

Evaluation Report Title:

P06132 Nigeria Stability and Reconciliation Programme (NSRP) – Independent Evaluation Provider (NIEP)

Response to Evaluation Report (overarching narrative)

In 2013 the UK Department for International Development (DFID) contracted WYG International (WYG) and The Centre for Research and Documentation (CRD) to conduct the Independent Evaluation of the Nigeria Stability and Reconciliation Programme (NSRP). NSRP was a five-year (2012-2017) programme supporting Nigerian-led initiatives to manage conflict non-violently and reduce the negative impacts of violence on the most vulnerable. It was an ambitious and innovative programme operating at federal, state and local government authority level in eight of Nigeria's most conflict-affected states.

Due to the complexity and spread of the programme and the novelty of some components, WYG International was contracted to conduct an external evaluation straddling nearly the entire length of the programme. The evaluation process started with a baseline assessment in 2013, one year into the NSRP programme, while a mid-term evaluation was conducted in 2015 and the final evaluation in 2017. The final evaluation is the cumulative product of evaluation's research and findings over the full evaluation period and examines the individual and cumulative delivery and outcomes of NSRP interventions.

Through the course of the evaluation, the specific objectives, approach and methods have evolved, in close collaboration with NSRP and DFID. The final evaluation, however, remains true to the spirit of the original terms of reference. A comprehensive and mixed evaluation approach was adopted, triangulating the implementer's internal monitoring and research data with other evidence (a perception survey of the population in the target areas; undertaking nine in-depth case studies of supported platforms; a survey of platform participants; key informant interviews (KII), and a review of documentation).

The final evaluation is clearly written and presents an analytical, well-judged and balanced view based on the acknowledged limitations of data and evidence available to the independent evaluation team. Findings of the evaluation are precisely sets out and clearly summarised. The independent evaluation team has worked closely with the implementing partners in the whole evaluation exercise, starting from the baseline assessment, the mid-term evaluation and through to the Final Evaluation.

The Final Evaluation draws conclusions on the success of NSRP (focusing on the peace architecture, societal participation, exerting influence and the platforms for engagement) and synthesises lessons to inform future programming, both with respect to peace building and the design of complex programmes delivered in dynamic political environments.

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

The Final Evaluation is essentially to inform future DFID programming in fragile/conflict affected areas but will also benefit implementing partners working on conflict programming.

This was a final evaluation and as such no specific recommendations were made that require action in the programme itself. The final evaluation presented key findings that have all been accepted by DFID and will be used for designing similar programmes either in Nigeria or in other countries.

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

Evaluation Report Title: P06132 Nigeria Stability and Reconciliation Programme (NSRP) – Independent Evaluation Provider (NIEP)

Recommendations	Accepted or Rejected	If “Accepted”, Action plan for Implementation or if “Rejected”, Reason for Rejection
For Future Peacebuilding Programmes		
<p><i>Appropriate result indicators need to be in place:</i> Narrow quantitative result indicators on their own are problematic from a methodological perspective, and more focus should be given to underlying networks of relations in peacebuilding programmes. In addition, where monitoring frameworks are designed to capture supporting qualitative data, this should be captured, analysed and responded to. Future programmes should experiment with more appropriate mix method approaches to monitor progress and performance and should ensure programme partners are able to implement these approaches appropriately.</p>	Accepted	Lesson will be shared within DFID and taken into account in the design of new programmes. This will inform lessons and best practices collated and developed by the Conflict Cadre and other relevant sections involved in conflict programming and evaluation, like the Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Division and the Evaluation Division.
<p><i>Legacy & sustainability should be more appropriately addressed from design:</i> Although results have been achieved, an absence of clear legacy strategies for platforms, a lack of wider societal participation, and a dependence on individual</p>	Accepted	Lesson will be shared within DFID and taken into account in the design of new programmes. For example DFID Nigeria will use the evidence from its current suite of evaluations – including this one – to understand progress against our current Business Plan and to plan for the future spending period.

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

<p>relationships rather than the development of institutional process based solutions, is likely to have impacted negatively on the ability of the programme to lead to long term systemic and sustainable change. These aspects should be addressed in future programmes.</p>		
<p><i>Behavioural change takes time and requires support:</i> Although it is important to bring actors together and create safe spaces for democratic dialogue, emphasis on supporting sustained behavioural change amongst platform participants is needed and support to implement policy changes are required; future programme should aim to more explicitly explore and measure the success of a range of initiatives to bring about behavioural changes. Donors should also acknowledge the lengthy time periods and extend of the ongoing support which might be required to achieve systemic and behavioural change.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>DFID Nigeria will use the evidence from its current suite of evaluations – including this one – to understand progress against our current Business Plan and to plan for the future spending period. Behaviour change is an important part of the theory of change for our programmes in a number of sectors.</p>
<p><i>Support to give a voice to marginalised groups should be complemented with support to improve processes and capacity amongst those who hold power.</i> The convening of multiple stakeholders, including those from marginalised groups, are important for legitimacy, adding value to the functioning of the platforms, in particular at local level;</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>This is also an important theme for future development programming in a number of sectors. In particular we will combine this finding with learning from Mobilising for Development programme which relies on a similar causal pathway.</p>

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

<p>however, power relationships means some actors are more influential than others and are more able to drive forward policy change. Future programmes should seek opportunities to exploit this, and should consider a multipronged approach which combines giving a voice to marginalised groups while focussing on capacity development of influential actors.</p>		
<p><i>The limitations inherent in the platform model needs to be understood:</i> Platform models are attractive solutions to enable locally led, bottom up reform; however, the limitations of the platform model should be explored and acknowledged, and appropriate support to enable platforms to flourish (e.g. ongoing, tailored training to conveners, more support to conveners and platform chairs in establishing and using systems that effectively document actions and following up on resolutions and outcomes) must be built into the programme design. More thought should be given to long term sustainability of platforms, and the risk of platforms being co-opted by a dominant stakeholder(s) should be acknowledged.</p>	Accepted	Lesson will be shared within DFID and taken into account in the design of new programmes.
<p>For other complex programmes in dynamic environments</p>		
<p><i>Robust M&E systems and adequate M&E capacity is required:</i> Persisting challenges in accessing M&E data significantly impacted</p>	Accepted	Lesson will be shared within DFID and taken into account in the design of new programmes. DFID Nigeria is embarking on a programme of

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

<p>on NSRP's ability to accurately assess programme performance, possibly resulting in underestimating results; future programmes should ensure the value of ongoing M&E – and regular reflection on data to inform operational decisions – is clear to all involved, and that adequate capacity to gather and interrogate appropriate data on an ongoing basis exists. Not only should implementing partners (IPs) ensure M&E is viewed as important and adequately resourced, but thought should be given to building in time and funds to develop M&E capacity amongst partners from the onset, and how to clearly demonstrate in what way data should be used on an ongoing basis.</p>		<p>improvements across all aspects of programme management including management of results systems.</p>
<p><i>Real time learning is needed:</i> The extent to which real time learning took place -and the way in which it is supported by IE's – could have been improved; this way of working requires more ongoing engagement and quicker feedback loops, and is a lesson for both IPs and IEs.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Lesson will be shared within DFID and taken into account in the design of new programmes. The DFID Nigeria flagship governance programme PERL is already building on this lesson, as one example.</p>
<p><i>Programmes should adapt as a result of changes in context <u>and</u> learning:</i> An inability to identify impermeable barriers and an absence of a reflective culture most likely resulted in missed opportunities to focus efforts in areas where greater change might</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Lesson will be shared within DFID and taken into account in the design of new programmes.</p>

Management Response & Recommendations Action Plan

<p>have been possible. As implementation progresses, political and other significant confounding factors or even impermeable barriers will arise; programme should not persist in trying to address these, but should acknowledge them and adapt to ensure resources are focussed on opportunities where impact can be achieved. Programmes should also aim to understand what is working and what not through appropriate and robust M&E, and should not hesitate to change or stop that which is not achieving or unlikely to achieve impact.</p>		
<p><i>The dissemination of information is only one component of bringing about change:</i> The provision of quality information and research, support to engage with and utilise this, is only one component in bringing about policy change; convening and advocacy activities are also important.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>DFID Nigeria will use the evidence from its current suite of evaluations – including this one – to understand progress against our current Business Plan and to plan for the future spending period. Policy change is an important part of the theory of change for our programmes in a number of sectors.</p>