
- and c) have a representative balance of different parties among M&E personnel.

While many of the typical methods and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating can also be applied to DDR programmes, M&E in a post-conflict setting requires special attention in six areas:

- **conflict sensitivity** needs to be woven throughout the process of developing and implementing M&E mechanisms, so that the DDR programme does not heighten existing tensions or create new ones;
- **security** of both staff and stakeholders needs to be constantly factored into decisions;
flexibility is needed regarding timing and appropriate methods of data collection, based on what is feasible and can realistically and safely be achieved;

a gender-responsive approach is required, to ensure that the needs and capacities of men, women, boys and girls are accounted for irrespective of the direct client caseload;

national capacity development is to be prioritized as the owners and custodians for DDR and subsequent recovery and development are national institutions; and

a big picture perspective of the overall context is required, so that the results of DDR programming are seen in the broader context of achieving stability and security and how they relate/contribute to the wider peace and recovery process with a view to national development.

By clearly identifying simple, practical steps needed to establish and manage an M&E system in DDR programmes, this How to Guide will make M&E accessible to managers, planners and other staff.

It will show how M&E can be integrated into the main components of a DDR programme: disarmament of combatants and their demobilization; short-term assistance provided for reinsertion; social and economic reintegration of individual ex-combatants and associated groups into their communities; and public information and strategic communication in support of DDR. In addition, cross-cutting issues – i.e. programming for men and women, youth, children, foreign combatants, food aid, HIV/AIDS and health - should be specifically tracked to inform the development of appropriate programming, and contribute to lessons learned about ‘what works’ for these different groups and why.

M&E, the IDDRS and this How to Guide

The Integrated Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS) sets out policy guidance on monitoring and evaluating DDR programmes.

This How to Guide builds on this guidance to offer practical advice to programme planners and programme staff working in DDR. It provides explanations and practical descriptions of how M&E can be conducted in DDR programmes. Where needed, reference is made to the relevant chapters in the IDDRS, the IDDRS Operational Guide and the UNDP Practice Note on DDR (see www.undp.org/cpr/we_do/ddr.shtml).

M&E in the International Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Standards (IDDRS)

Module 3.50 of the IDDRS sets out the standards for M&E of DDR programmes. The module elaborates guiding principles for M&E, deals with developing an M&E strategy and framework for DDR, and describes the standards for M&E in DDR programmes.

A shorter version of Module 3.50 for quick reference can be found in the Operational Guide to the IDDRS (IDDRS/OG).

(see www.unddr.org/iddrs/)
**Who should use this guide?**

This guide has been developed for DDR practitioners working to support DDR programmes. Chapter 2 (*How to integrate M&E into DDR programme design*) is aimed at DDR programme planners, while Chapter 3 (*How to set up and run a DDR M&E system*) and Chapter 4 (*How to close and hand over an M&E system*) are primarily aimed at DDR programme managers and M&E staff.

Each DDR programme is unique, and operates in a particular environment. The suggestions provided in this How to Guide are necessarily generic. The steps suggested for planning and conducting M&E are guidelines which will need to be customized to the particular context.

---

**UN definitions**

**Managing for results** is a management strategy by which an organization ensures that its processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results.

**Results** are changes in a state or condition which derive from a cause-and-effect relationship. They may be intended or unintended, positive or negative. There are three types of such changes which can be set in motion by a development intervention – the output, the outcome and the impact. *(see Harmonized UN Terminology)*

---

**What is ‘managing for results’ for DDR?**

In the past, DDR programmes focused on the support provided for disarming and demobilizing combatants and on support packages for reinsertion and reintegration. Less attention was usually paid to how successful ex-combatants were in reintegrating socially and remaining economically active, and how the programme contributed to the security and stability of the country or region.

**Managing for results** in DDR programmes involves a shift in focus from deliverables to results: i.e. for DDR programmes, towards tracking the extent to which the reintegration of ex-combatants is successful and the extent to which the programme helps stabilize the community, country or region and improve its security. This entails less emphasis on monitoring the actual activities implemented as part of DDR programmes, and a greater focus on the results: on the broader outputs, especially the outcomes and, as far as possible, on impact.

**Monitoring** and **commissioning evaluations** are, together with planning and reporting, key elements of managing for results; this shift in focus means that M&E needs to have a corresponding change from measuring deliverables, to measuring the longer term results of DDR programmes.

---

**‘Managing for results’ and gender**

Managing for results implies that people remain at the centre of any DDR programme. Non-discrimination and fair and equitable treatment of all participants...
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and beneficiaries are core principles of the UN approach to DDR. This implies differences in the support provided, based on the specific needs of each sex and by age (see IDDRS 4.1.). The ultimate goal of gender-responsive M&E is to make DDR programmes more effective and to improve the delivery of DDR services to programme participants and beneficiaries by ensuring equal benefits to both women and men, and providing equal access to those benefits, given women’s specific social roles. That is why gender-sensitive M&E must focus on the needs and capacities of women and men separately, as this will allow DDR practitioners to transcend the role of women exclusively as victims.

Gender-responsive DDR is about women, men, girls and boys. It explicitly includes male and female ex-combatants, female supporters of armed groups and female dependents of ex-combatants. A helpful way for DDR planners and practitioners to think about gender responsiveness and M&E is to approach it in two complementary ways: (1) use a gender perspective in all M&E activities and (2) monitor and/or evaluate overall gender responsiveness of DDR programmes.

Documents and international commitments on gender responsiveness in DDR programmes

- Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) (see http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/)
- UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, especially art.13 (see http://www.peacewomen.org/un/sc/1325.html)
- UNSCR 1820 on Sexual Violence and Conflict, especially art. 10 (see http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/106577.pdf)
- UNDP Eight Point Agenda for Women’s Empowerment (8PA) (see http://www.undp.org/crp/we_do/8_pa.shtml)
- IDDRS 5.10 (see http://www.unddr.org/iddrs/05/)
- Operational Guide to the IDDRS 5.10 (see http://www.unddr.org/iddrs/og/OG_5_10.pdf)
- How to Guide on Gender-Responsive DDR
Gender responsiveness may be assessed through three perspectives:

- programme benefits and service delivery (male/female participants and beneficiaries);
- using a gender perspective as a methodological tool in M&E activities, since it allows finer analysis; and
- DDR programme level (figure 1, IDDRS.5.10, page 6) which establishes nine areas of gender responsiveness, and may be broadly divided into internal (budget, M&E, HR) and external (donor support, coordination mechanisms with women’s organizations).

To ensure that this is the case, all M&E for DDR needs to identify and measure gender-appropriate programming, which will be done by setting gender-appropriate objectives, indicators, baselines, targets and ensuring that gender differences are specifically evaluated.

Political will, accountability, gender commitment from senior programme management and adequate financial resources, are crucial for gender-responsive M&E.
Planning for M&E is an integral part of DDR programme design. The time spent on planning and developing a strong M&E framework at the programme design stage is an investment. If done properly, it will pay dividends in terms of programme effectiveness and responsiveness, and in the small amount of time required for remedial corrections at the implementation stage.

Effective monitoring of DDR programmes is an obligation. Without it, given the specific nature of the caseload, dissatisfaction can rapidly escalate and have a negative impact on communities, project staff or even peacebuilding.

All major steps of developing and operationalizing M&E frameworks should be carried out in a participatory manner, including representatives of all key stakeholders. This is important for transparency, to ensure that the programme addresses concerns of each of the groups within the target population, and also as one means of developing national capacity for programming and M&E. Again, this will involve an investment of time at the front end of the programme, but, if well done, will pay dividends later on in terms of buy-in of all target groups and stakeholders.

In this chapter, step-by-step guidance will be given on how to plan for M&E as part of the DDR programme design.

### The difference between monitoring and evaluation

- **Monitoring** is a continuous activity to provide main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with early indications of progress (or the lack of progress).
- **Evaluation** is a one-off exercise to systematically and objectively assess progress towards the achievements of results.

DDR monitoring is usually conducted **internally** on an ongoing basis by the DDR programme, while evaluations are typically conducted by **external evaluators** to provide an independent assessment of the programme.
Seven Steps for DDR Programme Planners for Integrating M&E into Programme Design

**STEP 1:** DEFINE THE RESULT CHAIN

**STEP 2:** DEFINE WHAT NEEDS TO BE MONITORED AND EVALUATED

**STEP 3:** DEVELOP AN M&E STRATEGY

**STEP 4:** DEFINE THE INDICATORS

**STEP 5:** AGREE ON INDICATOR BASELINES AND TARGETS

**STEP 6:** BRING IT ALL TOGETHER IN AN M&E PLAN

**STEP 7:** DEFINE CAPACITIES, CONDITIONS AND BUDGET NEEDED
**Step 1: Define the result chain**

A result chain of a DDR programme defines what is planned, how much it will cost, and what it should lead to.¹

Defining a result chain is a standard part of programme design, independent of any M&E requirement. Any attempt to monitor or evaluate at a later stage depends on the existence of a result chain. Therefore, a key step in integrating M&E into DDR programmes is to make sure that a result chain is properly defined. Time invested in developing this chain jointly with stakeholders will build consensus on the approach of the programme, and will contribute to clarifying and managing expectations from different stakeholders.

There is increasing consensus on the specific labels for the various parts of the result chain. The terminology agreed upon by the United Nations (UN) as well as by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), uses the terms: impact, outcome, output, activity and input (see www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=224).

- The DDR programme goal or **impact** is a long-term effect on an identifiable population group produced by an intervention. It will typically only be detected

---

¹ The harmonized terminology of the UN and the OECD for a result chain is: ‘The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives – beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts and feedback. [...] It is based on a theory of change, including underlying assumptions’.
several years after a DDR programme ends. For DDR programmes, the impact will most often be to enhance security and stability in a post-conflict environment, so that recovery and development can begin. A gender-responsive definition must take into account how men and women, boys and girls experience security and stability. This might help in going beyond a traditional understanding of stability and security and include groups that have not necessarily been part of a peace agreement.

DDR examples:

• peace, national security and reconciliation are consolidated
• complex web of existing divisive and destructive power structures and dependencies is broken down.

**Outcomes** are short or medium-term effects which contribute to an impact. They are changes in a development condition. While outputs do not necessarily make a difference for participants and beneficiaries, outcomes do. DDR programmes influence outcomes, but they will not have full control over them. Indeed, intended outcomes are often not realized during the duration of a DDR programme, but sometimes only years later. For DDR programmes, the outcome is typically related to the sustainable reintegration of male and female ex-combatants, females associated with armed groups and female dependents, into their communities.

DDR examples:

• 9,000 male and female programme participants returned to communities of their choice and are economically active and socially accepted
• 3,000 male and female ex-combatants and associated members of armed forces and groups with special needs (pregnant women, handicapped, seniors) are reintegrated into communities of their choice and are economically active and socially accepted.

**Outputs** are products and services needed to achieve an outcome and which result from the completion of activities. They are largely under the control of the DDR programme. Outputs are by definition always delivered while the DDR programme is on-going. Because outputs are deliverables, DDR programmes and their staff are fully responsible and accountable for achieving them. Outputs are usually related to disarmament, demobilization, support for reinsertion and reintegration of ex-combatants and associated members of armed forces and groups, support to communities receiving them and national capacity development.

DDR examples:

• national DDR commission staff is trained, equipped and operational
• 3,000 weapons less than 100 mm in calibre have been destroyed

• 10,000 male and female combatants are demobilized and prepared for transition to civilian, peaceful life (including by being informed about non-violent conflict resolution, gender-based violence and HIV/STIs)

• the reintegration of 4,000 male and female ex-combatants is supported through training, psycho-social counselling and mediation at community level

• 1,000 community members are prepared to coexist with DDR programme participants

• 1,500 female programme participants have access to tailored support for social and economic reintegration.

- **Activities** describe the actions that are needed to obtain the stated outputs. Activities are carried out by DDR programme personnel and implementing partners. Typically, more than one activity is needed to deliver an output.

  DDR examples:

  • support the development of eligibility criteria for the DDR programme
  • screen participants on the basis of established eligibility criteria
  • plan operations for disarmament, to collect weapons, to manage stockpiles, to destroy weapons
  • develop and distribute information materials on peace and reconciliation
  • carry out community sensitization outreach activities
  • enrol male and female ex-combatants in catch-up education courses, vocational training and other educational institutions.

- **Inputs** are financial, human, material, technological, as well as information resources used for the DDR intervention.

  DDR examples:

  • funds, including trust funds and assessed budgets
  • equipment, including computers, MIS software, photographic and biometric equipment
  • staff, including managers, technical experts, consultants, data entry clerks, M&E officers, support staff.
Monitoring and Evaluation for DDR Programmes

Result chain for DDR in Sudan

**Impact:** Individuals and communities are protected from physical violence

**Outcome 1:** The risk of ex-combatants and special needs groups to disrupt security is mitigated

**Outcome 2:** The risk of insecure communities to disrupt security is mitigated

**Output 1.1:** Ex-combatants are provided with support to reintegrate into civilian life

**Output 1.2:** Special needs groups are provided with support to reintegrate into civilian life

**Output 2.1:** Immediate sources of insecurity in selected communities are mitigated

*Based on: DDR Guideline Manual Module 9, Planning, Project Proposal Writing, Reporting, M&E and Information Management, NSDDRC & UN DDR Unit, Sudan*

When planning a DDR programme in line with managing for results, it is paramount to start with the higher order results and work downwards. First, programme planners need to define what the DDR programme ultimately wants to achieve (impact and outcomes). Second, planners should consider what activities and broad outputs are needed to achieve these results. Third, planners need to calculate the costs to carry out the planned activities (inputs). Implementation, however, is done the other way round: Inputs are used to conduct activities, which in turn form broader outputs. Over time, outputs are expected to achieve planned outcomes, and ultimately contribute to the planned impact of the DDR programme.

Which parts of the result chain can be considered as results? **Results** are not inputs or activities. Results are outputs, outcomes and impact. Because outputs are largely under the control of the DDR programme, programme managers are fully responsible and accountable for delivering them. For example, programme managers are responsible for providing programme participants with marketable skills and a mechanism for accessing micro-finance. However, outputs are not behavioural or institutional changes; and impact can only be observed later and is usually difficult to attribute fully and credibly to a DDR programme. Outcomes are therefore the most critical level of results to monitor and evaluate in DDR programmes.

**Result chains** typically have the structure of a tree’s root: a number of activities lead to the delivery of an *output*, a number of outputs translate into an *outcome*, and a number of outcomes contribute to a desired *impact*.

The result chain can be depicted in various ways. Most commonly, result chains are shown as flow-charts or in table format with numeric coding like 1., 1.1., 1.1.1. To keep the DDR result chain simple (and ideally restricted to a single page), include only outputs, outcomes and impact for M&E purposes. Especially in a fast-changing environment, activities and inputs will need to be detailed in work plans and to facilitate budgeting rather than in planning documents.
## Example of a typical DDR result chain (with numeric coding)

**Impact:**

1. Security and stability in post-conflict environment enhanced to allow recovery and development to begin, with specific attention paid to gender equality and women’s empowerment

**Outcomes:**

1.1. 8,000 male and female ex-combatants are reintegrated into communities of their choice and are economically active

1.2. 350 communities receive and support ex-combatants in their reintegration, with minimal censure towards male and female ex-combatants or women associated with armed forces and groups

**Outputs:**

1.1.1. 10,000 male and female ex-combatants are supported to become economically active

1.1.2. 8,000 male and female ex-combatants are supported to socially reintegrate into their communities

1.2.1. 350 communities are supported to reintegrate ex-combatants

An important, but often overlooked, element of a DDR result chain is identifying and tracking risks and assumptions throughout the DDR programme cycle. This is a standard approach for development programmes, but is even more critical in highly volatile situations typical of DDR. Risks are negative external events or occurrences which might seriously affect achievement of desired results. Assumptions are the necessary conditions which must exist for the cause and effect relationship to operate as expected. They are the fine print of the result chain, describing the strength of the link from one level to the next.

Risks and assumptions need to be identified and tracked on at least two levels (output to outcome, and outcome to impact):

- What risks are taken which might prevent a DDR output (e.g. the support provided to ex-combatants) from translating into the desired outcome (e.g. their sustainable reintegration)? What assumptions are made which are necessary conditions for the translation of a DDR output into the desired outcome?

- What risks are taken which might prevent the outcome (e.g. the sustainable reintegration of ex-combatants) from yielding the expected impact (e.g. more security and stability)? What assumptions are made which are necessary conditions for the translation of a DDR outcome into the desired impact?
### Example of defining risks and assumptions in a simple DDR result chain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Security and stability in post-conflict environment enhanced to allow recovery and development to begin</td>
<td>- all parties are committed to the peace process and will not resume the conflict (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- a complementary community arms collection programme is implemented (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- security forces are restructured and absorb a fixed number of combatants into their ranks (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- commanders will release combatants and associated groups to participate in the DDR programme (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- neighbouring states undermine peace process (risk)&lt;br&gt;- change of local/national government (risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1.1. 8,000 male and female ex-combatants are reintegrated into communities of their choice and are economically active</td>
<td>- economic situation does not further deteriorate to absorb ex-combatants and associated groups (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- there is continued political will in communities to receive and integrate ex-combatants (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- ex-combatants hand over only old and almost unserviceable weapons (risk)&lt;br&gt;- communities do not accept back women associated with armed forces and groups (risk)&lt;br&gt;- the number of training institutes and their capacities will not meet the quality and number required for the training of ex-combatants (risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1.1.1. 10,000 male and female ex-combatants are supported to become economically active</td>
<td>- economic situation does not further deteriorate to absorb ex-combatants and associated groups (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- there is continued political will in communities to receive and integrate ex-combatants (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- ex-combatants hand over only old and almost unserviceable weapons (risk)&lt;br&gt;- communities do not accept back women associated with armed forces and groups (risk)&lt;br&gt;- the number of training institutes and their capacities will not meet the quality and number required for the training of ex-combatants (risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2. 8,000 male and female ex-combatants are supported to reintegrate into their communities</td>
<td>- economic situation does not further deteriorate to absorb ex-combatants and associated groups (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- there is continued political will in communities to receive and integrate ex-combatants (assumption)&lt;br&gt;- ex-combatants hand over only old and almost unserviceable weapons (risk)&lt;br&gt;- communities do not accept back women associated with armed forces and groups (risk)&lt;br&gt;- the number of training institutes and their capacities will not meet the quality and number required for the training of ex-combatants (risk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any result chain is based on a potentially infinite number of assumptions, and faces many risks. Decisions must be made on a limited number of key risks and assumptions to include in the result chain, which will be monitored throughout the life of the programme. In deciding what issues are key, two criteria should be kept in mind:
How probable is it that a risk will become a reality or that the assumption will turn out to be invalid? How severe would the consequences be for the delivery of outputs and the achievement of DDR outcomes and impact?

An important source for identifying risks and assumptions is the conflict and security analysis which should be carried out before a DDR programme is designed (unless a good one already exists for the programme area). This analysis looks holistically at the conflict and security dynamics and identifies factors that can positively or negatively affect the outcome of DDR (see IDDRS/OG 3.20). Conflict and security analyses should be continually monitored and updated throughout the life of the programme so that the results can guide programming decisions in what are often dynamic and fast changing situations. For each key risk and assumption, it is useful to define a threshold and an exit strategy. For example, if armed conflict resumes and only 30 percent of armed groups come forward to participate in the programme in year two of the DDR programme (threshold), the programme will reduce its activities to areas where no irregular forces operate. In severe cases, the exit strategy might even be a complete stop of activities.

---

2 Ideally, conflict and security analyses are conducted jointly by all major partners working in an area, so the analysis is shared, contributing to programming coherence between partners and projects.
**Step 2: Define what needs to be monitored and evaluated**

As with risks and assumptions, not everything in a complex programme like DDR should, and can, be monitored and evaluated. Be selective as to what will be the key information to be monitored and evaluated.

To identify which information will be significant, consider who the key stakeholders are, and what kind of information they require. For most programmes, important stakeholders from the perspective of the DDR M&E unit are: a) the DDR programme management; b) national oversight institutions like the National Commission for DDR; c) DDR participants and beneficiaries and their communities; d) donors and non-governmental organizations (NGOs); e) relevant government ministries like the Ministry of Labour or Agriculture; and f) UN political analysts. In addition, M&E systems should support both accountability and learning and this will also affect choice of information to be gathered.

It can be helpful to ask the following questions:

- What information does the DDR programme management need regularly to manage effectively?
- What information does the National Commission for DDR and other government organizations need to oversee the implementation of the DDR programme?
- What information does the DDR communication unit need to shape attitudes towards DDR through public information and strategic communication?
- What information do donors require to monitor implementation, results and the efficient use of their funds?
- How do the different groups of the target population perceive ‘success’?
- What information can be derived from communities of return that can be integrated into DDR programming?

Based on this assessment, draw up a list of questions which a future DDR M&E system should be able to answer. To identify relevant key questions for a DDR programme, it is helpful to consider the following issues:

- The most important questions focus on the result chain of the DDR programme: are sufficient inputs provided; activities carried out as planned; planned outputs delivered in time, and outcomes and impact achieved? M&E systems for DDR programmes need to include outputs and outcomes in the areas of disarmament, demobilization, reinsertion and reintegration. Key aspects typically involve the issue of inclusion, appropriateness of programming for women, children and youth, and operational issues.

- Decisions will depend on what information is already available before the DDR programme starts (the baseline). Check the detailed DDR conflict and security
analysis which is usually conducted as the first stage of DDR programme design (see IDDRS/OG 3.20) to identify additional key questions.

- In addition, check whether the objectives of the DDR programme remain relevant (relevance), if the programme is effective (effectiveness) and efficient (efficiency), and if the benefits from the DDR programme are likely to continue after funding has been withdrawn (sustainability).

### The OECD/DAC evaluation criteria

The five OECD/DAC (Development Assistance Committee) evaluation criteria are widely used for evaluations: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability (see www.oecd.org/dac).

These evaluation criteria are helpful when formulating the most pertinent questions a DDR M&E system should be able to answer.

The UN has endorsed these criteria for DDR programmes (see also IDDRS 3.50). It has recently included two additional commonly applied evaluation criteria to the OECD/DAC criteria (see Standards for Evaluation in the UN system, Standard 3.6.): value-for-money, and client satisfaction. (see also IDDRS/OG 3.50.)

As a result of Step 2, the key questions which a DDR M&E system should be able to answer will be defined. These questions can be listed and organized according to the level of results (outputs, outcome, impact\(^3\)) they refer to, and should all be gender-sensitive. This implies that information gathered will need to be disaggregated by sex and age (see IDDRS 5.10 Annex D), which is an easy, cost efficient and helpful way to identify any bottlenecks and barriers which may prevent men and women from accessing certain benefits, and ultimately to improve the DDR programme.

The following box includes an example of key questions to be answered by a DDR M&E system:

---

3 Inputs are usually tracked in detail by the financial systems. Activities are more easily planned and monitored based on flexible annual or quarterly work plans.
Example of key questions which a DDR M&E system needs to be able to answer

**Impact level**
- How has the security situation evolved in the country during, and after, the DDR programme? Does this differ for men, women, youth, the elderly?
- Is there credible evidence to show if, and to what extent, the DDR programme has contributed to a change in the security situation?

**Outcome level**
- How many male and female ex-combatants who received full reintegration support are economically active 6 months after DDR interventions stopped? Are the activities they are engaged in, those which they would wish to be doing?
- Which types of reintegration options are more successful in providing sustainable reintegration for men and women?
- How do male and female programme participants and their families perceive the value of the reintegration assistance they received? Is this differently perceived by female ex-combatants, women formerly associated with armed forces and groups and female family members?
- How content are programme participants with the support provided by the DDR programme? Is there a difference in opinion between male and female ex-combatants?
- How many ex-combatants ended up abandoning the programme? How many of them are female? Why?

**Output level**
- To what extent did the DDR programme deliver the outputs as planned, and was this delivered within the planned timeframe?
- How many willing to join the DDR programme qualify and are verified for DDR? How many of them are female (divided into combatants and supporters)?
- How many combatants are disarmed? How many of these are female?
- How many weapons are surrendered for each combatant who demobilized? Does this differ for men and women?
- How many formations and units are decommissioned or disbanded?
- How many weapons are volunteered by communities?
- How many combatants are demobilized? How many are under-age? How many are women (officers and under-age)?
- How many combatants are disarmed but not demobilized? How many of them are female?
- How many ex-combatants enter reintegration programmes? How many of them are female?
- Which reintegration option do ex-combatants choose? Does this vary between men and women?
- How much does reintegration support of ex-combatants cost per head?
- How expensive is DDR compared to the level of economic development of a country?
**Step 3: Develop an M&E strategy**

Based on the key questions defined in Step 2, a broad consensus on the DDR M&E strategy may be sought. As with all elements of programming for DDR, it is important to include key stakeholders in this decision. The M&E strategy defines what information will be needed to answer the key questions. At this point, three issues need to be further refined for each question:

- **Monitoring or evaluation:** Can the question be answered through continuous monitoring (i.e. data gathering) or is a more comprehensive analysis through in-depth evaluation needed?

- **Data collection:** Does the information needed require the DDR programme to collect primary data (i.e. data that has not yet been collected by someone) or can secondary data (i.e. data that has already been collected by someone else) be used? Is the data disaggregated by age and sex?

- **Data source:** What data source will be used to answer the question?

**Monitoring or Evaluation?**

If the information to answer the question is available through straightforward data-gathering on an ongoing basis (i.e. the number of combatants demobilized, or the percentage of ex-combatants choosing a certain reintegration option), the question can be answered through ongoing monitoring. Frequently, the updates will come straight from a DDR Management Information System (MIS) like DREAM (see box in section following on primary and secondary data).

Those questions which cannot be answered by monitoring will need to be addressed through evaluation. Evaluations need to be planned based on what in-depth information is needed by DDR stakeholders and at what point during the programme.

Different types of evaluation provide different information. The initial step for designing an evaluation refers to the decision about the evaluation type. For DDR programmes, commonly used evaluation types are:

- **Formative internal evaluation:** Often conducted internally in the early phase of programme implementation, and designed to inform ongoing programming and to identify those elements which may need adjusting to fulfil the desired objectives.

- **Mid-term evaluation:** External and carried out during implementation, with the same function as the formative evaluation.

- **Terminal evaluation:** External and carried out at the end of the programme to support both accountability and learning.
- **Ex-post evaluation**: Conducted several years after the end of a DDR programme, mainly to gather lessons learned to support future programming, (see IDDRS/OG 3.50, section 6.1).

## Types of evaluation for DDR programmes and their timing

### Formative internal evaluation
- Primarily conducted in the early phase of programme implementation in order to assess early hypotheses and working assumptions, and analyse outcomes of pilot interventions and activities.
- A mechanism for correcting implementation strategies early on in the programme implementation process, and to identify and deal with potential problems.
- Generally carried out internally by the M&E officer or unit within a DDR section.

### Mid-term evaluation
- Similar to formative internal evaluations, but are usually more comprehensive and strategic – as opposed to diagnostic – in function.
- Intended to provide an assessment of the performance and outcomes of a DDR process for stakeholders, partners and donors, enabling policy-makers to assess the overall role of DDR in the broader post-conflict context.

### Terminal evaluation
- Usually carried out at the end of the programme cycle.
- Designed to evaluate the overall outcomes and effectiveness of a DDR strategy and programme, the degree to which the programme’s main aims were achieved and the overall effectiveness in contributing to broader impact.
- Generally address key questions regarding the overall strategic framework and focus of the programme, notably its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

### Ex-post evaluation
- Usually conducted several years after the end of a DDR programme in order to evaluate long-term effectiveness of the results/outcomes produced by the programme, particularly sustainability of positive outcomes, direct and indirect impacts on security conditions, prospects for peacebuilding and consequences for economic productivity and development.
- Although not frequently used, ex-post evaluations are a promising tool to assess success or failure of DDR programmes.
Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System

The Norms for Evaluation in the UN System define the guiding principles for evaluating the results achieved by the UN system. Built upon the Norms, the Standards for Evaluation in the UN System provides guidance on the establishment of the institutional framework, management of the evaluation function and how to conduct and use evaluations.

(see UN Evaluation Group at: www.uneval.org)

How can a DDR evaluation be as independent as possible?

The power of external evaluations is that they provide an independent view on progress and/or results achieved by a DDR programme. It is paramount for credibility that an external evaluation is as independent from the DDR programme as possible. That is why external evaluations need to be planned and integrated into the DDR M&E strategy at the very beginning. Evaluations can be made more independent using the following guidelines:

- External evaluations must not include any person who has been previously involved or will be involved in running or supporting the DDR programme in any way.
- While the DDR programme staff should provide operational support to the evaluators, they should not be involved in the evaluation process. It is generally accepted that the DDR programme staff can be helpful in setting up meetings with stakeholders or to propose interview partners. It is not acceptable, however, to sit in at meetings with stakeholders or to provide evaluators with a mandatory list of interview partners.
- Ideally, funding for the evaluation should not come from the DDR programme. For maximum independence, an external evaluation should be directly funded – for example, by one of the donors of the DDR programme or an interested research institute.

Primary or secondary data?

Secondary data is data that has already been collected and is readily available. Examples of secondary data are information from a DDR MIS such as DREAM, data from national statistics, or data from reports by implementing partners. The advantage of secondary data is that it is usually cheap, quick and safe to collect in a volatile environment. The disadvantage is that, in some cases, the data might not be valid or as reliable as may be hoped. It may also not be sufficiently disaggregated by sex and age. This is often the case with national or international statistics in post-conflict countries. Secondary data from national sources is usually the preferred choice for DDR programmes. Rather than establishing parallel structures to collect data, it is better to rely on, and strengthen as needed, national systems that are already in place. This is also important in order to strengthen national capacities and promote sustainability of programme achievements after the programme itself has ended.
Primary data is data which is newly obtained. This is usually more expensive than using secondary data, and sometimes difficult to collect in a post-conflict context. However, information on progress towards outcomes and impact is often difficult to obtain from secondary sources. Examples of this type of information are the reintegration success of combatants, or the satisfaction of communities with the way combatants have been supported by the DDR programme. This would most commonly be collected through surveys.

One advantage of collecting primary data, especially if it is sex and age-disaggregated, is that it can serve as valuable secondary data for other parties, and, by being made available to the broader community, may serve as an advocacy tool, for example in gender awareness, or for improved national data collection.

The collection of primary data is another entry point for gender-responsive M&E:

- **How is the data collected?** Is it collected in a gender-responsive and culturally appropriate way? What are the most appropriate means for such collection? (key informant interviews, focus groups with female/male or mixed, etc.)?

- **Who collects the data?** Does the team consist of men and women? Are interpreters selected considering the impact their sex might have on collecting data?

- **Who is consulted?** Are local, national or international gender experts consulted? Are government ministries and agencies concerned with gender issues involved (e.g. women and family ministries)? Are women’s organizations consulted (and how are they selected)? What individual women are consulted (and who do they represent)?

- **What questions are asked?** Women should not be asked questions only on ‘gender’ issues, domestic violence and sexual violence. Women may have a different perspective on security and stability issues, challenges and opportunities. With regard to sensitive issues such as HIV/AIDS, and sexual and
gender-based violence, asking questions without a certain level of trust may not yield the desired results.

- **Do men speak for women?** In certain contexts, men will want to talk on behalf of women using the argument that women will not want to talk. In some cases, men may insist on being present when women are interviewed. Such cases call for creativity to establish different entry points to assess the opinion of women.

If the DDR programme collects primary data, it is important to bear in mind that this data can be **sensitive** and needs to be properly secured. Make sure that published information cannot be tracked back to individuals or small groups, but is only available in aggregated form so as not to compromise the security of any programme participants.

**What is the data source?**

Finally, identify the source of the data. At the input and output level, this will often be the DDR MIS, the budget or reports by the implementing partners. At the level of outcomes, this will typically be a sample survey or data collected through local DDR staff or implementing partners. At the impact level, the data source is usually secondary statistical data, or an analysis of the contribution made by the programme which would be part of any evaluation.

### Using sample surveys for DDR programmes

The most frequently used tool for collecting primary data for DDR outcomes and impact is the survey. A survey is a system for collecting information from, or about, people to describe, compare, or explain their **knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour**. If possible, surveys should make use of a control group (‘experimental design’ if participants are randomly assigned, ‘quasi-experimental’ if not). For DDR programmes, potentially useful survey instruments are:

- interviews
- structured record reviews, and
- structured observations*.

In many cases, DDR programmes will make use of sampling for surveys. **Sampling** is a powerful tool to get information on a large population (e.g. all former combatants or all communities affected by reintegration efforts) by collecting data only from a limited subset of the population. Preferably, surveys should use probability sampling (where each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected as part of the sample). In the DDR context, however, non-probability sampling, like convenience sampling or quota sampling, may be the only option available.

*(see Arlene Fink (2003), the Survey Handbook, 2nd edition, SAGE Publications)*
In conflict or tense areas, including all parties to the conflict and all key stakeholders in the choice of who is included as survey respondents, as well as making sure of a balance between different parties to the conflict, or demographic groups among staff, is paramount to minimize bias in the answers and also to demonstrate transparency of the process. Failure to gather information from all groups can seriously bias answers which can, in turn, undermine effective programme design/operation. It is also important to include women and youth among respondents and staff for the same reasons.

In many cases, DDR programme staff will not have the technical knowledge and the experience to design and analyse a survey. Usually, programme planners will need to plan and budget for the use of an external organization for this task.

A Nationwide Survey of Ex-combatants was, for example, conducted in Liberia in 2006. UNDP, in partnership with the African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect, conducted a randomized nationwide survey of the population of ex-combatants. The study targeted a sample of 600 ex-combatants and used a randomized sampling approach to obtain a representative sample of ex-combatants by category of DDR programme participation or non-participation and gender.

(see http://www.lr.undp.org/Ex-combatants%20Nationwide%20Survey%20-%20Key%20Findings.pdf)

* A fourth survey instrument, self-administered questionnaires, is often not suitable for DDR due to the lack of literacy among ex-combatants and potential communication problems.

**The M&E strategy table**

The core elements of a DDR M&E strategy may now be summarized in a simple table which should form part of the DDR programme document. The table lists the key questions identified and defines whether the information is coming from continuous monitoring or from one-off evaluations. The table also shows if the answer to a question will rely primarily on secondary data or whether the DDR programme will collect the data directly. Finally, the table defines the source of data for answering the question.
## Simplified example of a DDR M&E strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Monitoring/Evaluation</th>
<th>Data Type*</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How has the security situation evolved in the country during and after the DDR programme? How does this differ for men, women, youth, the elderly?</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>National statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To what extent has the DDR programme contributed to a change in the security situation?</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Contribution analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How many male and female combatants who received full reintegration assistance are economically active six months after DDR support stopped? What % of these are women, and are they are engaged in activities they wish to be doing?</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Sample survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How do ex-combatants and their families perceive the value of the reintegration assistance they received? Is this differently perceived by female ex-combatants, females associated with armed forces and groups, and female family members?</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>DDR Regional office staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To what extent did the DDR programme deliver the outputs as planned? Were they delivered within the original timeframe of the programme?</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How many male and female combatants are disarmed? What % of these are female (divided into combatants and associated followers)?</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>DDR MIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How many male and female ex-combatants enter reintegration programmes?</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>DDR MIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How much does reintegration support of male and female ex-combatants cost per head?</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>DDR budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Primary data usually implies that funds need to be earmarked for data collection. Ensuring that primary data collection is gender-responsive may have related expenses, such as hiring male/female interpreters, male/female only focus groups, etc.
Step 4: Define the indicators

DDR indicators with indicator baselines and targets need to be defined at the planning stage with the participation of all key stakeholders, and should be included in the DDR programme document. Indicators not only form the backbone of any performance monitoring system, they are also helpful in refining (fine-tuning and interpreting) result statements. Often, a participatory process to agree on indicators and indicator targets will lead to a revision of output, outcome and impact statements and will help make results more precise and relevant to the target population.

Management for results implies that progress and results are measured for all outputs and outcomes as well as for impact. That is why any DDR programme needs indicators at all result levels. There are differences between input and activity indicators (measuring inputs and activities), performance indicators (measuring outputs and outcomes) and impact indicators (measuring impact).

The basis for defining indicators and indicator baselines are the questions defined in Step 2. Take each question and define a set of indicators to answer the key elements of the questions. Use as few indicators as possible, but use sufficient indicators to capture the most important aspects of the question. As a rule of thumb, use two to five indicators per result. Further up in the result chain, more indicators are generally required, because results become increasingly complex.

To be useful for performance monitoring, indicators need to fulfil certain minimum standards. A commonly used set of criteria is ‘SMART’: specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound.

SMART indicators can capture both quantity (e.g. the percentage of ex-combatants who are underage) as well as a certain quality (e.g. the level of satisfaction of officers with the reinsertion package). However, SMART qualitative indicators can usually also be captured through a numeric indicator (e.g. percentage of officers who rate the reinsertion assistance ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’).

Ideally, an indicator should be direct and closely linked to the result it attempts to measure. For example, if the output is ‘10,000 ex-combatants provided with reintegration assistance, a direct indicator would be the ‘number of ex-combatants provided with reintegration assistance’.

However, in some cases where direct data cannot be reliably collected, a more indirect indicator (proxy indicator) will be needed. This is typically the case if a result is an abstract concept. For example, a DDR programme measures impact (‘security situation improved’) by using four proxy indicators (violence, confiscated ammunition, confiscated weapons, suspects detained). Indirect indicators are also used if data for direct indicators is not collected frequently enough (e.g. household surveys are often conducted only every five years), or if data for direct indicators is too difficult, dangerous or expensive to collect.
Checklist for SMART indicators

Relevant
- Does the indicator **directly relate to the output or outcome**? Does it measure the ‘right thing’?

Objective
- A good, objective indicator does not involve a subjective judgment by somebody.
- It has no ambiguity about what is being measured.

Numeric
- Numeric indicators are more sensitive to change than categorical indicators (for example, yes/no indicators).
- The interpretation of numeric data for indicators is generally less subjective than for categorical indicators.

Specific
- The indicator needs to be as clear and specific as possible in terms of quantity, quality, time, location, target groups, etc of an intervention.
- The description of the indicators can be as long, specific and detailed as needed.
- The actual data set (baseline, target, status) must be a single number or a single word.

Data available
- Make sure that sufficient (also historical) data for the indicator is, and will be, available.
- The first measurement for the indicator (‘indicator baseline’) and an **indicator target** must be included in the definition of an indicator.

Disaggregation
- Indicators often need to be disaggregated at a level where it is most meaningful, for example, by sex, age, ethnicity, language, urban and rural areas.

As far as is relevant, all indicators need to be disaggregated by sex. Additionally, some indicators should be disaggregated to inform on youth, children or another subgroup (see IDDRS/OG 5.10, 5.20, 5.30).

In many cases, there is a choice to use a total, a percentage, or both. For example, to track how many officers the DDR programme processes, use ‘number of demobilized combatants who are officers’ (total) or ‘percentage of demobilized combatants that are officers’. For reintegration, track the ‘number of ex-combatants who enter vocational training’ or the ‘percentage of ex-combatants entering vocational training’. Both indicators might be important to track, but they capture a different perspective. In many cases, both indicators will be needed to give a more complete picture of progress.
Further, work with cumulative numbers or with numbers for a certain period of time. To track decommissioning, for example, simply use ‘total number of combatants decommissioned’ or ‘number of combatants decommissioned per month’. With one set of data, the other data can easily be calculated, so in this case use only one of the two options.

For examples of DDR indicators, see Annex 1.
Step 5: Agree on indicator baselines and targets

Every indicator must have an indicator baseline and an indicator target to be useful for performance monitoring. If either the baseline or the target cannot be defined at the planning stage, the indicators will be of no value in measuring progress and success. If the indicator baseline is not clearly identified, or a target for the indicator agreed upon, go back to Step 4 and revise the indicators.

Indicator baseline

An indicator baseline is the first critical measurement of an indicator. For example, if the indicator is ‘number of combatants disarmed’, the baseline at the planning stage is ‘0’. For the indicator ‘average number of days between demobilization and start of reintegration programmes’, the baseline is the number of days when this calculation is done for the first time. For the indicator ‘percentage of weapons surveyed and cantoned through the DDR programme’, the indicator baseline would be ‘0%’. It is imperative that, when baselines are constructed, women as well as men, the young as well as old, men of different status, as well as representatives of any different parties to the conflict, are all consulted, so that bias and political views are balanced, and thus minimized.

Ideally, all DDR indicators have an indicator baseline already at the planning stage, whether through previous surveys, conflict analysis or other data sources. However, in particular cases, an indicator baseline might still be missing. For example, if a DDR programme plans a client satisfaction survey, the indicator ‘percentage of ex-combatants who are either very satisfied or satisfied with the reinsertion package’ will not have a baseline, since the first survey can only be conducted once a certain number of combatants have demobilized. In these special cases, footnote the indicator with the information on what type of data collection is planned and when it is going to take place.

Indicator targets

In addition to a baseline, every indicator needs an indicator target. An indicator target is the expected measurement of the indicator at a certain point in the future. For example, if the indicator is ‘number of combatants disarmed’, the indicator target could be 15,000 by March 2012. Frequently, the definition of indicator targets is an afterthought or not done at all. However, without a target,
no judgement can be made about success or failure of an intervention in the future.\(^5\)

It may be difficult and may take some time and negotiation to get all stakeholders to agree on indicator targets, but forging agreement on these, as on the rest of the programme objectives, is an indispensable part of planning a DDR M&E framework. As with the identification of indicators, broad agreement on targets can be achieved through a participatory process which involves key stakeholders (male and female participants and beneficiaries, national and international partners, etc.). Different indicators can represent measures of ‘success’ as perceived by different groups of stakeholders.

It is understood that in the volatile environment in which many DDR programmes operate, many indicator targets can only be estimated. For example, it might be difficult to precisely define essential targets like the ‘number of combatants submitted to the DDR programme by the Ministry of Defence or armed group for demobilization’. However, an educated and broadly discussed estimate is better than no target. If stakeholders cannot agree on a precise target, a target range can also be defined (e.g. ‘10,000 – 15,000 combatants’).

There are two opposing considerations in setting targets:

- At the planning stage, there is a tendency to be ambitious and set targets too high. This might be effective for resource mobilization, but backfire at a later stage when the targets turn out to be unrealistic.

- On the other hand, there can be tendency to be overly prudent in setting targets to make sure they can be achieved with ease. To avoid that, it helps to set targets in relation to the funds available to be spent. International benchmarks or the experience from other DDR programmes help in setting realistic targets.

Remember to keep written records of the target-setting process. Records will be useful at a later stage to analyse why a target has not been reached or why a target has been reached much earlier than anticipated. These also provide useful lessons learned for future DDR programmes or programmes in different areas.

The target of an indicator may be higher than the baseline, (e.g. ‘number of combatants who start a reintegration programme’) or lower (e.g. ‘number of violent political demonstrations’). In some cases, the indicator target can even be the same as the baseline (e.g. ‘percentage of ex-combatants who are not satisfied with the reintegration options offered’)

\(^5\) In those few cases where a data collection activity is planned and no baseline is yet defined, it also does not make sense to define a target.
**Step 6: Bring it all together in an M&E Plan**

Now it is time to bring all elements together in a DDR M&E plan. The M&E Plan is not a stand-alone document but must be an integral part of the DDR programme document. As part of this document, it will need to be agreed upon by key stakeholders in the DDR process.

An M&E plan has three components: a) a narrative component, that describes M&E for the DDR programme; b) a monitoring framework, that summarizes the indicators; and c) an evaluation plan, that describes all planned evaluations.

**Narrative component**

The narrative component describes the M&E management plan. It outlines (in words) how to undertake and coordinate the M&E of the DDR programme. The M&E management plan defines clear accountabilities by specifying who is responsible for what in monitoring and evaluating the programme. It also addresses how the DDR programme will engage with national partners at all levels to contribute to strengthening national M&E capacities.

**Monitoring framework**

This matrix includes the different levels of the result chain, the indicators to measure these results, including the indicator baseline and target. The monitoring framework will form the backbone of a future DDR performance monitoring system.

The DDR M&E framework should include at least the following information:

- The **description** of the indicator, which should be as specific, comprehensive, objective and detailed as possible.
- The **baseline** and the **target**, which represent the status of the indicator at a minimum of two defined points in time: pre-programme (baseline) and during or post-implementation (target[s]). The values for these will normally be expressed as a single number or word, and should specify, in brackets, the month and year for which they apply.
- The **means of verification**, which provides specific advice about where the data for the indicator will be obtained from. For example, a DDR MIS like DREAM will often be the means of verification for indicators on the output level. For indicators on security, the means of verification might be the monthly hospital reports or police reports on homicide rates.
- **Responsibility**, which identifies the person or organization unit responsible for updating the data for the indicator.
- The **frequency**, which refers to how often the responsible person will be expected to update the data for the indicator. While it makes sense for fast-
paced DDR programmes to update the indicator data on the output level at least on a monthly basis, data on client satisfaction might only be available annually through a comprehensive sample survey.

- The costs incurred in collecting data for the indicator. Many output indicators will not incur any cost. However, indicators which involve a survey or in-depth analysis of documentation (e.g. ‘percentage of new laws with special provisions for ex-combatants’) will need funding.

### Extracts from a DDR monitoring framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Security and stability in post-conflict environment enhanced to allow recovery and development to begin</td>
<td>No. of instances of factional fighting per quarter</td>
<td>19 (03/2008)</td>
<td>0 (03/2012)</td>
<td>UNDSS</td>
<td>M&amp;E unit</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of gunshot wounds treated per month</td>
<td>65 (03/2008)</td>
<td>10 (03/2012)</td>
<td>Hospital records</td>
<td>M&amp;E unit</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME 1.1.</td>
<td>No. of ex-combatants who are economically active at least 6 months after reintegration support ceased</td>
<td>0 (03/2008)</td>
<td>8,000 (03/2012)</td>
<td>Sample survey</td>
<td>M&amp;E unit</td>
<td>annually after 2009</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 1.1.1.</td>
<td>No. of ex-combatants who have completed a vocational training programme</td>
<td>0 (08/2008)</td>
<td>10,000 (03/2012)</td>
<td>Impl. Partner reports</td>
<td>programme unit</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation plan

The evaluation plan summarizes the different evaluations planned to occur during and after the DDR programme. It specifies what is to be evaluated (objective), the type of evaluation, when (time), with/by whom (partners) and approximately how much it will cost (resources).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation title</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative self-evaluation</td>
<td>programme implementation</td>
<td>internal self-evaluation</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>10,000 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term evaluation</td>
<td>programme implementation</td>
<td>mixed (external &amp; internal)</td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>WFP and UNICEF</td>
<td>50,000 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative self-evaluation</td>
<td>programme implementation</td>
<td>internal self-evaluation</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>10,000 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final summative evaluation</td>
<td>programme outcomes</td>
<td>external</td>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>WFP, UNICEF and DFID</td>
<td>80,000 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-post summative evaluation</td>
<td>programme outcomes and impact</td>
<td>external</td>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>WFP, UNICEF and DFID</td>
<td>80,000 US$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 7: Define capacities, conditions and budget needed

M&E is a service to any DDR programme and does not come free. The capacities for M&E, the necessary conditions to set up and run an M&E system and the budget needed to conduct monitoring and to commission evaluations need to be planned before the DDR programme implementation starts.

Who does M&E?

Monitoring is carried out by most DDR staff in some way. Where possible, monitoring mechanisms which support capacity development for national partners and target beneficiaries should be selected. As well as strengthening capacity, this will increase local ownership of the projects and their results.

However, a specialized M&E unit (or at least an M&E specialist in small programmes) is needed to set up and run a DDR M&E system. The M&E unit needs to provide technical backstopping to DDR staff and build national capacities in M&E. This unit will need to have a direct reporting line to the DDR programme management (chief and deputy-chief of the integrated DDR unit) to be able to freely report information, even where negative, and avoid possible conflicts of interests.

The composition and size of the M&E team will depend on the size of the DDR operation and its specific character. In most DDR programmes, a team of at least three M&E staff will be needed to effectively run an M&E system: one manager of the unit and two M&E officers who make sure that sufficient contact with the DDR operation on the ground is kept through field visits.

At least initially, most DDR programmes will require one M&E specialist to be an international expert with broad M&E experience. This specialist can set up the M&E system, oversee its operation for one to two years and develop the capacity of national M&E staff in the programme, if needed.

The DDR M&E unit should combine expertise and competencies in the following areas:

- expertise in monitoring and managing evaluations
- DDR expertise
- gender expertise
- security expertise
- knowledge of the country context and the conflict.

Evaluations are, in most cases, undertaken by external evaluators, not internally by DDR staff. DDR programmes, however, need staff with the capacity and knowledge to plan, commission, manage and backstop an external evaluation.

In addition, sample surveys for DDR programmes will also be conducted – at least partially – by external survey specialists, again, wherever possible, using national capacity, such as local universities or institutes.
Budget

M&E need to be budgeted for. The funds needed for proper and effective M&E will largely depend on four factors:

- How many dedicated M&E staff does the DDR programme hire and at what level?
- How many external evaluations are planned?
- How many, and what type of, surveys and other primary data collection activities are planned?
- What are the costs associated with training?

A very approximate rule of thumb is that around 3-7 percent of dedicated programme resources will be needed for effective and meaningful M&E.

**UNDP and DDR M&E**

UNDP has been an actor in the area of DDR since 1991, and it has managed and implemented DDR programmes in both peacekeeping and non-peacekeeping contexts. UNDP makes use of a number of resources and tools which help DDR programmes in their M&E tasks.

*Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures* provide UNDP guidelines on programme and project management, including M&E.

(see http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/)

Specifically for M&E, the UNDP Handbook *Planning Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results* is a good source of information for those seeking more detailed advice on how to do M&E for DDR.

(see http://www.undp.org/eo/handbook)

For evaluations, UNDP has an *evaluation policy* based on the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System.

(see http://www.undp.org/eo/policy.htm)

UNDP’s *Enterprise Resource Planning* system, *Atlas*, is increasingly used for monitoring. While it is still focusing largely on financial monitoring, it is increasingly incorporating and tracking indicators. Most of the indicator-tracking may now be done through the Atlas system. However, the system does not help in identifying quality indicators and data.

At the same time, UNDP has established a system to identify risks through an *Enterprise Risk Management (ERM)* platform. This provides DDR programmes with a systematic way to identify and track risks through a comprehensive risk log.

(see http://content.undp.org/go/userguide/results-management---accountability/enterprise-risk-management/)
Developing national capacities for M&E

It is important for outcomes and impacts of the programme to be sustained beyond the life of the programme. In many countries where DDR programmes are implemented, national capacity in many aspects of programme management is weak, particularly in the field of M&E. Attention should therefore be given, throughout the programme period, to the capacity development of national actors in M&E. When developing national capacities, gender equality considerations are particularly important. It costs little extra in terms of time or money, but has the potential to yield significant benefits to the effectiveness of any recovery and development processes that may follow.

The developing of national capacities for M&E is therefore not a separate step, but should permeate all M&E activities in a DDR programme. The primary responsibility for DDR programmes – as well as for monitoring and evaluating DDR - rests with the national actors. Because national ownership is not limited to government ownership, national capacity development for M&E must be targeted to a wide range of DDR actors, state and non-state actors, and actors at the national, regional and local levels. One should consider including non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations, some of which may be implementing partners for the DDR programme.

Because national capacities for M&E are often weak in the early stages of post-conflict stabilization, national capacity development for M&E is necessarily a gradual process.

There are five typical key target groups for developing national M&E capacities for DDR programmes:

- national staff employed in DDR M&E and programme units
- national staff of implementing partners
- national DDR institutions like the National Commission for DDR and the national technical and coordination body
- national research institutes with links to DDR
- target participants and beneficiaries.

There are a number of tools available to develop national capacities for these five groups:

- The most relevant tool in the context of DDR programmes is on-the-job training. Typically, national staff of DDR programmes at headquarters and in regional offices will be coming into close contact with M&E for the first time, and will be able to see and learn from M&E at work. National staff working for implementing partners will need to carry out result-based reporting, for which more formal M&E training will be useful.
To the extent possible, DDR programmes should make use of qualified **national staff** for M&E. International experts should only be used if adequate national M&E capacity is not available in the country. Often, national and international expertise will be combined to achieve adequate capacity. For example, nationals can be junior evaluators in a team with international evaluators, or university students can work as enumerators for sample surveys.

The DDR M&E unit may have the expertise to organize more formal basic, intermediate and advanced training in M&E for a wide range of actors. For the more advanced staff working in the DDR M&E unit, their training needs could require study tours or formal M&E training online or abroad.

DDR M&E staff can promote better networking of national and international M&E staff in the country. This can initially take the form of regular meetings to exchange experience on M&E and can develop towards (re)establishing a national evaluation society. Once formalized, the group will be able to establish contact with regional evaluation societies (see [http://www.mande.co.uk/societies.htm](http://www.mande.co.uk/societies.htm)).
It is key for the credibility of the DDR programme that the M&E system - including the MIS - is set up, tested and operationalized before the programme starts.

Two entities are primarily concerned with this task in a typical DDR unit:

- The **DDR Programme Management** (usually consisting of the chief and deputy-chief) has overall responsibility for an effective M&E system.

- The **Monitoring and Evaluation Unit** (or an M&E specialist in smaller programmes) is actively responsible for the establishment and day-to-day running of the DDR M&E system. To ensure the independence and integrity of the system, the M&E unit should report directly to the Programme Management.

In this chapter, step-by-step guidance will be given on how to set up and run a DDR M&E system, based on the plans described in the previous chapter. Step 1 is to make sure that all requirements for meaningful M&E are in place. Steps 2 and 3 involve setting up the information and monitoring system. Once this is done, actual monitoring and evaluation of the DDR programme may begin. This will typically include monitoring results (Step 4) and risks (Step 5), managing evaluations (Step 6) and reporting to key stakeholders on information collected through M&E (Step 7). Steps 4 to 7 are frequently repeated and form the core day-to-day function of a typical DDR M&E unit or an M&E specialist.

But before that, it is useful to look at something that can be done throughout these steps: consider how, while carrying out these tasks, potential for national capacity development in M&E can be exploited.
Seven Steps for DDR Programme Managers and M&E Staff on How to Set Up and Run a DDR M&E System

**STEP 1:** Make sure all requirements for meaningful M&E are in place

**STEP 2:** Set up the information system

**STEP 3:** Set up the monitoring system

**STEP 4:** Monitor DDR results

**STEP 5:** Monitor DDR risks

**STEP 6:** Manage DDR evaluations

**STEP 7:** Report on progress

**REPEAT**

Strengthens national capacities for monitoring and evaluation.
Step 1: Make sure all requirements for meaningful M&E are in place

Review all relevant documentation, including the DDR programme document, from an M&E perspective. The DDR programme should already have clearly defined objectives at outcome and output levels, a strong and well-defined M&E plan including, for monitoring, a solid set of indicators, each with its baseline and target; and, for evaluation, a clear evaluation plan. Before setting up an M&E system for the DDR programme, the DDR programme managers and M&E staff must verify that these prerequisites exist. The following check-list will help.

Check list: are M&E requirements in place?

- ✓ Is there a detailed result chain with (as a minimum) the programme's outputs, outcomes and impact clearly defined?
- ✓ Do the outputs, outcomes and impact of the DDR programme demonstrate a logical flow from one to the other; are they relevant to the situation now in place; and will they support gender-responsive programming?
- ✓ Do programme documents specify an M&E strategy, with key questions to be answered?
- ✓ Are risks and assumptions in the result chain clearly identified? Are they still valid? Is the list complete?
- ✓ Are indicators at the level of output, outcome and impact identified and disaggregated by sex and age?
- ✓ Are all these indicators SMART? (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound)
- ✓ Does every indicator have its corresponding indicator baseline and target defined?
- ✓ Does the programme document contain a monitoring framework with indicators, baselines, targets, means of verification, frequency of data collection, costs and responsibility?
- ✓ Are data collection activities for compiling primary data (i.e. sample surveys) for the DDR programme identified and budgeted for?
- ✓ Is there an evaluation plan?

If the answer to any of these questions is ‘no’, then the first priority is to take corrective action. Refer to the table below, and to the relevant sections of the previous chapter, for guidance.
### What to do if some elements are missing

Because of the nature of the environment DDR programmes operate in, not all requirements for meaningful M&E are always in place before a DDR operation commences. What should responsible DDR programme managers and M&E specialists do if a clear result chain, an M&E strategy or a performance monitoring framework, are not yet defined?

Because meaningful M&E is only possible if properly planned, the elements necessary for M&E need to be defined retrospectively as soon as possible. The steps involved are the same as outlined in Chapter 2 of this guide:

- define the result chain
- define what needs to be monitored and evaluated
- develop an M&E strategy
- define indicators
- agree on indicator baselines and targets
- develop a monitoring and evaluation plan which defines capacities, conditions and budget.

While the details of these requirements can be worked out by the DDR unit, the key elements (result chain, monitoring framework, evaluation plan, and most particularly, the indicators and their respective baselines and targets) must be discussed and endorsed by the National Commission on DDR (NCDDR), together with key donors.
Step 2: Set up the information system

The implementation of DDR programmes requires the capacity to input, manage and use a large quantity of data. This data needs specific tools, expertise and resources to service the programme. Errors in information management of DDR programmes can have a serious impact on the DDR process, on the security of staff, and on the consolidation of peace. For example, information on the payment of benefits for ex-combatants, if not delivered in a reliable and timely fashion, can translate into frustration or even riots.

Information management has to be organized from the very start. Develop a system through which all relevant information for the DDR programme can be received, collated, stored and shared, as required. This system will need to be responsive, reliable, accountable and accessible. There should be both a hard-copy and an electronic filing system. Think about what information is to be made available to which stakeholders, how this information can most appropriately be shared, and who will be responsible for doing this. Different means of communication may be appropriate for different types of information and for different stakeholders. A common computer directory (shared access folder) is one channel through which information can be shared; or a simple intranet (limited access), or website (public access), could be set up. In some situations, the most effective means to share updates with implementing partners will be through a quarterly newsletter.

Where there is a communications unit, there is clearly an opportunity for collaboration and coordination. If another unit or organization is arranging an information system, it is important that programme management and M&E staff get involved from the start in the design of the system.

For any documentation management system to be useful, it is paramount that it is up-to-date and complete, and contains the most recent versions of key documents. Advantages of having a well-designed, effective and regularly updated information system:

- effective monitoring of DDR programme
- easy access to information by management and staff
- enhanced institutional memory (particularly valuable where staff turnover may be high, or when key staff are away)
- those who provide reports and data (e.g. implementing partners) can see that their monthly reports and data do have a true function
- facilitates speedy identification of any reporting errors or malpractice
- enables questions from donors, media, etc. to be answered speedily
- excellent resource - for example, when evaluation teams make their desk review
- one-stop shop for key information required in the preparation of annual and final reports, press releases, etc.
- no searching through piles of papers to find one piece of information: if the system is kept updated, the information can be found immediately.

### The importance of setting up a Management Information System before starting DDR - the case of Liberia

A DDR MIS system consists not only of the software that captures the personal, family, socio-economic data of ex-combatants and their families, benefits received and data from surveys conducted, but also includes photographic and biometric equipment needed to identify DDR participants and avoid double registration by combatants.

In December 2003, the Liberia DDR programme had the Disarmament (D1) form ready to collect personal combatant data including weapons information, but the MIS was not in place. With political demands overriding technical concerns, the process started on 7 December 2003. Although an effective MIS might not have controlled the huge intake which exceeded the capacity of the process, it would have helped in the accountability problems that followed. Combatants were provided with yellow duplicate copies of the D1 form which, in the ideal situation of temporary cantonment, was meant as a temporary receipt whilst waiting for the official demobilization card. In Liberia many ex-combatants received the form and returned to their communities. In the absence of photographic/biometric evidence, and in a city awash with weapons in the immediate aftermath of war, the yellow forms were sold or given to relatives, and those with multiple weapons re-disarmed and collected more yellow forms with relative ease.

With the expectation of a weapons buy-back programme and the approaching Christmas festivities, disarmed combatants who had expected immediate cash for their weapons went on the rampage in the capital city Monrovia and the violence that followed resulted in a number of deaths. This forced the UN Mission in Liberia to agree on an advance payment of US$75 per person, which was a quarter of the transitional safety-net allowance each ex-combatant was due to receive in two instalments. Payments were made based on the yellow forms. In the absence of an MIS system which could have guaranteed the necessary accountability, the process may have been exposed to some level of abuse.

When the disarmament and demobilization process started again in April 2004, by which time the necessary MIS had been deployed, albeit without a biometric system, no further riots occurred and ex-combatants were discharged in a controlled manner. More importantly, each dollar disbursed to any participant was documented and tracked in the system to that individual.

Whilst an MIS cannot replace a well-designed DDR programme and implementation plan, the MIS must be planned for during the assessment phase and should be deployed and operational before the process starts.

*Source: UNDP*
Step 3: Set up the monitoring system

Typically, a DDR monitoring system makes use of a mix of the following elements:

- performance monitoring, which focuses on outputs, outcomes and impact
- process monitoring and field visits, which capture inputs, activities and outputs
- information management (see Step 2), which monitors all components.

Together these elements form a solid, yet simple monitoring system which covers the most important aspects of a DDR programme.

Performance monitoring

To set up the performance monitoring tool, the information is entered in the monitoring framework in an indicator tracking sheet which contains a list of results expected, each with its corresponding indicator(s). Then, for each indicator, the respective baseline and target (with month/year) are recorded, and space provided for the inclusion of all updates on progress with respect to the indicator. This can best be done using a text-processing or spreadsheet software, rather than using a database.

Given the dynamic environment of DDR programmes, it is recommended that DDR indicators are monitored on a monthly basis. To update indicators more often does not usually provide much new and meaningful information. To do so less frequently
might result in missing crucial new information for decision-making in a volatile and
dynamic environment typical for a DDR programme.

This monitoring tool, like the others described later in this section, serves as
an invaluable source of readily available information to answer queries from
headquarters, donors, or staff needing to respond to media questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracts from a DDR indicator tracking sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field visits

Field visits are a monitoring tool primarily used for validation of reported progress and results. The emphasis is on observing and ascertaining credible information on progress being made towards the attainment of outputs and outcomes.

During field visits, DDR staff from programme headquarters typically visit implementing partners at their work site, and regional DDR offices or communities engaged in the DDR process.

There are two reasons why a field visit should be conducted:

- DDR programmes need to define a policy of routine field visits. For example, a DDR programme M&E unit can decide to conduct a minimum of one field visit to each implementing partner per quarter.

- Field visits can also be conducted on an ad-hoc basis. These can serve to validate unclear reports or to collect more information on a problem or a conflict.

The overall coordination for field visits is the responsibility of the DDR M&E unit or the M&E expert. It is usually more effective to have a team of two or three people conducting a field visit. Joint field visits that include government and donor representatives can be especially useful. Depending on the purpose and the unit visited, the team can consist of:

- DDR programme staff from headquarters
- DDR M&E staff
- DDR programme management staff
- DDR gender focal point or expert
- government representatives
- donor representatives
- representatives from UN agencies and missions.

Process monitoring

DDR programmes are typically large and complex. In many cases, it will be valuable to not only monitor results, but also the process which leads to their achievement. As noted before, especially in conflict/post-conflict areas, how M&E (and other project activities) are undertaken can materially affect the success of the project. Process monitoring is also a prime tool to monitor the internal gender responsiveness of the DDR programme.

Be aware that process monitoring is also a potential source of conflict, since DDR programme staff may perceive it as examining and reporting on their own performance. Nevertheless, it is indispensable to demonstrate transparency and accountability in DDR programmes.
As with performance monitoring, first establish who needs what information. Typically, the primary user of process monitoring is the DDR programme management, and the primary objective is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the DDR programme and ensure that tensions between target groups are minimized. To ensure conflict sensitivity, specific indicators to measure whether the process of project implementation is conflict sensitive can be included in results matrices.

Process monitoring also refers to the fact that many DDR programmes use the services of national or international partners to implement parts of the programme. This is typically the case with support to social and economic reintegration. These implementing partners may be local or international NGOs, bilateral or multilateral organizations, the private sector or community organizations. They implement programmes and services within the UN-supported DDR operation based on contracts with the joint implementing unit of the National Commission for DDR. The implementing partners are accountable to the joint implementing unit in technical and financial matters and will usually report on a regular basis.

The role of process monitoring is to track implementation reports, monitor if they fulfil their contractual reporting obligations and summarize findings from the implementation report:

- **To track implementation reports**, DDR M&E units can design a simple Excel sheet with the following fields: date the report is due, status (not due, received, delayed), date the report is received, delay in days, and provide a hyperlink to the report. This data can be aggregated by implementing partners to compare their reporting performance. Aggregated data can also be used to calculate the following useful indicators and track them over time:
  - percentage of reports received in time
  - percentage of reports currently delayed (disaggregated by regions and implementing partners)
  - average number of days reports are delayed.

- **To summarize findings** from various implementation reports, M&E staff will also need to make use of a qualitative approach. The DDR M&E unit can analyse reports with regard to frequent concerns or challenges, collect lessons learned from the reports and look for opportunities where the experience and expertise of an implementing partner can help another partner.

While tracking implementing partners is one important aspect of process monitoring, human resources, regional office, gender responsiveness, public information and budgetary issues can also be tracked through relevant indicators.
### Example of areas and indicators for process monitoring of DDR programmes

#### Human Resources
- Total number of male and female DDR programme staff
- Ratio of male to female among DDR programme staff
- Ratio of international to national among DDR programme staff
- % of staff based in DDR headquarters
- % of male and female staff based in DDR headquarters
- % of DDR programme staff that completed gender training
- % of overall budget spent on international staff

#### Implementing Partners
- Number of active implementing partners with signed contracts
- US$ disbursed to implementation partners
- % of DDR budget for implementing partners compared to overall expenditure

#### Public Information
- % of funds spent on public information and sensitization
- Number of hits on DDR programme website
- Number of permanent staff in public information unit

#### Budgetary Issues
- US$ in millions received
- Current total expenditure in millions of US$
- % of funds received which have been disbursed
- Monthly expenditure by DDR programme
- % of expenditures which are administrative overhead costs
**Step 4: Monitor DDR results**

Once the monitoring system is set up, monitoring the DDR programme can begin. Monitoring should commence from day one of implementation. It consists of **quantitative and qualitative monitoring**, the **analysis** of data, **reporting** the findings on progress (see Step 7) and – if needed - the **adjustment** of the DDR programme.

**Quantitative monitoring**

The key tools for monitoring performance are the indicators defined in the monitoring framework and the indicator tracking sheets. The monitoring framework designates **who is collecting what data, from which source, and how often.** The M&E unit in a DDR programme makes sure that the information is collected on time and has the responsibility to update the indicator tracking sheets on a regular basis.

Many of the indicators at the output level will have new data available at least on a **monthly basis.** Much of the new data will feed in directly from a DDR MIS like DREAM. However, new data for indicators is not always available, especially on the outcome and impact level, when the indicator tracking sheets are updated. In these cases, the past data remains valid until new data becomes available.
Qualitative monitoring

Qualitative monitoring consists of receiving, collating, systematically storing and sharing all information on the DDR programme which is not numeric but text-based. This includes field visit reports, reports from implementing partners, and other reports produced by the DDR programme and other organizations. To monitor qualitative information, use the information system described in Step 2.

Data analysis

A thorough analysis of the data collected through quantitative and qualitative monitoring should typically be conducted on a monthly basis for DDR programmes, or more often if needed. For meaningful interpretation of data, combine two complementary approaches:

- **Quantitative data analysis** is strong at objectively indicating *what* is happening. Because it is often numeric, a certain understanding of statistical methods is needed. DDR M&E staff members need to be able to read, analyse and interpret data and to use statistics as evidence in arguments. Keep in mind that gender is an important category for quantitative data analysis, and meaningful quantitative data often needs to be disaggregated by sex and age as an easy and inexpensive way to improve the DDR programme.

- More in-depth analysis is needed to understand *why* something is happening. **Qualitative data analysis** is based on subjective, rich and in-depth information normally presented in the form of words. Examples are narrative reports from implementing partners, field visit reports, anecdotal evidence from DDR regional office, narrative analyses by other organizations, etc.

For greater credibility, triangulation may be used. **Triangulation** is the use of three or more theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis, to verify and substantiate an assessment. The advantage of triangulation is that it reduces bias that can come from a single theory, source or type of information, and improves accuracy.

Commander satisfaction survey in Afghanistan

The DDR programme in Afghanistan conducted a satisfaction survey of its Commanders Incentive Programme (CIP) in 2007.

The survey collected information from 107 ex-commanders. Staff of the DDR regional offices conducted the interviews in 14 provinces representing all regions of Afghanistan. The data was analyzed by the DDR M&E unit in Kabul.

The questionnaire included questions on the commanders’ satisfaction with the reintegration process, the options and packages provided, the training and courses offered and the impact and sustainability of the training.

*Source: Afghanistan New Beginnings Programme (ANBP), CIP Satisfaction Survey, April 2007*
What to do if the DDR programme changes

Many DDR programmes operate in a volatile and dynamic environment, and are therefore prone to unexpected developments and changes in the approach to DDR. Generally, outputs are more likely to be changed than outcomes or the impact. Indicators, but especially indicator targets, should not be changed unless absolutely necessary.

- If the outputs or outcomes of a DDR programme are changed, the monitoring framework with the indicators needs to change as well.

- If indicators need to be changed (because they do not cover all important aspects or because they do not measure the right thing), the changes should be recorded and the rationale behind the changes well documented. It is good practice to retain the previous indicators or target as a footnote in the monitoring framework.

In general, all changes made to the result framework and the monitoring framework should be based on a broad consensus of stakeholders. If stakeholders agree upon changes, the reason and the decisions should be clearly documented.

and credibility of data. For example, the information from a sample survey of ex-combatants may be combined with results of focus group interviews and on-site observations to reach a solid, triangulated judgement. In addition to triangulation, using data disaggregated by sex and age will provide a different perspective and thus allow a more subtle level of analysis.

Data analysis should not be conducted by the DDR M&E unit in isolation. It must, to the extent possible, involve key stakeholders, especially in the analysis at the outcome and output level. Continued stakeholder participation in data analysis cannot be assumed, it must be institutionalized to function properly, for example through regular meetings where monitoring results are shared and discussed. For DDR programmes, this usually involves the National DDR Technical Planning and Coordination Agency and the National Commission on DDR. Although the staff of the National Commission may not be able to conduct data analysis, it is important that they are involved in discussions and validation of the data analysis and its subsequent interpretation.
### How to use sample surveys

Secondary data is usually available on the impact level (often in the form of national or international statistical data), while much of the data for outputs will come from the DDR MIS, or from implementing partners. However, data on the success of reintegration is typically not available and needs to be collected. Most DDR programmes will need to use some form of survey to measure progress and success at the outcome level.

For DDR programmes, **rapid, small-scale sample surveys with a small sample size and only a few variables** are powerful instruments to collect data at the outcome level. Small, limited sample surveys for DDR are more feasible than large, complex surveys. Large-scale, technically complex surveys are expensive, time-consuming and more appropriate for academic research or special studies. Small-scale surveys with a limited set of questions administered to a small group of programme participants or community leaders, and based on non-random sampling, can also produce relevant numeric data.

Most DDR programmes will not have the **technical expertise and experience** to design a credible sample survey and to calculate the sample size. That is why most DDR sample surveys will need to be, at least partially, designed and analysed by external specialists.

Ideally, **enumerators** (i.e. those who conduct the interviews) will be external to the project to avoid a potential bias. However, DDR programmes often operate in an environment where access is limited and security a concern for external enumerators. As an alternative, **DDR staff** based in the field can be used to collect data if: a) the staff members are well trained in interview techniques; and b) they are not involved in collecting data from ex-combatants or communities they previously directly worked with. **Target beneficiary members** can also be trained, with representatives of the different groups included in the training, so bias is minimized. For example, a small team of DDR staff can be identified and seconded for a sample survey, trained in a central location and subsequently deployed in areas they have not worked in previously. It is essential that both men and women participants and beneficiaries are included in the sample. Previous experience with DDR surveys has shown that rapid, small sample surveys tend to exclude women and women’s organizations from the process.
**Step 5: Monitor DDR risks**

Because DDR programmes are often implemented in a volatile context, monitoring risks is crucial. There are real and specific risks associated with dealing with ex-combatants: they are armed (often even after disarmament), usually not patient, they may have little respect for civilian project staff and they can be demanding and intimidating.

Proactive and systematic monitoring of identified risks may allow the DDR programme to mitigate threats and take calculated actions to pursue opportunities. Monitoring risks will also be informed by the continuous updating of the overall conflict analysis for the area.

Based on the identification of risks at the output/outcome level and at the outcome/impact level, risks in DDR programmes should be monitored at least on a **monthly** basis, together with the update of the indicator tracking sheets. An update should also be triggered on an ad hoc basis by any unexpected development.

Monitoring risks involves the following three tasks:

- existing risks need to be re-assessed if their status has changed;
- newly-emerged risks for DDR need to be logged and described; and
- already recorded risks which are no longer relevant can be deleted from the risk log.

If the risk status has changed, a new relevant risk has emerged or a risk could be eliminated, assess what threats and opportunities the changed environment present for DDR. There can be a new need for mitigating action or pursuing new opportunities. This analysis and its potential implications for the DDR programme need to be effectively communicated to DDR management and other stakeholders (see Step 7).
Monitoring the security situation in Haiti

The DDR programme in Haiti used five quantitative indicators as a basis for assigning changes in the security situation of the country on a monthly basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspects detained</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons confiscated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead bodies found</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostages rescued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammunition confiscated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on: DDR Quarterly Report, Integrated DDR Section UNDP – MINUSTAH, July/August 2006*
Step 6: Manage DDR evaluations

When managing DDR evaluations, base decisions on the evaluation plan (see Chapter 2). Given the usually volatile and changing environment of DDR programmes, the evaluation plan will need to be adjusted over time. Again, changes in the evaluation plan should be based on an agreement with stakeholders, especially the National Commission for DDR and financial partners.

In most cases, an evaluation will be externally commissioned and internally managed. External evaluations are regarded as being more objective and less prone to bias, and thus usually have more credibility. In some cases, a combination of external evaluators and UN staff from headquarters or other DDR programmes may be the preferred option. Whatever the situation, an evaluation must be managed. General detailed guidelines on managing evaluations can be found in the Standards for Evaluation in the UN System by the United Nations Evaluation Group (see www.uneg.org).

Although most DDR staff will be involved at some point in an evaluation, it is useful to form a small evaluation focal team to manage the evaluation. This team of three to four staff members should assume primary responsibility for the organization of the evaluation. Working as a team is more efficient than working alone because DDR programmes are usually large and the processes complex. In large DDR programmes, it is recommended that the evaluation focal team consists of the following staff (where they exist):

- senior programme manager
- head of the M&E unit (or M&E specialist in smaller programmes)
- head of the reintegration unit
- head of the disarmament or demobilization unit
- DDR gender focal point or expert
- head of the information and sensitization unit.

Managing an evaluation consists of three phases: before, during and after the evaluation.

---

**Key activities to manage an evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the evaluation:</th>
<th>During the evaluation:</th>
<th>After the evaluation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>define evaluation details</td>
<td>provide logistical and administrative support</td>
<td>assure the quality and use of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calculate costs</td>
<td>liaise and backstop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft Terms of Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hire the evaluation team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Define Evaluation Details

Based on the evaluation plan, define the following details of the evaluation:

**What mix of methods should the evaluation use?**

While the details of the method mix can be left to the evaluation specialists hired, define the general mix of evaluation methods to be used by the evaluation team. There is a big difference in the duration and resources needed to conduct an evaluation based on key informant interviews, compared to an evaluation which involves a sample survey. More guidance on how to refine the methods for an evaluation, for example, is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation/methodology/methods/mth_dsg_en.htm.

**Should individual evaluators or a firm be hired?**

For DDR programmes it is unlikely that a firm with special DDR expertise can be identified. For this reason, DDR evaluations will mostly be carried out by individual evaluators. Forming a temporary team of at least two individuals offers the right combination of DDR and evaluation expertise.

**How many team members should the evaluation team include?**

A typical DDR evaluation team should consist of at least two evaluators: one specialist on evaluation techniques and one DDR specialist, with at least one of the team members having the appropriate gender expertise. Depending on the purpose of the evaluation, additional expertise can also be included: community, weapons management, conflict sensitivity, etc. In addition, it is usually more effective to hire national researchers prior to the evaluation to carry out preliminary research and prepare the ground for the evaluation. It is paramount for the credibility of an evaluation that all team members are completely independent from the DDR programme. They must have absolutely no connection with the design, formulation or implementation of the DDR programme and cannot be employed in the future by the DDR programme for at least one year.

**Should evaluators be international and national?**

For many DDR evaluations, the best choice is to combine international evaluators with broad experience in DDR and evaluations, with national experts who have a better grasp of the local context and are better able to communicate with beneficiaries and partners. To minimize potential bias or conflict of interests, it is common practice that the team leader is an international specialist. The lead evaluator must ensure the overall integrity of the evaluation team. He/she is ultimately responsible for safeguarding the objectivity and independence of the team and the resulting evaluation report. Striving for gender and geographic balance among team members is good practice for evaluation teams.
**How long will the evaluation last?**

Depending on the type and the scope, a typical DDR mid-term evaluation will take between four and six weeks for a team of two evaluators. A typical terminal evaluation for a DDR programme might take between six and 10 weeks and require a larger team.

**Calculate the costs**

Costing will depend on how early in the programme cycle the evaluation takes place. A terminal evaluation is usually more complex and expensive than a mid-term evaluation. It also depends on how many evaluators are needed, how many evaluation questions have to be answered and how much time is required. Keep in mind that gender commitment has to be followed or expressed in the budgetary commitment as well. This means that gender expertise has to be included in the evaluation team, which may have implications on the costs of the evaluation.

---

### Examples of time frame and budget required for a DDR Mid-Term Evaluation and a DDR Terminal Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>DDR Mid-Term Evaluation</th>
<th>DDR Terminal Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial visit of team leader (on-site)</td>
<td>½ week</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk reviews (off-site)</td>
<td>1½ weeks</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation mission on-site (incl. first draft report and debriefing)</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>5½ weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of final report (off-site)</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>1½ weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 weeks</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 weeks</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakdown of the resources required for:**

| National consultants - research                                         | 2 x 2 weeks             | 2 x 3 weeks             |
| International experts - mission                                         | 1 x 6 weeks             | 2 x 10 weeks            |
| National experts - mission                                              | 1 x 6 weeks             | 2 x 10 weeks            |
| Travel costs                                                            | Travel and DSA for national and international experts | Travel and DSA for national and international experts |
Draft the Terms of Reference

This section provides all the information needed to draft the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation. The structure of the TOR should follow the Standard for Evaluation in the UN System (see www.uneg.org):

- context for the evaluation
- purpose of the evaluation
- scope (what is covered and what is not covered by the evaluation)
- key evaluation questions
- methodology (approach for data collection and analysis and involvement of stakeholders)
- work plan, organization and budget
- products and reporting
- use of evaluation results.

Because the TOR condenses the key elements of the planned evaluation, they should be broadly discussed with stakeholders and agreed upon in a participatory manner. A broad agreement at this point will help avoid conflicts over the evaluation later on.

Hire the evaluation team

Once the structure of the evaluation team is defined and the TOR agreed upon, identify the evaluators and have them recruited through the responsible human resource unit.

The process of hiring the evaluation team needs to be highly transparent and well documented. At a later point in time, the rationale and the decision path of the selection process should be evident from written or electronic documents. For this purpose, write a decision log which records the different steps taken in the selection process for the expert team.

Gender-sensitive TORs for evaluations

Evaluations must take into consideration gender responsiveness as a cross-cutting issue, as well as looking at specific gender-related activities. When external evaluators are contracted, make sure to include the following in their TORs:

- explicitly require that proven gendered expertise is included within the evaluation team
- explicitly include gender-specific aspects of the DDR programme (e.g. gendered aspects of income generating and micro-finance projects, on participants, beneficiaries and receiving communities, on the overall local market etc.)
- explicitly ask data to be presented throughout the report in a sex and age-disaggregated manner and to explain the reasons for possible differences.

Resources to identify potential evaluators and researchers

- Evaluation networks like MandE News or Eval-Net
- Vacancy bulletins like the vacancy bulletin of http://www.reliefweb.int
- Local universities and research institutions
- National evaluation associations
Apart from being well-qualified, the selected evaluation team should, to the extent possible, be gender-balanced. Gender considerations on who interviews whom will depend on the local context and culture and need to be considered prior to hiring an evaluation team.

The final decision about the evaluation team should again be participatory, to make sure evaluation results are considered credible by key stakeholders.

**Provide logistical and administrative support**

The DDR M&E unit can provide logistical support to the evaluation team upon request (and if not agreed upon in the TOR) in the following areas:

- arrange meetings with interview partners from the National DDR Commission, the DDR Joint Implementation Unit, donor representatives, UN inter-agency working group etc;
- arrange travel and field visits and provide means of transport in line with the security regulations in the country;
- provide temporary office space and equipment;
- support the team in obtaining additional material, if the evaluators have difficulties doing so; and
- suggest additional documents and information for review to the evaluation team.

If requested by the evaluation team, the M&E unit should provide a list of stakeholders the team might be interested to meet. However, keep in mind that the team leader is ultimately responsible for identifying which people to meet and which documents to review.

DDR staff should not participate in any meetings of the evaluation team. This might interfere with the interviews conducted, since interviewees might not always feel comfortable to speak freely.

**Liaise and backstop**

During the evaluation, the DDR evaluation focal team should liaise formally every two or three days with the evaluation team to be briefed on progress, and to be invited to suggest further action, or offer additional insights. Only if the evaluation focal team are well-informed, can the evaluation team be fairly pushed to justify its conclusions, back them up with evidence, and help deepen and clarify the evaluation team’s discussions.
Assure the quality and use of the evaluation

During the evaluation and after the draft evaluation report has been submitted, the evaluation focal team needs to make sure that the evaluation is of sufficiently high quality.

The evaluation team is bound by the TOR, which should also provide the framework for assessing the quality of the evaluation. Apart from making sure that the method mix used is in line with the TOR, a key element of quality assurance is to make sure that all evaluation questions are adequately answered and that the arguments leading to judgements are clear and logical.

Further, the DDR evaluation focal team should make sure that the evaluation report is readable, accessible and follows the evaluation report structure defined in the Standards for Evaluation in the UN System (see www.undg.org).

In order to ensure the quality of an evaluation, the evaluation manager should ensure that the evaluation is built on a well thought-out evaluation approach and design, including a clear rationale for the methodological approach, and that all findings are backed by data or other evidence. For a more detailed assessment of the quality of an evaluation, evaluation managers can make use of checklists. A useful and comprehensive checklist to assess the quality of an evaluation is the Program Evaluation Metaevaluation Checklist. This checklist concentrates on the use, feasibility, propriety and accuracy of an evaluation and assigns a score from 0/1 (poor) to 6 (excellent) to each of a total of 30 criteria (see http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/program_metaeval.pdf).

Evaluations are expensive and time-consuming, so it is paramount to make sure that the findings are put to use. Managers of evaluations can promote the use of evaluation results in many ways. The time spent carefully planning the evaluation so that it meets the needs of decision-makers pays off at this point. The Utilization-Focused Evaluation checklist by Michael Quinn Patton provides guidance for conducting evaluations from a utilization-focused perspective, which is oriented around an evaluation’s intended users and uses (see http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/ufe.pdf). Evaluations should also be widely shared with the DDR community, for example through the UN DDR Resource Centre (see http://www.unddr.org/)
**Step 7: Report on progress**

Reporting on progress must be based on information collected through M&E. Good reporting is about getting the right information to the right user in time. The user can subsequently use performance feedback to improve the DDR programme. In addition, reporting also increases transparency. DDR donors or the media will want to know what has been achieved with the funds provided.

For effective reporting on progress, take into consideration the information needs of the target group. In order to know what information partners expect, and in what form they prefer to receive the information, it is useful to discuss and agree on a reporting format which fulfils their information needs. However, also try to agree on a common reporting format for most partners to minimize the workload.

If the monitoring system is well-designed, a key tool for reporting on progress and success is the indicators. When reporting on delivery of outputs or progress towards outcomes or impacts, indicators should always be the first point of reference. Their strength is that good indicators are objective and credible yardsticks of progress.

Current status data for indicators must be analysed and reported in context. A comparison over time will show trends and changes. To establish a time line with indicator data, have at least three points in time: the indicator baseline, the current status of the indicator, and the indicator target. The more data points there are in between the baseline and the target, the more compelling the trends.

![Indicator data over time](image)

Apart from performance monitoring, reporting on progress of DDR programmes will also refer to the following sources:
The data analysis which combines both quantitative (numeric) and qualitative information (reports, assessments, anecdotal evidence, etc.) during Step 3 may yield useful conclusions.

The risk log and the risk monitoring system can provide useful information for explaining and supplementing performance information.

The DDR Management Information System will usually have additional, detailed information at the output level not captured through indicators. Some of it may be relevant to the report. For example, the ex-combatant profiles can be aggregated to produce a profile of a typical ex-combatant.

New information generated by a monitoring system or by evaluations needs to be made available immediately to DDR key stakeholders. This will typically include the DDR programme management, the national oversight institutions such as the National Commission for DDR, DDR participants and beneficiaries, and donors. Timely and accessible information on the DDR programme also enhances the transparency of the DDR process. There are different ways that DDR M&E units or specialists can disseminate updated information on performance monitoring to stakeholders:

- Regular meetings with DDR senior management and national stakeholders such as the National Commission for DDR.

- Regular fortnightly or monthly M&E bulletins with updated monitoring information based on information needs and including a special section on gender issues; in Liberia, for example, the DDR programme produced fortnightly reports on disarmament and demobilization and monthly reports on reinsertion and reintegration and distributed them by email to DDR staff and other stakeholders.

- Regularly updated intranet (with restricted access for internal use) or internet (for public viewing).

- Mechanisms through which programme participants are kept informed are also important, particularly, for instance, when surveys have been conducted; they should have a chance to hear the results in their own language; to effectively inform programme participants and beneficiaries, the DDR gender focal point will be useful in establishing the best way to reach female and male ex-combatants, their supporters and dependants.

An important client of information generated by the M&E system is the information and sensitization unit of DDR programmes. The data derived from DDR performance monitoring directly feeds into public information and strategic communication in support of DDR. Typically, this unit will disseminate the information and use it to update the DDR information on the Country Office website.
For information to be easily understood, present data in a clear and understandable form (written summaries, oral presentations\textsuperscript{6}, visual presentations, and graphics). Usually, a good way to do this is to present numeric information in easy-to-read graphs (disaggregated by sex and age, where relevant).

\textsuperscript{6} Particularly important for balanced gender-access to information, as typically, there are higher illiteracy rates among women than men.
The DDR programme will necessarily face closure at some point in time. The disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants may end with the programme closure, or it may be continued under the authority of national institutions. In many cases, DDR activities will gradually be replaced by new programmes of national recovery, reintegration and development.

Clearly, the primary responsibility of the DDR programme is to ensure that its achievements are sustained, and that the exit strategy, either as envisaged in the programme document, or as agreed upon during the programme period, is properly instituted. Programme managers and the M&E staff will need to ensure that this is carried out satisfactorily.

There is, however, another responsibility of M&E staff: to close the programme M&E system and to hand over M&E to one or more national institutions. To enable maximum advantage to be taken from the closure and hand-over processes, one must plan ahead for these in good time, ideally from the mid-term point in the programme period.

The key questions are:

- **What** can be handed over? What assets are there, specific to M&E, which can usefully be handed over to national institutions?
- **To whom** can these be handed? Which organizations or institutions can benefit from such hand-overs?
- **How** should these hand-overs be implemented?
- **What** needs to be done during the months or years *prior* to closure of the programme, to maximize any benefit that can be drawn from the hand-overs envisaged?
### Illustrative example of M&E ‘assets’ for hand-over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Asset’ for Hand-Over (for example)</th>
<th>Potential Recipients (for example)</th>
<th>Pre-Closure Tasks to Ensure Maximum Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key documents (programme document, reports received, reports produced, evaluations, etc.)</td>
<td>Headquarters National Commission</td>
<td>Collate in single folder and create CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E systems (management information system, indicator tracking system, monitoring frameworks, etc.)</td>
<td>National Commission National Planning Office Other country offices</td>
<td>Collate in single folder and create CD Provide training and/or written guidance on use of the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication systems (intranet, internet, newsletter templates, etc.)</td>
<td>National Commission National Planning Office DDR community of practice</td>
<td>Create CD Provide written guidance on use of the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>Headquarters National Commission DDR community of practice</td>
<td>Document and distribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The national staff employed in M&amp;E unit</td>
<td>National Civil Service Commission National NGOs</td>
<td>Provide needs-based on-the-job training Publicize availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other national staff from other offices, with whom M&amp;E unit has worked</td>
<td>The offices employing them</td>
<td>Provide needs-based on-the-job training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E staff personnel records</td>
<td>Headquarters (HR)</td>
<td>Collate records; hold exit interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Closing the programme M&E system

When closing the programme M&E system, ensure a proper and orderly process:

- **Collect, organize and digitalize M&E data**
  As a first step, collect, organize and digitalize all potentially relevant M&E data. This includes meeting minutes, templates, pictures, maps, surveys, evaluation
How to close and hand over an M&E system

Reports, databases, software, etc. If not already available in digital form, these should be digitalized for easy storage and transport.

- **Document lessons learned**
  A great deal of knowledge is accumulated during the implementation of a DDR programme, including gendered lessons learned. To make sure that this knowledge is properly recorded and can be used again for similar programmes, the M&E unit should start the process of capturing all lessons learned, a minimum of one year before the DDR programme is due to close. The documentation of lessons learned can use a variety of tools: concept notes, lessons learned papers, or comparative experience papers.

- **Exit interviews**
  With a high staff turnover, and many staff who will leave after the DDR programme has ended, the M&E unit can systematically conduct exit interviews with staff before their contracts expire. Exit interviews should also contain specific questions on gendered lessons learned. Such interviews can be valuable not only for lessons learned, but also provide material for inclusion in references and testimonials for those staff.

- **Hand-over to relevant headquarters unit as repository**
  All information should subsequently be handed over to national stakeholders and relevant units in headquarters which should serve as a repository. This can be in the form of digital CDs for easy transport.

  If the programme has been run in a participatory way, engaging with local partners and building national capacity, this will greatly help smooth the exit process and support the likelihood of sustainability of project benefits.

**Handing over M&E**

To maximize benefits at the national level from the upcoming hand-over of M&E, consider the following strategies:

- **‘Nationalize’ DDR programme staff**
  A powerful strategy to build up national capacity is to increase the proportion of national staff working in the DDR programme, including the M&E unit. It is
useful to track the percentage of national staff in DDR programmes, as well as the proportion of national DDR staff at a certain managerial level, from the beginning, as part of implementation monitoring.

- **Final surge on national capacity development**
  One or two years before the DDR programme is to end, consider shifting the focus of the programme more towards developing national capacity. The workload will have decreased somewhat once the M&E unit is fully established and reporting systems are operating smoothly, and time can more easily be found for capacity development of national staff, whether through formal training programmes or informal on-the-job peer training, or a combination of both. When operations start to slow down at the end of the programme, even more time may become available to focus on national capacity development, of national staff directly employed, and those from other organizations with whom the office may have been collaborating.

- **Plan ex-post evaluations and survey**
  The final year or two of a DDR programme is also the time when any ex-post evaluations should be planned and prepared. It is useful to prepare in advance the necessary documentation for a desk review, make sure that a budget is secured, the broad method is determined and a clear time frame is set for the evaluation.

- **Transfer M&E to a national entity**
  Since DDR is likely to continue in some form after the end of a DDR programme, consider how to transfer the existing M&E system, the data it contains and its tools to a relevant national entity. This can be the National Commission for DDR or a line ministry responsible for longer term national recovery and reintegration strategies. However, since the agreement to disarm and demobilize is often based on trusting a neutral body like the UN, the transfer of all data can be regarded as a breach of confidentiality. It needs to be clear from the beginning of the DDR process which data will be transferred from the DDR programme. In general, when transferring the M&E system to a national entity, make sure that no information is transferred which could be used to prosecute or stigmatize individuals in the DDR process.
Conclusion

DDR practitioners are usually under considerable pressure to plan, design and implement programmes quickly. However, to demonstrate the progress and success of DDR programmes, proper monitoring and evaluating is essential. Therefore, M&E has to be an integral part of DDR planning and implementation.

Well-planned monitoring and focused evaluation make a DDR programme more effective and help to distinguish what works and what does not. Good M&E can increase accountability to all stakeholders and support resource mobilization.

Traditionally, DDR planners and practitioners have been more familiar with monitoring and evaluating inputs and implementation. The key challenge is to track the (re)integration of ex-combatants into communities, and to determine if the DDR programme has contributed to security and stability after conflict.

During the planning phase of a DDR programme, planners need to define a clear result chain, decide what needs to be monitored and evaluated, choose a meaningful set of indicators and define the capacities and budget required for M&E. During implementation, DDR programme staff need to monitor progress towards results, monitor external risks, manage external evaluations and report the relevant information to the right stakeholders.

It is hoped that DDR planners and programme managers will find useful advice and support within this guide.
## Annex 1: Examples of DDR Indicators

### Impact:

1. **Security and stability in post-conflict environment enhanced for both men and women to allow recovery and development to begin**
   - No. of instances of factional fighting per quarter and who are the targeted victims (disaggregated by sex and age)
   - No. of incidences of explosive attacks (bomb, suicide, improvised explosive devices, grenade, rocket) per quarter
   - No. of gun shot wounds treated in trauma hospital in capital city per quarter (disaggregated by sex and age)
   - No. of bomb injuries treated in trauma hospital in capital city per quarter (disaggregated by sex and age)
   - No. of incidences of recorded homicide per quarter (disaggregated by sex and age)
   - No. of incidences of recorded rape per quarter (disaggregated by sex and age)
   - No. of incidences of recorded aggravated assault per quarter (disaggregated by sex and age)

### Outcomes:

1.1. **8,000 male and female combatants are disarmed, demobilized and socially reintegrated into communities of their choice and are economically active**
   - No. of ex-combatants who formally finish the reintegration programme (disaggregated by sex and age)
   - Ratio of ex-combatants who formally finish the reintegration programme compared to ex-combatants who enter reintegration programme (disaggregated by sex and age). Collect reasons for leaving
   - No. and % of ex-combatants who are economically active at least 6 months after reintegration support ceased
   - No. and % of women associated with armed forces and groups who are economically active at least 6 months after reintegration support ceased
   - Ratio of ex-combatants who are economically active at least 6 months after reintegration support ceased compared to no. of ex-combatants who formally finish a reintegration package (disaggregated by sex and age)
   - % of ex-combatants who are very satisfied or satisfied\(^7\) with the disarmament and demobilization process (disaggregated by sex and age)

\(^7\) Based on a sample survey using questionnaires to measure client satisfaction; the questionnaire offers three possible answers: very satisfied, satisfied, not satisfied.
1.1. % of male and female ex-combatants who are very satisfied or satisfied with the reintegration assistance (disaggregated by sex and age)

% of women associated with armed forces and groups who are very satisfied or satisfied with the reintegration assistance

% of communities with at least 100 ex-combatants (disaggregated by sex and age and maybe also between officers/troops) who think that ex-combatants are very integrated or reasonably integrated in the community at least 1 year after DDR support has ceased

1.2. 350 communities receive and support ex-combatants and associated groups in their reintegration

% of community leaders of communities (disaggregated by sex and age) which received support through the DDR programme who are very satisfied or satisfied with the support they received for reintegrating ex-combatants

% of community leaders in communities (disaggregated by sex and age) with at least 50 ex-combatants that indicate that ex-combatants are very integrated or reasonably integrated in their community at least one year after DDR support has ceased

Outputs:

1.1.1. 10,000 female and male combatants are disarmed

No. of combatants referred to the programme for disarmament and demobilization and by whom (disaggregated by sex and age)

No. of officers referred to the programme for disarmament and demobilization (disaggregated by sex and age)

% of referred combatants verified by national verification committee (disaggregated by sex and age)

No. of combatants disarmed (disaggregated by sex and age)

No. and type of weapons received by the DDR programme from combatants (disaggregated by sex and age)

No. and type of weapons received by the DDR programme from communities

1.1.2. 7,000 combatants are demobilized and reinserted and 3,000 women associated with armed forces and groups are demobilized and reinserted

No. of combatants formally demobilized (disaggregated by sex and age)

% of combatants disarmed but not demobilized (disaggregated by sex and age)

% of combatants who received complete reinsertion package

% of targeted units decommissioned (disaggregated by sex and age)

No. of targeted units declared non-compliant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1.3. Examples of DDR Indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9,500 male and female ex-combatants and women associated with armed forces and groups are supported to reintegrate into their communities | ▪ No. of ex-combatants formally entering reintegration programmes (disaggregated by sex and age)  
▪ % of ex-combatants who qualify for special support for under-aged combatants (disaggregated by sex)  
▪ % of ex-combatants who demobilized but declined receiving reintegration support (disaggregated by sex and age)  
▪ Average no. of days between demobilization and start of reintegration programmes  
▪ % choosing agricultural reintegration support (disaggregated by sex and age)  
▪ % choosing small business reintegration support (disaggregated by sex and age)  
▪ % choosing educational support (disaggregated by sex and age)  
▪ % of ex-combatants who drop out of reintegration programmes (disaggregated by sex and age) |
| 1.2.1. 350 communities provided with tools and capacities to support the integration of ex-combatants and associated groups | ▪ % of 350 communities which finished a participatory planning process including representatives of women’s groups  
▪ No. of communities with at least one community micro-project funded by DDR programme  
▪ US$ in thousands provided directly to communities for community micro-projects |
Annex 2: Terms of Reference for DDR evaluations

1. Background (recommended length: ½ - 1 page)
   - What is the context of the DDR programme?
   - Who are the key stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries of the DDR programme?

2. Objectives of the evaluation (recommended length: 1 page)
   - Why is the evaluation being done?
   - Why is the evaluation being done at this time?
   - For what purpose will the evaluation be used?

   Typical objectives for DDR evaluations are:
   - Assess early hypothesis and working assumptions; analyse outcomes from pilot interventions and activities (formal internal evaluation).
   - Evaluate the performance of the DDR programme, including gender responsiveness, so far and progress towards planned outcomes (mid-term evaluation).
   - Evaluate the overall outcome of a DDR programme, including gender responsiveness; evaluate to what extent outcomes have contributed to broader impact (terminal evaluation).
   - Evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the results produced by the DDR programme, particularly the sustainability of positive outcomes, direct and indirect impact on security conditions, prospects for peacebuilding and consequences for economic productivity and development (ex-post evaluation).

3. Scope (recommended length: ½ - 1 page)
   - Does the evaluation cover disarmament, demobilization and reintegration?

   Does the evaluation equally cover all three main components of DDR, or does it focus on one aspect of DDR? Early evaluations will focus more on disarmament and demobilization, while terminal and ex-post evaluations typically focus on the success of reintegration.
What is the time frame to be covered by the evaluation?

Does the evaluation cover the entire DDR programme from the very beginning, or does it concentrate on the more recent past? What is the cut-off date for the evaluation (the date from which no data or information will be considered)?

What is the geographic coverage of the evaluation?

Does the evaluation cover the entire geographic area of the DDR programme, or does it focus on a smaller geographic area?

4. Evaluation questions (recommended length: 1 - 2 pages)

What are the key questions the evaluation will attempt to answer?

A typical DDR evaluation will be able to answer credibly and in-depth about three to five key questions. These key questions should already be defined in the DDR M&E strategy (see Chapter 2, Step 2 – Define what needs to be monitored and evaluated).

Typical key questions for DDR evaluations are:

- How effective and efficient has the DDR programme been in disarming and demobilizing male and female ex-combatants? What are the differences in the effectiveness of reaching males vs. females?
- How suitable are the reintegration options offered to male and female ex-combatants and women associated with armed forces and groups? Were the different needs of men and women adequately addressed?
- To what extent are male and female ex-combatants who received full reintegration assistance economically active after DDR support has stopped?
- To what extent have male and female ex-combatants been able to adapt to civilian life and adopt non-violent behaviour (self-inflicted violence, interpersonal violence and inter-group violence)?
- How has the security situation evolved in the country during and after the DDR programme? To what extent has the DDR programme contributed to the change in the security situation?


- How relevant is what the DDR programme does? (relevance)
- How well does the DDR programme produce the products and services it committed itself to deliver? (efficiency)
- How well do these deliverables translate into progress towards the outcome? (effectiveness)
- How sustainable is the support provided by the DDR programme? (sustainability)
• To what extent do the DDR outcomes contribute to the overall impact? (impact)

5. Methods (recommended length: ½ - 1 page)

- **What method is suggested to answer the evaluation questions?**
  
The TORs can suggest an overall approach or method for conducting an evaluation. For example, the TORs will need to define if the evaluation will include a sample survey, since this will change the funds, team composition and time needed for the evaluation. However, the details of the evaluation method should be defined by the evaluation experts together with the DDR programme staff and key stakeholders.

Typical methods to evaluate DDR programmes are:

- documentation review
- interviews with key informants
- participatory techniques like focus group panels
- field visits
- questionnaires
- sample surveys.

6. Evaluation team (recommended length: ½ - 1 page)

- **Who will conduct the evaluation?**
  
How many evaluators does the evaluation team comprise? Who is the team leader and therefore the person responsible for finalizing the evaluation report? Are they internal and external evaluators? Are they national or international evaluators; individual evaluators or a firm; gender-balanced with regard to the local context and culture? What is their required area of expertise? What are their required skills, their experience, their qualifications and relevant competencies (e.g. language skills, gender expertise)? Who is responsible for what in the evaluation team?
7. Management arrangements (recommended length: 1 - 2 pages)

- **How will the evaluation be managed?**
  
  Typical elements which define the management of an evaluation in detail are:
  
  - Who will manage the evaluation?
  - Who forms the steering committee for the evaluation (male and female members)?
  - Who will provide which logistical support in-country?
  - What is the timeframe for the evaluation process, including a detailed breakdown of activities and dates (desk review, briefings of evaluators, visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires, debriefings, preparation of report, stakeholder meeting, finalization of report, consultations and follow-up).

- **What are the expected products?**
  
  Typical products of an evaluation are:
  
  - inception report which outlines the team’s evaluation method
  - final report with findings, (gendered) recommendations, lessons learned, good practice.

- **What is the budget for the evaluation?**
  
  The budget of a DDR evaluation typically includes:
  
  - fees for consultants
  - travel and travel-related costs
  - workshop costs (briefing and debriefing stakeholder workshops)
  - administrative support
  - specific provisions to ensure gender responsiveness.
Monitoring and evaluation of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration programmes are often under-prioritized and perceived as secondary, cumbersome and time-consuming. However, M&E is not only desirable, it is integral to successful programme planning and implementation. It contributes to programme effectiveness and accountability for all stakeholders, which, in turn, support resource mobilization. By clearly identifying simple, practical steps to establish and manage an M&E system for DDR programmes, this How to Guide will make M&E more accessible to DDR managers, planners and other programme staff.