Independent Evaluation of the Reinforcement of the Tanzania Peacekeeping Training Center Project

December 2023 Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
This report is a product of the Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME) of UNITAR. The findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed therein do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the partners of the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Center of Tanzanian Armed Forces project (reference: C2022.TARPT107.DEUMFA). The evaluation was conducted by Aura Liliana Lopez Lopez with field mission support by Charles Mulisa. The report is issued without formal copy editing.

The designation employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research concerning the legal status of any country, city or area or its authorities or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.
Acknowledgements

The evaluator is grateful for the support provided by the Ministry of Defense and National Service, The Tanzania People’s Defense Forces, and the Tanzania Peacekeeping Training Center of the Republic of Tanzania, during the evaluation, and specially for all the logistical support provided during fieldwork. Special thanks to General George Itang’are and Lt. Colonel Majembe Majura for facilitating access to facilities and informants on site. The evaluator is also grateful for all the unvaluable support from the Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit team, with special thanks to Brook Boyer and Katinka Koke. Finally, the evaluator acknowledges the Pre-deployment Training and Advisory team of the Division for Peace for facilitating the evaluation at different stages.
List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of the project logic for 2021 and 2022 phases.
Table 2. Summary of areas and criteria of the Institutional Assessment Framework tool.
Table 3. Key evaluation questions under OECD-DAC criteria.
Table 4. Reviewed Certification Framework Level 1.
Table 5. Training directly managed by UNITAR and breakdown of participants by gender.
Table 6: Thematic analysis
Table 7. Summary of implementing partners’ agreements.
Table 8. Summary of final financial report and percentage of budget items relative to the total budget.
Table 9: Capacity areas within the three dimensions

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Ranking of Troop Contributing Countries.
Figure 2. Theory of change diagram.
Figure 3. Stakeholder analysis and position in terms of project’s expected outcomes.
Figure 4. Peacekeeping training supported with project funding (Outcome 3, 2022).
Figure 5. Participants in ToT (2021-2022) by gender.
The Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Center of Tanzanian Armed Forces project aimed to strengthen the impact of peace operations by directly addressing the challenges related to deficient pre-deployment training, with a particular focus on uniformed personnel. It intended to do so by transforming the existing Peacekeeping Training Center of the Tanzanian Armed Forces (TPTC) into a fully integrated training and research centre for the preparation of East African uniformed personnel deploying to UN peace operations. UNITAR has been supporting Tanzanian military and police forces since 2016 in the framework of the respective pre-deployment training programmes. The project fits in this framework by reinforcing TPTC through two phases: Phase I (2021), implemented between July and December 2021 and Phase II (2022), implemented between 15 April and 31 December 2022. Following the evaluation, a subsequent 2023 project was implemented.

The evaluation assessed the project’s relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability. Overall, the evaluation found the project to be highly relevant to SDG 16, international and UN peacekeeping frameworks and dispositions including the Women, Peace and Security Agenda and TPTC’s strategic, organizational vision. While the project showed alignment with UNITAR’s overall peace programming portfolio, no synergies with other UNITAR projects were visible. The project was coherent with Human Rights, Gender and Training of Trainers (ToT) standards. In assessing effectiveness, the evaluation found the project’s targets to be overall achieved, yet with adjustments to some outputs. The project’s development and implementation of a comprehensive institutional capacity strengthening framework was found to have contributed to four of the six dimensions of capacity established in the framework: i) institutional framework and operating systems, ii) people and human resources, iii) infrastructures and equipment and iv) network and relationships. The project was also considered efficient, although the evaluation lacked information on the outputs planned for delivery by one implementing partner on the establishment of a research hub and support provided by another implementing partner on the delivery of an activity that was not aligned with the objective of the project. The evaluation found that the project is likely to cause impact in contributing to improved performance of pre-deployed personnel, strengthened female leadership in peacekeeping operations and increased institutional capacity. TPTC was found as highly reliant on external funding support which challenges the sustainability of the project’s results.

The evaluation issued a set of five recommendations of which four were accepted and one was partially accepted.

The evaluation was managed by the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PPME) Unit and was undertaken by Aura Liliana Lopez Lopez with field mission support from Charles Mulisa. The PPME Unit is grateful to the evaluator, the Peacekeeping Training Programme Unit project team and partners based in Geneva and Tanzania, as well as other project stakeholders for providing important input into this evaluation.
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Executive summary

Introduction and background

Funded by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Reinforcement of the Tanzania Peacekeeping Training Centre project falls under UNITAR's Division for Peace programming, pre-deployment training and advisory team (PDTA). The project was implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Defense and National Service of Tanzania (MODANS). UNITAR has been supporting Tanzania military and police forces since 2016 in the framework of the respective pre-deployment training programmes. The current project fits in this framework by strengthening the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces, providing both infrastructural and technical support for improvement of its activities related to pre-deployment of uniformed personnel (UP) to peacekeeping missions.

UNITAR has been working to strengthen Tanzania’s regional presence as a partner in the promotion and maintenance of peace through the support of the Tanzania Peacekeeping Training Center (TPTC) since 2021. The TPTC is mandated to provide training to potential peacekeepers for the multi-dimensional challenges of contemporary peace operations.

In a more focalized way, the project also provided support to the Tanzania Police Force in activities related to the training of Individual Police Officers (IPOs). Furthermore, it has worked in targeted activities with other Implementing Partners, namely, the Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons (RECSA), and the East Africa Standby Force (EASF).

During its 2021 phase, the project was predominantly focused on the infrastructural expansion of the centre, with additional activities regarding: 1) assessment of institutional conditions for the creation of a research hub for TPTC and its operating framework; 2) the expansion of its partnership base; 3) the development of a concept note for the integration of technology solutions to the improvement of the Msata training facilities; and 4) the training of Tanzania Police Force’s male and female UP.

For the 2022 phase, the project increased its focus on supporting TPTC’s action plan and the revision of its strategic framework, which included provision of equipment, training of trainers (ToT), pre-deployment training, and a special focus in addressing dimensions of capacity that contribute to TPTC’s goal to become a regional “centre of excellence” and a reference for high-impact pre-deployment training in the East African region. Capacity strengthening used the Institutional Assessment Framework (IAF) developed by the UNITAR Division for Peace to assess the situation and areas of focus for capacity development. This phase also incorporated support to the TPF for specific pre-deployment training activities.

Evaluation purpose, scope, and methodology

This evaluation has been commissioned and managed by the Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME) with a purpose to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project’s improvement, strategic direction, and broader organizational learning. The scope of the evaluation is to assess the 2021 and the guideline to map the conditions of TPTC and others subject to the assessment.

1 The term “tool” is used to interchangeably describe the file that consolidates areas, dimensions, and criteria of the IAF, and is used as
2022 phases (hereinafter, the project) as sequenced, and thus, interlinked phases of the project.

The evaluation was guided by 26 questions across the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, UNEG evaluation standards and UNITAR’s evaluation policy. Considering the available information and access to stakeholders, the design was mainly qualitative, with quantitative data documentary evidence analyzed for the efficiency component. The instruments used combined key informant interviews, semi-structured in-depth interviews, focus groups and non-participant observation of trainings conducted by instructors some of whom have taken part in the ToT conducted by UNITAR. The evaluator ran a collaborative exercise to reconstruct the project’s Theory of Change, to better understand and account for the main pathways and causal chain leading to desired impact.

Over 150 document records were reviewed during the desk review phase, paired with remote and in person data collection. A fieldtrip to Tanzania was undertaken as part of efforts to collect data and cover the full range of stakeholders. A total of 45 people (13 female and 32 male) were interviewed comprising all stakeholder groups identified, using the different instruments. The evaluation was adaptive to limitations faced, mainly related to the availability, robustness, and consistency of information, in addition to the short timeframe of implementation of both phases.

Main Findings

Relevance

The project design and overall impact is highly aligned with the UNITAR Strategic Framework 2022-2025 and highly relevant to SDG 16 and SDG 5, specifically addressing Target 16.1, indicator 16.1.2., Target 5.1., indicator 5.1.1., and Target 5.5., indicator 5.5.2.. The project is also highly relevant and in line with global UN efforts to achieve and sustain peaceful societies, namely with The Cruz Report, Action for Peacekeeping, UN Resolutions 2436 and 2518, UN dispositions on the WPS Agenda and the Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy 2018-2028.

Furthermore, the project is relevant to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries, including trainers, military (TPTC) and police (TPF) stakeholders, as well as aligned to the overall project goal. Relevance to TPTC strategic organizational vision is demonstrated through four areas: i) networks and internationalization, ii) support to capacity development of instructors, iii) pre-deployment training activities, and iv) infrastructural expansion.

Coherence

The project is well-aligned with UNITAR’s portfolio within the areas of conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding. It is also coherent with UNITAR’s Division for Peace standards for training and guidelines for ToT design and implementation, with a visible content and methodological alignment of ToTs conducted, and complements well the UN Pre-deployment training provided to Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) partner trooper and Formed Police Units (FPUs) contributing countries. Nonetheless, the evaluation of ToTs and leadership training has an evidenced lack of systematic data management and reporting, dissemination or reflection with key stakeholders and strategic use for targeted learning and adapting purposes.

Overall, the intervention showed a gender-sensitive and women empowerment approach and a good alignment with human rights standards. However, the evaluation did not find evidence of a gender sensitive content approach to the ToT, neither from the content outline shared, nor from thematic analysis of the interviews with participants and other key informants.
Effectiveness

Related to the project’s achievement of planned outputs and outcomes, most targets and activities were achieved with adjustments to some outputs. The short timeframe of implementation limited achievement at the level of the overall project objective, as well as the donor’s disbursement of funds, and the internal decision-making and operational structure of the TPTC/TPDF as main stakeholders.

There has been progress achieved in several of the capacity-development areas (four out of six), but not sufficiently to attain the project objective of “expanded accessibility”. The infrastructure and equipment donated is, however, identified as contributing to the enhancement of training and learning, enabled by the use of technology.

UNITAR’s high focus on developing and implementing a comprehensive institutional capacity strengthening framework, has greatly contributed to improvement of TPTC’s capacity to re-formulate its strategic vision and action plan, with steps forward a “shift in mindset” regarding their core value proposal, the need to improve quality of training and instruction, and the relevance given to gender-parity issues within training of peacekeepers and overall female leadership development. In sum, from thematic analysis of data collected, there was evidence of progress in four of the six dimensions of capacity established in the framework: i) institutional framework and operating systems, ii) people and human resources, iii) infrastructures and equipment, and iv) network and relationships.

Nonetheless, more work is still needed on training of persons in charge of maintenance and use of the IT infrastructure in place, functionality of the e-library, partnerships development, donor diversification, curricula update and the development of TPTC’s value offer as a “centre of excellence” and comprehensive strategic business plan.

Efficiency

The evaluation found that the budget granted for the 2021 phase was implemented efficiently and that implementing arrangements made, contributed to the timely delivery. Equipment purchased was also observed as of quality and functional. There was lack of information, however, on the outputs delivered from the partnership with RECSA for the “review of the operating framework of TPTC in support of the establishment of the “research hub”.

Efficiency of the 2022 phase was also found to be satisfactory with partnership arrangements contributing to the delivery of the infrastructure to satisfaction of TPTC. The equipment donated to support training activities was partially purchased but with a plan for procurement at the time the evaluation concluded. All activities supporting TPTC’s action plan were implemented timely and with quality, in spite of some variations to the original plan.

There was less evidence of the efficiency of activities connected to the TPF, although the budget was also fully implemented and reported with activities completed.

Regarding the allocation of funds to the Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation, the evaluation did not find evidence of how this was connected or the forms in which contributed to the project’s objectives or those of the TPTC.

Likelihood of Impact

The project is likely to cause impact in the following domains, based on ground assumptions: i) improved learning outcomes and performance of pre-deployed personnel, if there is a continued, structured, and cycled plan to strengthen capacity of TPTC instructors with certified ToT training; ii) Strengthening of female leadership in PKO, if there is there is continued dedicated female leadership training that expands to male personnel and leadership across
operational areas, and from the explicit inclusion of a gender-sensitive component in the strategic plan for TPTC, which if materialized into the action plan, could lead to significant structural changes in the way female leadership and participation in PKO is realized within TPTC and the military; and iii) the potential impact from the institutional strengthening capacity process conducted for the TPTC by UNITAR, if the 2023-2028 strategic framework is fully implemented as currently planned.

Likelihood of sustainability

Overall, the TPTC remains highly reliant on external funding and technical donor support, which hinders the possibility for eventual self-sustained action in areas like pre-deployment training implementation, adoption and self-supported implementation of ToTs, and even maintenance of new facilities and donated equipment. Some of the major factors influencing self-sustainability of the centre and thus the project’s activities have to do with the highly centralized TPTC operating and the need for increased capacity in the understanding and navigation of the donor ecosystem, standards and regulations, as well as the need for a longer-term business plan that helps diversifies their sources of income.

The evaluation, while seeing positive effects from the expanded training facilities, is unable to assess the extent to which this will reflect on longer term impact on performance of peacekeepers, a well-funded research centre, and enhanced technological access.

Recommendations

The evaluation issued five recommendations to inform future phases of the project.

Recommendation 1. Consolidate a ToT offer for TPTC and TPF that is cycled and scheduled, covering all UNITAR’s ToT levels (1-3), and agree with the participants and leadership on measures and tools to assess the use and impact of training on learning markers of pre-deployed personnel and performance of deployed personnel. Furthermore, work on establishing arrangements with implementing partners to access gender-disaggregated data of results of pre-deployment trainings and peacekeeping missions.

Recommendation 2. Strengthen information management systems and monitoring and reporting practices. The evaluator highly recommends that in conjunction with the findings and recommendations from the institutional assessment, UNITAR places greater emphasis on the ways in which results are assessed, strengthening TPTC’s accountability as an implementing partner in terms of financial and results management and reporting.

Recommendation 3. Continue to apply and refine the Institutional Assessment Framework package and work towards developing a descriptive narrative of the 156 criteria established for all six areas of measurement. This also entails working on ways to monitor and evaluate progress achieved, in line with recommendations from the assessment, action plans, and partner’s strategic organizational vision.

Recommendation 4. Conduct a localized, context-sensitive, gender analysis in agreement and collaboration with the MODANS and Tanzania People’s Defense Forces (TPDF) and use it to develop a gender-transformative pedagogy to address barriers to effective and meaningful participation of women in peacekeeping operations (PKO) and missions. Bring male and female uniformed personnel (UP) to the process from across roles and institutional areas.

Recommendation 5. Avoid segmented, non-traceable and disconnected action across stakeholders by strengthening accountability and reporting mechanisms in place, joint monitoring and ensuring from design that interlinked action and coherence
with project’s overall objective are clearly identified across and between IPs.

Lessons Learned
Four lessons learned were identified during the evaluation process.

Lesson 1. Institutional capacity development is a sustained, time-bound, and co-responsible effort that requires a human-centered and adaptive management approach from UNITAR, implementing partners, and donors. It also requires a strong relationship built to agree on key areas of capacity development and joint progress monitoring mechanisms.

Lesson 2. To increase the effectiveness and likelihood of impact of UNITAR’s interventions in peacekeeping (and in general), there must be a coherent and interlinked design at the onset, that while keeping the adaptability and navigation of complexity as premises, clearly connects across impact goal, outcomes, results, and activities as a unified compass of action. A ToC is also necessary to guide the common rationale of interwoven conditions understood as drivers of change.

Lesson 3. The pedagogy of a gender-sensitive and gender transformational vision for the inclusion and equal access of women in UN missions and PKO within the military, stays at the surface unless a whole-institution approach is applied to all gender-equality areas of institutional capacity.

Lesson 4. Building infrastructure can be a substantial preparation for capacity development activity that impacts the access and quality of pre-deployment training and other peacekeeping training-related activities. However, to reach such effectiveness, there needs to be institutional arrangements in place that ensure clear roles of the parties involved, a high level of accountability, and a thorough assessment of need, potential use, and sustainability of the infrastructure as capacity development assets.
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Introduction

1. This document constitutes the report of the independent evaluation of the Reinforcement of the Tanzania Peacekeeping Training Center project. The project was funded by the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Germany for the 2021-2022 phase, which was governed by two contribution agreements, the first covering the period from 15 July 2021 to 31 December 2021, and the second the period from 15 April to 31 December 2022. The combined value of the two agreements is 2,594,917.12 Euros, or roughly 2,709,773 USD. At the time of the issuance of this report, the project started a third phase, covering the period from May to December 2023.

2. The project falls under UNITAR’s Division for Peace programming and as such seeks to contribute to helping Member States achieve Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 to promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies. Under the UNITAR strategic framework 2022-2025, the project is aligned with sub-objective 1.1: Support institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace, which focuses broadly on tackling violence; addressing root causes of conflict, insecurity, and injustice; and strengthening governance and institutions which are essential steps to creating a more sustainable future. The project was managed by the Pre-deployment Training and Advisory Team (PDTAT) within the Division for Peace.

3. In partnership with the Ministry of Defense and National Service of Tanzania (MODANS), UNITAR has been supporting Tanzania military and police forces since 2016 in the framework of the respective pre-deployment training programmes. The current project fits in this framework by strengthening the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces, providing both infrastructural and technical support for improvement of its activities related to pre-deployment of uniformed personnel (UP) to peacekeeping missions. UNITAR’s mandate delimits its support to pre-deployment activities. Activities and support provided in the field and after deployment are the responsibility of the United Nations Department of Peace Operations (DPO).

4. The project’s primary implementing partner (IP) is MODANS, with which UNITAR has been working to strengthen Tanzania’s regional presence as a partner in the promotion and maintenance of peace through the function of the Tanzania Peacekeeping Training Center (TPTC), supported by UNITAR since 2021. The TPTC is envisioned as a Centre of Excellence, mandated to provide training to potential peacekeepers for the multi-dimensional challenges of contemporary peace operations. Acting under the direction of the Chief of Operations and Training, the Centre provides training mainly to military personnel (contingents, staff officers, etc.) prior to deployment to UN / African Union (AU) peace operations. Financially, the centre depends on MODANS and benefits from the support of several international partners, including the Federal Republic of Germany.

---

2 The 2021 phase was funded with 1,094,917.12 EUR and the 2022 phase was funded 750,000 EUR which was amended to 1,500,000 EUR in July 2022.
5. As contained in the application for funding, the goal of the project is to “strengthen the impact of peace operations by directly addressing the challenges related to deficient pre-deployment training, with a particular focus on uniformed personnel […] by transforming the existing Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces into a fully integrated training and research centre for the preparation of East African uniformed personnel deploying to UN peace operations.”3 The project also seeks to strengthen gender-related aspects of peacekeeping and the mainstreaming of a gender parity approach in the way TPTC and Tanzania Police Forces operate, in support of the Women Peace and Security Agenda (WPS) enshrined in United Nations Security Council resolutions (UNSCR) 1325 and 2242.

6. In a more focalized way, the project also provided support to the Tanzania Police Force in activities related to the training of Individual Police Officers (IPOs). Furthermore, it has worked in targeted activities with other IPs, namely, the Regional Centre on Small Arms and Light Weapons (RECSA), and the East Africa Standby Force (EASF).

7. This evaluation has been commissioned and managed by UNITAR’s Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME) and guided by the UNITAR Evaluation Policy and Operational Guidelines for Independent Evaluation. It also incorporates the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation, including Human Rights and Gender Equality considerations, and the Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations. The evaluation used the OECD-DAC criteria to assess project performance in terms of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability.

8. The evaluation’s purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project’s improvement, strategic direction and broader organizational learning. The scope of the evaluation is to assess the 2021 and 2022 Agreements (hereinafter, the project) as sequenced, and thus, interlinked phases of the project. However, at times, in the aim of clarity, this report often makes references to each phase as an individual unit of analysis.

---

3 Source: Application for funding, 2022.
Project description, objectives, and development context

Context of the intervention

9. The United Republic of Tanzania has a longstanding partnership as a Troop/Police Contributing Country (TCC) for peacekeeping operations (PKO) in the African continent, especially in the East African region. Currently, Tanzania is the 12th biggest global TCC to the UN’s peacekeeping missions and the 5th in Africa, with 1,526 troops deployed as of 31 March 2023.

10. The TPTC, established in 2002, has as its primary function to provide pre-deployment training for military UP collaborating in UN peacekeeping missions, as well as to UN staff officers. The TPTC has received support from international partner countries, with Germany and the United States as two of its main providers of financial and technical aid. The TPTC operates under the direct authority of the Tanzania People’s Defense Forces (TPDF), and the MODANS.

11. Recently, the TPTC has increasingly focused on organizational change management aspects of its operations, and the design and implementation of a strategic framework and action plan that responds to “multi-dimensional” challenges of PKO. This aligns with the ambition of the TPTC to be known as a “centre of excellence” that provides quality and high-impact training not only to Tanzanian military and police officers participating in the UN and AU peace operations, but to troops outside the country, in Africa and globally. Furthermore, the TPTC has also expressed ambitions to develop research and contribute to the body of knowledge for African peacekeeping.

12. With support from Germany and UNITAR, the TPDF-TPTC have also enhanced infrastructural and technological capacity, and revised a strategic framework and action plan, which incorporates updated dimensions to the “being and becoming excellent” vision. The following sections present in detail the logic of the project’s intervention and the Theory of Change (ToC).

Project objective and expected outcomes

13. As mentioned, the project’s overarching impact objective, as specified in the log frame for the 2021-2022 phase is “To strengthen the impact of peace operations by directly addressing

---

4 Egypt, Ghana, Morocco and Rwanda are the four top contributing African countries.
the challenges related to deficient pre-deployment training – particularly of East African uniformed personnel (men and women) deploying to the UN peace operations.” At a more specific level, it has centred efforts in the support to the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces in the improvement of their current training offer, and towards expanding its capacity to become a regional peacekeeping training centre for East African UP deploying to the UN peace operations. In parallel, the project has worked with the Tanzania Police Forces (TPF), in support of the training of instructors and leadership role of female police UP, as a direct contribution to the UN Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact goal</th>
<th>To strengthen the impact of peace operations by directly addressing the challenges related to deficient pre-deployment training – particularly of East African uniformed personnel (men and women) deploying to the UN peace operations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall objective (Phase I &amp; II)</td>
<td>Expanded access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel (men and women) in East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong> to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td><strong>Strengthened capabilities and motivation</strong> of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact pre-deployment training for police personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td><strong>Strengthened capabilities and motivation</strong> of female police officers to occupy leadership positions in national forces and peace operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td><strong>Increased accessibility</strong> to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td><strong>Strengthened capabilities and motivation</strong> of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact pre-deployment training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td><strong>Strengthened capabilities and motivation</strong> of uniformed personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of the project logic for 2021 and 2022 phases.

*Note: Words in bold highlight changes in the narrative of outcome from phase I to phase II.*

14. During its 2021 phase, the project was predominantly focused on the infrastructural expansion of the centre, with additional activities regarding: 1) assessment of institutional conditions for the creation of a research hub for TPTC and its operating framework; 2) the expansion of its partnership base; 3) the development of a concept note for the integration of technology solutions to the improvement of the Msata training facilities; and 4) the training of Tanzania Police Force’s male and female UP.

15. For the 2022 phase, the project increased its focus in supporting TPTC’s action plan and the revision of its strategic framework, which included provision of equipment, training of trainers (ToT), pre-deployment training, and a special focus in addressing dimensions of capacity that contribute to TPTC’s goal to become a regional “centre of excellence” and a reference for high-impact pre-deployment training in the East African region. Capacity strengthening
used the UNITAR-developed Institutional Assessment Framework (IAF)\(^6\) to assess the situation and areas of focus for capacity development. This phase also incorporated support to the TPF for specific pre-deployment training activities.

### Institutional Assessment Framework

16. An important aspect of the project’s intervention is the direct institutional capacity development support provided by UNITAR to the TPTC. In the framework of the project, UNITAR developed and carried out an IAF which was used as a tool to map the situation for TPTC along six dimensions of capacity and designed a capacity development and technical assistance plan. These dimensions include:

1) Legal and regulatory framework - Directives, policies, and procedures  
2) Institutional framework and operating systems  
3) People and human resources management  
4) Infrastructures and equipment  
5) Networks and relationships  
6) Sustainability

17. As further detailed in Table 2, the tool is structured to map conditions in the 156 criteria established for the above-mentioned categories. Of these, 25 criteria are related to enablers of gender parity and female UP leadership. The assessment was conducted over a period of six months with support and in agreement with the TPDF and TPTC and results have been used by UNITAR to tailor institutional capacity support provided until now, when phase 3 (2023) of the project is being implemented. The evaluation addresses the findings on progress regarding the utility of the tool and progress achieved in the report’s Findings section, under “Efficiency”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of capacity assessed</th>
<th>Number of criteria per area</th>
<th>Criteria related to gender-sensitive aspects of capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal and regulatory framework - Directives, policies, and procedures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Framework and operating systems</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8 (2.6; 2.10; 2.15; 2.18; 2.23; 2.37; 2.40; 2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and Human Resource Management</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13 (3.2; 3.10; 3.16; 3.18; 3.20; 3.27; 3.30; 3.34; 3.35; 3.38; 3.42; 3.45; 3.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructures and equipment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 (4.5; 4.10; 4.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) The term “tool” is used to interchangeably describe the file that consolidates areas, dimensions and criteria of the IAF, and is used as the guideline to map the conditions of TPTC and others subject to the assessment.
Table 2. Summary of areas and criteria of the Institutional Assessment Framework tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking and relationships</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator's elaboration from the framework.

Theory of Change

18. The project’s original ToC was revised and re-constructed to offer a better view of the underlying causal logic of the project. Mindful of the challenging and complex environment in which peacekeeping processes operate, the evaluator proposed a collaborative approach to the reconstruction of the problem statement, impact goal, established pathways, causal chain, and key assumptions, capturing in the voice and experience of representatives from project management. It is important to note that, as already mentioned in the methodology section, the project’s ToC, while seeking to impact peace-at-large in the East African region, is predominantly centered on the strengthening of the TPTC as the driver of action, as has been the project design and implementation for the largest part.

19. As a result, the ToC is summarized as follows:

(Pathway 1) If the TPTC’s institutional capacity is strengthened to develop its strategic vision, with a strategic framework and processes in place to guide the path toward becoming a centre of excellence, then functioning of the TPTC is strengthened as well, enabling increased effectiveness of its intervention in PKO, increased outreach of training and likelihood of sustaining results. (Pathway 2) Furthermore, if the TPTC is provided with advisory support for the strengthening of human capacities and processes in place, then, the quality of TPTC [pre-deployment] training offer and its design and delivery are improved to support better preparation of UP, both male and female. (Pathway 3) Finally, if the conditions of trained UP are improved to better simulate the realities of the field deployment sites during pre-deployment training, then the personnel’s preparedness will also increase to perform their mandated tasks. (Impact goal) If all conditions are met, UNITAR’s intervention will contribute in the longer term to the improvement in performance and safety of peacekeepers (men and women), impacting the successful implementation of the mandate, and peace and stability of the beneficiary communities and the East African region.

20. While the effort to reconstruct and validate the ToC is an important step towards a theory-based project implementation, with the short time of implementation of each phase, the extent to which progress made towards the impact goal is limited. However, it could guide the implementation of the project moving forward the current phase, and other future phases, if that were the case. Figure 2 presents a graphic consolidated view of the ToC, with additional information.
Figure 2. Theory of change diagram.
Evaluator’s design in collaboration with project management team. A Web version can be seen here: ToC.
Methodology and limitations

Methodological approach

21. The methodological design was adjusted from the one originally advised in the evaluation’s Terms of Reference, proposed as a mixed-methods, qualitative and quantitative methodology. However, following the evaluability assessment and desk review conducted by the evaluator, the limited data and contact information available for participants in training conducted under the project, made unviable the deployment of a larger-scale survey to participants in trainings conducted by UNITAR. With careful consideration of the complex implementation environment of the project and with utilization focus on mind, the evaluator opted for a qualitative design, which implied the combination of several qualitative instruments and greater emphasis on triangulation and pattern analysis.

22. The evaluation has also been designed as formative and utility focused. Hence, the evaluator has given special attention to the understanding of the environmental, organizational and systemic conditions for the implementation of the project, the institutional capacity development aspects, and the extent to which context influences aspects of project implementation and the intended and unintended effects the project has had in the TPTC and other implementing partners’ capacity to improve their engagement in PKO.

23. In line with these approaches, the evaluation is also guided by Blue Marble Evaluation Principles, especially, Principle 7, Cross-silos, Principle 10, Bricolage Methods, and Principle 13, Theory of Transformation.7

Do No Harm and Ethical Considerations

24. Furthermore, the evaluation has adhered to the UNEG Norms and Standards, and Ethical Guidelines. Regarding the latter, the design has ensured that a Do No Harm approach is followed when interacting with stakeholders and designing instruments. Local cultural sensitivities and norms were considered during fieldwork and it was ensured that participants in the interviews and focus group discussions had access to interpretation in their native language, Swahili, if needed.

25. Participants were also clearly informed of the objectives and use of the information gathered and asked to provide verbal informed consent for the confidential use of the information, as well as for the recording of interviews and collaborative sessions. Where participants did not authorize recording, the evaluator relied on notes and afterward consolidation and verification with the local assistant evaluator to ensure that insights were faithful to the accounts of informants.

26. Considering the high importance attached to hierarchy within armed forces in Tanzania, the evaluator directly requested to the TPTC leadership that participants in focus groups

---

7 “A theory of change specifies how a project or program attains desired outcomes. Transformation is not a project. It is multi-dimensional, multi-faceted, and multilevel, cutting across national borders and intervention silos, across sectors and specialized interests, connecting local and global, and sustaining across time”.

8 This occurred with a few informants in higher level government positions and military ranks, who requested not to be recorded.
and interviews were not accompanied by supervisors or any other person who could limit or influence their ability to express their views freely and in relation to their lived experience in the project.

**Evaluation matrix and evaluation questions**

27. The evaluation followed the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria for the assessment of the extent to which the project has been designed and implemented to achieve relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and the likelihood of impact and sustainability. Following the desk review phase, the evaluator suggested the adjustment to the scope and/or narrative of some of the Evaluation Questions (EQs), to better reflect the project logic and in consideration of the timeframe of implementation, scope of activities and anticipated limitations. This led to a total of 26 EQs, described in the annexed Evaluation Matrix document. Furthermore, the evaluator also proposed emerging indicators to delimit the inquiry for the answer to these questions. Key evaluation questions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD-DAC Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Is the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries’ needs and priorities, and designed with quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td>To what extent is the project coherent with relevant UN/international frameworks and policies, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international norms and standards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>How effective has the project been in delivering results and in reinforcing the peacekeeping training centre of Tanzanian armed forces, local trainers, and training participants’ capabilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood of Impact</strong></td>
<td>What are the potential cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood of Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>To what extent are the project’s results likely to be sustained in the long term? How is environmental sustainability addressed in the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Key evaluation questions under OECD-DAC criteria.*

*Source: Terms of Reference.*
Stakeholder analysis

28. The stakeholder analysis was conducted in parallel to desk review and the various sensemaking meetings held with project management and PPME. Departing from the project document and accompanying log frame, the stakeholders were mainly classified considering their relative level of involvement in the project, based on how many activities and outputs were directly connected to such stakeholder, the contractual relationship (i.e., grant agreement with implementing partner) in addition to the financial support provided in relation to the overall project budget. With this information, each project outcome per phase had the stakeholder mapped and positioned per project outcome/phase. Thus, the stakeholders were classified as follows:9

![Stakeholder Analysis Diagram](image)

Figure 3. Stakeholder analysis and position in terms of project’s expected outcomes.

Evaluator’s elaboration.

The classification does not include the donor, as it has a different type of involvement and is understood as a cross-cutting actor. However, as shown in Table 3 describing the

---

9 In the stakeholder table, the grant to the Ministry of Defense and National Service of the United Republic of Tanzania is shown by labelling it as TPTC below, since TPTC is the primary target of the assistance.
stakeholders consulted per method applied, the appointed liaison was interviewed as part of the key informants.

Sample selection

29. The non-random sampling technique applied was purposeful and convenient. It was purposeful as it was made according to the analysis of stakeholders, targeting those who could better inform and enrich the depth of the insights for each of the EQs. The list of key informants was drafted by the evaluator and further refined and validated in several iterations with the Project Management team and PPME. Other key informants were added following a snowball sampling, according to their identified importance in the narrative of other key informants. A total of 45 informants participated in the evaluation, within the various methods applied.

30. However, the sample was also convenient, as it included informants based on reachability and availability. In some cases, participants were not available because they had already been moved from their post, or they were unresponsive to requests. In the case of participants in pre-deployment training conducted directly by the IPs, the contacts were not provided to evaluator. In the case of instructors trained by UNITAR, the evaluator only had access to a few of them during fieldwork, but not to the contacts of all participants in these training courses.

31. Participants in focus group discussions and observed instructors were directly selected and appointed by the TPTC officers accompanying fieldwork activities. As seen in the summary table of methods and participants (Table 3), there was an imbalance of male and female informants, despite the evaluator’s requests to have representativity of female UP in the ToT focus group and in-depth interviews. The evaluator was explained that the participation of female UP in this ToT was only of four women, who were not available at the time the focus group and in-depth interviews were conducted.

Table 3. Stakeholders and sample per data collection method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Type of Informant</th>
<th>Data collection methods (Participants in blue are already counted in other methods)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KII</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>NPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPTC&amp;TPDF</td>
<td>Leadership and key staff TPTC/TPDF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants in ToT</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants in Women Leadership training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-deployed UP participating in trainings observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants in IAPTC conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPTC&amp;TPDF</td>
<td>Leadership conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor and project manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Type of Informant</td>
<td>Data collection methods (Participants in blue are already counted in other methods)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Total participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KII</td>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>NPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECSA</td>
<td>Key project liaison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania Police Force</td>
<td>Key project liaison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa Standby Force</td>
<td>Key donor liaison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td>Project Management team and key staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPOI</td>
<td>Key Liaison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total participants/informants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KII: Key Informant Interview
FGD: Focus Group Discussions
NPO: Non-Participant Observation
SS-IDI: Semi-structured In-depth interview
ToC WS: ToC workshops
M: Male
F: Female

**Data collection and analysis**

32. The data collection process followed three stages: 1) desk review; 2) primary data collection, divided in three sub-stages, a) data collected remotely, b) data collected in the field visit, and c) further triangulation and follow-up interviews; and 3) data analysis. Each stage is described as follows:

33. **Desk review**: a comprehensive desk review of over 200 documents was conducted. This entailed project records such as narrative and financial reports from UNITAR and IPs for the 2021-2022 phases, UNITAR documents related to training and evaluation standards, and an extensive review of external sources to contextualize and position the intervention within the peacekeeping training and operational standards, gender and peacekeeping performance related UNSCR (1325, 2242, 2518, 2436), and the “Reforming peacekeeping” UN agenda including the Action for Peacekeeping Initiative Plus (A4P+) priorities and action plan. The documents reviewed for this evaluation are listed in Annex 4.

34. Project-related information was classified in the document matrix and used for an initial analysis of the project trajectory, project logic and activities conducted. During this phase, the evaluator also created the evaluation matrix, revising the initially proposed EQs, and further using data from project documentation and other sources to elaborate the initial qualitative categorization and general strategic themes that were established using the core EQs.

35. **Re-constructed Theory of Change**: A ToC was reconstructed for the project, grounded in the need to unpack the causal logic of the process and how the various activities are inter-connected to move forward impact and outcome-level results of the intervention. In three collaborative sessions facilitated by the evaluator, the project management team worked on: 1) analyzing the problem that the project aimed to contribute to; 2) defining a

---

10 No response received from stakeholder following interview requests.
delimited problem statement; 3) defining the impact goals, intervention pathways and the causal linkages and interlinkages. The resulting narrative and ToC diagram are presented in the Theory of Change section of the report.

36. **Primary data collection:** Primary data collection and desk review were conducted in parallel throughout the evaluation data collection and analysis phase. A set of key informants were interviewed between January and May 2023. From 6-15 May, the evaluator collected data during a field visit in Tanzania, addressing primarily stakeholders associated to activities related to the support provided to TPTC.

37. The approach and collection of primary data was a responsive and adaptive process. As explained earlier in the report, the initial methodological approach was foreseen as mixed-methods, using qualitative-quantitative data collection and analysis methods, but following the evaluability assessment it was adjusted to use qualitative methods only.

38. After the data collection field trip, additional interviews were conducted remotely with project management, the donor and other key stakeholders in Tanzania, who at the time of on-site data collection were not available. Some of these additional interviews were part of the follow-up and triangulation process to bridge information gaps and substantiate findings.

**Data analysis**

39. During desk review, general categories for data analysis were established, using EQs as macro-categories. The evaluator proposed adjustments to the scope of some of the questions and started conducting preliminary theme analysis using the documentation available at desk review, particularly, for example, results from documents like the Institutional Assessment of the TPTC, and the key categories of the IAF tool.

40. All documents were classified and coded drawing on original categories and themes, using the qualitative data analysis software Quirkos™. Data collected from interviews and focus groups with primary sources, was further transcribed using Sonix®, and the ran for exploratory theme analysis using Al-Lyze Pro¹¹ and added to the codebook for comparative analysis in search for emerging patterns, trends and possible divergence in the viewpoints of informants, associated with the EQs and with the re-constructed ToC in mind.

41. Mindful of the limitations of qualitative data, the evaluator has emphasized follow-up interviews and cross validations to minimize possible data gaps identified and reach conclusive findings.

**Data collection instruments**

42. Four instruments were applied for collection of primary data: a) semi-structured key informant interviews (KIs), applied to all those defined as key informants, with pre-defined questions and follow-up emergent questions; b) focus group discussions (FGD), used for male and female participants in training directly conducted by UNITAR; c) semi-structured in-depth interviews, used as an instrument to create meaning and understanding around

¹¹ AI-LYZE is a beta stage tool GBT-based document analysis tool developed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), specially designed for use in development sector by evaluators and researchers. The evaluator has been invited to test and provide feedback on the tool on its Pro version, in its capacity as board member of a local evaluation association coalescing with MIT. Mindful of the Beta stage of the tool, the evaluator has also relied on recordings, transcripts and notes taken to ensure accuracy of theme content, iterating the analysis, complementing, or correcting if needed.
changes or challenges experienced by instructors participating in the ToT and female military personnel. These interviews followed the FGDs in support of in-depth, unstructured discussion of their accounts in the FGD. Finally, d) non-participant observation, conducted for training running during the fieldwork visit. Observation was guided by the content of training for the ToT, and it was comparative, targeting a participant in the ToT and a non-participant.

43. The instruments have been chosen and designed considering the stakeholders as units of analysis, and the need to situate the instruments and questions in context of the roles of each of those key participants in the project implementation.

Limitations

44. The evaluation encountered two major limitations:

1) Availability, robustness, and consistency of information
   a. Availability: Some of the information requested to access informants who participated in ToTs or pre-deployed personnel participating in activities directly connected to the performance of ToT participants as instructors was not available. Some narrative and financial reports or documentation from the IPs were not made available at the start of the document review phase but nearly ending the evaluation report writing phase and could hence not fully be taken into account in this report. Other relevant information such as reports, did not provide a comprehensive narrative account of activities conducted and the results obtained. In the case of the final report to the donor for the 2022 phase, this was scheduled to be submitted at the end of June 2023, when the evaluation was at its concluding phase, and could hence not be reviewed. In some cases, documents, and records of, for example, pre-deployment training participants and lessons from Tanzania’s Peacekeeping missions, were considered “classified”. To overcome these challenges, the evaluator made requests for additional information where needed. Where information was not sufficiently detailed or unable to obtain, the evaluation highlights these as “non-conclusive” findings.
   b. Robustness: Narrative and financial reports delivered by IPs are very succinct and therefore are limited as an instrument to understand sequence of activities, results, challenges and other important narrative aspects of project performance and effectiveness. In the case of one of the IPs (EASF), financial and narrative reports were provided to the evaluator in the final days of the evaluation. It is also important to annotate that this IP did not reply to requests for an interview from the evaluator or project management. To counter this, the evaluator ran various iterations to documentary and primary data collection, analysis, and follow-up interviews, triangulating the findings and revisiting the data as many times as possible to ensure accuracy, coherence, and reliability of the information.
   c. Consistency: Information reported in the UNITAR Event Management System (EMS) did not reflect in its entirety the extent of activities conducted by the project and registered in log frame/reports. Also, as already mentioned, this data did not contain information regarding participant’s contacts, did not mention that the events had learning objectives or attributed any certificates of completion and lacked self-evaluation data in the case of training. This was particularly challenging for activities conducted in 2022 where there were more events reported. Other elements of inconsistency were identified in the reports and solved by asking the project management directly to either clarify or update the information, or by direct request to IPs.
2) **Short timeframe of implementation:** Both phases of the project have had relatively short operational implementation windows, of about six (6) months for each phase. Thus, conclusions regarding anticipated impact, and effects from ToTs, as well as other activities conducted, must be read with caution and critical reflection from all the stakeholders. To work within this constraint, the evaluation has placed higher emphasis in creating meaning around the most important events and time-resource intensive activities of the project, to connect those to overarching dimensions and objectives, and by that, provide more utility-value for these components with “low-hanging fruits”, while making clear differentiations between those activities within the direct scope of work of the UNITAR team, and those understood as “supportive” of the TPTC’s and the TPF, pre-deployment and other UP and civilian training activities.

**Evaluation Findings**

**Relevance**

45. The relevance criterion is assessed against the project’s rationale in four areas:
   a. Project relevance to the SDGs and to UNITAR’s strategic framework.
   b. Relevance to international and the UN peacekeeping frameworks and dispositions.
   c. Relevance of the proposed intervention and its objectives, to the strategic objectives, training, and capacity development needs and priorities of stakeholders.
   d. Relevance in terms of gender equality agenda for uniformed personal in PKO and the WPS agenda.

46. Phases I and II of the project share the impact goal, overall objective and project outcomes with minor changes to outcomes and activities under each outcome, reflecting the continuum of the intervention (see Table 1). Both the 2021 and 2022 phases address ToT for instructors and support to the TPTC for pre-deployment training and other peacekeeping missions’ related activities.

**Project relevance to the SDGs and UNITAR Strategic Framework**

47. The project design and overall impact goal is highly relevant to SDG 16, responding to the need to “promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development”, specifically addressing [Target 16.1](#) and [Indicator 16.1.2](#), related to reduction of conflict-related deaths. Furthermore, the evaluation identifies that the focus of the project in empowering female informed personnel and promoting their equal access to opportunities is also highly relevant to SDG 5 regarding “gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls”, in relation to [Target 5.1](#) and [Indicator 5.1.1](#), and [Target 5.5](#) and [Indicator 5.5.2](#). Furthermore, the project is in line with UNITAR’s strategic objective 1: Support institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace as outlined in the 2018-2021 and 2022-25 Strategic Frameworks.

**Project relevance to international and UN peacekeeping frameworks and dispositions**

48. With the enhancement of performance and safety of peacekeepers as the core of the intervention, and the sought-after impact in the well-being of the communities where PKM are being conducted, the project is also highly relevant and in line with global UN efforts to achieve and sustain peaceful societies. Specifically, the project design and strategy of implementation demonstrates relevance to:

---

12 Target 16.1. Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere.
a. The Cruz Report\textsuperscript{13} and its call to action in four areas: (i) changing mindsets; (ii) improving capacity; (iii) achieving a threat sensitive mission footprint that is coherent with mission mandates and limits the exposure of the mission to threat; and (iv) enhancing accountability. The project’s focus in supporting the TPTC’s capacity to provide high-impact training, improving performance and safety of UP, is highly relevant to these dimensions as it targets the need to improve capacity of peacekeepers and their awareness of the demands of the context in which they operate, in coherence with their mandated tasks.

b. The thematic areas of improvement and 45 commitments of The Action for Peacekeeping Initiative (A4P) were launched in 2018, and the seven A4P+ priorities were defined for the 2021-2023 action plan. The project is especially relevant to priorities 2) strategic and operational integration, 3) capabilities and mindsets, and 4) accountability to peacekeepers.

c. Closely connected, the project design also shows high alignment with UN peacekeeping efforts to improve PKO and peacekeepers performance, as established in UN Resolution 2436 (2018). Further, the project design and implementation entail explicit efforts to improve peacekeepers training to impact their wellbeing and security, both physical and mental, in alignment with UN Resolution 2518 (2020) on safety and security of peacekeepers.

Project relevance to the WPS Agenda and other dispositions

49. Support provided to the TPTC and the TPF to better integrate gender-parity and empowerment as cross-cutting in PKO and training, has been clearly outlined in project design and identified as highly relevant. While actions have been very focalized given the timeframe of implementation and other environmental constraints (see effectiveness), the overall design and implementation is well-aligned to the UN dispositions on the WPS Agenda (UN Resolution 2242 (2015) and Resolution 2538 (2020) on women in peacekeeping), especially regarding participation of women in decision-making and equal access to opportunities for participation in peacekeeping missions. UNITAR has clearly committed itself as part of the objectives of the project to promote the effective inclusion of women, and their empowerment through dedicated training, to not only meet the nine (9) per cent established target (as of 2022) for women deployed, and the 2028 target of a 28 per cent of female officers enrolled in PKO (25 per cent of military and 30 per cent of police), but to also ensure they can perform in a gender-leveled training environment, ensuring that the right conditions are in place for women in pre-deployment, deployment and post-deployment phases.

50. Furthermore, the project addresses important aspects of the Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy 2018-2028 in support of the TPTC and the TPF’s capacity to “increase representation of women in the UN peacekeeping operations in a sustainable manner”.\textsuperscript{14} The project’s focus on enhancing female military and police leadership is also seen by the stakeholder as relevant in line with their acknowledgement of the need to improve conditions for access of female UP to deployment opportunities, while guaranteeing a cross-cutting participation and inclusion of women at all levels of peacekeeping and the military. While the United Republic of Tanzania as a Troop and Police Contributing Country (T/PCC) has made significant progress towards numerical representation of female in peacekeeping missions (9.4 per cent of women deployed),\textsuperscript{15} the notion of

\textsuperscript{13} The 2017 Report on “Improving Security of United Nations Peacekeepers”, also known as “Cruz Report", shed light on the pressing need to take measures to allow UN peacekeepers to operate securely in their deployment environments under challenging safety conditions.


\textsuperscript{15} As of 31 December 2022. Source: Troop Contributing Countries achieving gender parity targets. Available at: Gender | United Nations Peacekeeping
“meaningful participation” of uniformed women is still something that the TPDF, in coordination with TPTC and TPF have yet to fully incorporate as a way-of-doing that reflects as part of the structure at every level and dimension of intervention in PKO.

51. Efforts to promote a gender-responsive vision of peacekeeping at the level of the leadership of the TPDF/TPTC, and the support to the design of the TPTC’s 2023-2028 strategic framework with a gender-parity and gender-sensitive vision, is also in alignment with the WPS agenda and the DPO/Department of Operational Support (DOS) Policy on Gender Responsive United Nations Peacekeeping. This strategic level support is also relevant to the Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations\(^\text{16}\) initiated by Canada, as it has a clear intention to help address the structural and context specific barriers to women’s participation in peacekeeping in the Tanzanian military and police context. There is less relevance observed in terms of support to monitoring and evaluation efforts regarding the extent to which the increase in women’s participation in PKO is beyond numerical and is also supported by an enabling environment at all stages of their participation (recruitment, pre-deployment training, deployment, and post-deployment evaluation and support) and a measurement of the extent to which training and technical support provided is leading to enhanced impact and quality of their performance.

Project relevance to the needs of the TPTC and other stakeholders

52. Activities supported by the project are overall relevant to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries, including trainers, military (TPTC) and police (TPF) stakeholders, as well align to the overall project goal. The project has been particularly relevant to the stakeholders’ needs and priorities in the following areas:

a. Relevance to the TPDF/TPTC ideal to become a regionally recognized peacekeeping training centre, and particularly, a centre of excellence. The TPDF has increasingly taken steps towards creating a strategic vision and action plan for the TPTC that aligns with their developing concept of “excellence” and the “being a centre of excellence”. In the narrative of leadership representatives from these institutions, the funding and technical support provided has been described as “very relevant” to the strategic objectives of the TPTC and the 2021 and 2022 action plan activities, including the strengthening of capacity of trainers through the ToT, and with specific mentions to the support provided “to improvement of training equipment, technology and infrastructure to expand the centre’s activities”.

b. There is also relevance evidenced in relation to the TPTC’s ambition to extend its networks and increase its recognition and visibility, also as a (potential) provider of quality training services to other countries in the East Africa region, and internationally. This visibility, as expressed by several key informants, has been gained through participation in the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centre (IAPTC)’s conference (2022), and through the funding and technical support to update the communications strategy and image of the TPTC. There is also an ongoing membership request to the African Peace Support Trainers Association (APSTA).

\(^{16}\) Led by Global Affairs Canada, the Elsie Initiative focuses specifically on uniformed women serving in police and military roles. This is an area where the international community has struggled the most to reach gender parity goals. The Initiative also seeks to move beyond a discussion of numbers by working to increase the meaningful participation of women. This means ensuring that substantially more women are represented across ranks and functions—in non-traditional roles and positions of authority; in assignments that correspond to their experience and training; and in an environment that offers parity of deployment conditions and a professional culture conducive to their participation.
“We have made much progress regarding the visibility of the TPTC. With support from UNITAR we have put our name out there as a centre of excellence and a regional training centre. [...] We have a website, a logo, we have been to the IAPTC conference, and we are now a member of the association. [...] We [are] also in the process of becoming members of APSTA.” - Key informant interview, female, TPTC staff.

c. Both the TPTC and the TPF key informants highlighted the timeliness and relevance of the funding provided to peacekeeping and pre-deployment training activities. This component of the project (Outcome 3 of phase 2), which has not had direct technical or managerial involvement from UNITAR, has enabled core pre-deployment and other training activities that were outlined in both institutions’ action plans, as stated by key informants, and reported by UNITAR, as well as other documents reviewed.

![Peacekeeping related training supported (2022)](image)

Figure 4. Peacekeeping training supported with project funding (Outcome 3, 2022).

Evaluator’s elaboration with project information.

Coherence

53. Coherence was assessed against evaluation questions proposed in four thematic areas:
   a) alignment of the project with UNITAR programming in peacekeeping.
   b) alignment of the project with UNITAR standards for ToT and overall capacity building.
   c) Synergies with other projects; and,
   d) gender-sensitivity, inclusion, and human rights considerations.

Project alignment with UNITAR programming in peacekeeping

54. The intervention is well-aligned with UNITAR’s portfolio within the areas of conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. This project aligns with the peacekeeping agenda and the strengthening of pre-deployment training to enhance performance and safety of UP deployed to peacekeeping missions, as stated in project proposals for both phases. The project is also very coherent with UNITAR’s mandate regarding training and capacity-building related activities, as it has placed focus on the strengthening of institutional capacity of stakeholders, and direct support to ToT and pre-deployment trainers, as well as other peacekeeping-related trainings.
55. The project had limited articulation with other UNITAR programmes. From the desk review conducted and primary data collected, the evaluation did not confirm significant planned synergies across programming, especially within the programmes implemented during this period by the Division. Although the Division for Peace – through the PDTAT – works in parallel with other peacekeeping training centres in Africa (Ecole de Maintien de la Paix “Alioune Blondin Beye” (EMPABB), International Peace Support Training Centre (IPSTC) in Kenya, The Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) in Ghana, among others), the work with the TPDF/TPTC has been for the 2021 phase significantly focused on the enhancement of infrastructure of the Centre and the readiness component associated with the implementation of the Institutional Assessment tool. At the end of 2022 the assessment tool was also reportedly applied to the EMPABB project in Mali.

56. There have been other focalized synergies identified in, for example, the provision of medical equipment and supplies to UNITAR programmes in collaboration with the TPTC. Donor support has been also provided through UNITAR for “enhancing the physical and mental well-being of male and female military and police personnel deployed”. Result 1.1 of the project included the upgrading of training equipment for the Centre, which has been largely allocated to the purchase of medical supplies and equipment for Casualty Evacuation and medical emergency training (CASEVAC). As this activity relates to the one under the scope of UNITAR’s project, “Strengthening Response Capacities of Medical and Para-Medical Personnel Deployed to UN Peace Operations – Phase II”, 17 though funded by a different donor, the TPTC has supported sending of medical equipment donated by this project to training facilities in Burkina Faso, Chad, Ghana, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal and Togo.

57. UNITAR’s training and capacity building activities complement well the UN Pre-deployment training provided to Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) partner troop and Formed Police Units (FPUs) contributing countries. As one of the long-standing MODANS/TPDF partners, the U.S. Government-funded GPOI18 has provided pre-deployment training to Tanzanian contingents contributing in African/UN peace operations (MINUSCA, MONUSCO, UNIFIL). Data collected indicates that that TPTC has benefited from the complementing purpose of activities funded under the project, especially those related to enhancement of infrastructural capacity of the Centre, which GPOI has described as “very valuable contribution to enhanced pre-deployment training capacity and performance”, as well as from the direct support to financing of pre-deployment training logistics and equipment. There is also alignment in terms of the ToTs conducted and GPOI’s “effectiveness in PSOs, and improvement of capacities” expected outcomes from their assistance. As described by the informant, there is also a shared goal in terms of shifting “from direct training of peacekeepers to fully supporting the country’s efforts to build sustainable peacekeeping training capacity”. Key informants referred to collaboration and participation of UNITAR in the “lessons learned workshops” conducted post-deployment with GPOI and TPTC, however, the evaluation did not have access to the content of these workshops, or the way in which these turn into action for adaptation of training. There was also less evidence of efforts to conduct joint evaluation

17 Funded by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada-Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD), the initiative is designed to last two years, and targets military and/or police medical and para-medical personnel from selected African countries contributing military contingents and police units to the four high-risk missions: MINUSMA, MONUSCO, MINUSCA and UNMISS. Source: UNITAR.

18 GPOI is a U.S. Government-funded security assistance program intended to enhance international capacity to effectively conduct United Nations and regional peace support operations (PSOs) by building partner country capabilities to train and sustain peacekeeping proficiencies. Source: U.S. Department of State.
or review of the results from ToT conducted by UNITAR, or other activities directly liaising with “logistical and technical support provided by the personnel deployed in the country of operations by the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI)”.

Alignment of the project with UNITAR Division for Peace standards for ToT

58. The project is coherent with UNITAR’s overall standards for training, and the Division for Peace guidelines for ToT design and implementation, with a visible content and methodological alignment of ToTs conducted. Nonetheless, the evaluation of ToTs and leadership training has an evidenced lack of systematic data management and reporting, dissemination or reflection with key stakeholders and strategic use for targeted learning and adapting purposes (See also the effectiveness section).

59. Within the scope of the intervention, there were two types of training activities conducted:¹⁹ 1) the training of the TPTC and the TPF instructors (2 events), and 2) the leadership training for female uniformed personnel in both the TPTC and the TPF (2 events). For the first type, the evaluator had access to the training agenda and evaluation for the training conducted with TPTC instructors during the 2022 phase.²⁰ The structure and content reflected the standard Level 1 training competences and showed adaptation to the end users’ specific context of application, as highlighted as well by most participating instructors interviewed. However, for the second training, reported as a Level 2 ToT for the TPF trainers, the evaluator did not receive any supporting document showing content or sequence alignment with UNITAR standards. Overall, the evaluator did not receive the learning objectives for trainings conducted by UNITAR nor the results of the objective assessments conducted.

Table 4. Reviewed Certification Framework Level 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Trainer’s main competences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITAR Level 1 Trainer</td>
<td>• Delivers UNITAR training in compliance with UNITAR’s approach and quality standards, using a training package (session plans, training material, etc.) that have already been designed and made available prior to the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Facilitator</td>
<td>• Co-facilitates training with a Lead trainer (Level 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITAR Level 2 Trainer</td>
<td>• Designs, develops, and implements UNITAR training, from needs analysis through to evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Facilitator and Training designer</td>
<td>• Demonstrates a higher level of trainer knowledge, skills, and attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-facilitates the training with a Support Facilitator (Level 1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Learning Solutions Team, UNITAR.

The training report submitted does not inform about the number of participants certified, the learning objectives or the results from objective assessment of learning outcomes. However, from interviews conducted with project management and participants, the evaluator was informed that there was a type of assessment conducted, which could not be traced to files received, nor received from stakeholders (TPTC and TPF) after being requested.

60. Concerning the gender aspects of the ToT implemented, the evaluation did not find evidence of a gender sensitive content approach to the ToT, neither from the content

---

¹⁹ Note: By “conducted”, the evaluator refers, not to pre-deployment training supported via direct financial cooperation in phase II, but to ToT and training fully designed, implemented, and evaluated by UNITAR in collaboration with TPTC/TPF.

²⁰ The evaluator did not receive a copy of curricula for ToT or female leadership training conducted with TPF, however, considering the narrative of key stakeholders and PM regarding content and outcomes, the evaluator infers it followed the same structure/content in both cases.
outline shared, nor from thematic analysis of the interviews with participants and other key informant. In terms of male-female participation, 26 per cent (4) of participants in the 2021 ToT are reportedly female, 23.8 per cent (5) in the 2022 ToT and 100 per cent (25+21) in the Women Leadership for Peace and Women Leadership Training. The male-female balance for the ToTs is difficult to attain given structural factors that have to do with female representation in the TPTC instructor staff, as well as the discretionary appointment of participants by the leadership of the TPTC (Chief of Operations and Training, and Chief Instructor).

61. As for the Women Leadership for Peace training, there was no verified existing competency framework shared with the evaluator, however, the training is found to be coherent with a gender-parity and female empowerment approach of the project and the objectives of the WPS and UN Uniformed Gender-Parity Strategy. The content and structure of the five-day training addressed core topics related to female leadership and critical skills such as effective communication, negotiation, decision-making, with a visible practical and context-based approach that was also coherent with the application of such skills to the PKO settings in which the participants are mandated to perform. The evaluator did not have access to results from the evaluations of training, and there were conflicting views on whose responsibility it was to manage such information. Nonetheless, from data coded, there is clear thematic alignment in the narrative of all informants in terms of how this type of gender-focused training contributes to improve the TPTC and TPF steps towards meaningful participation of women in PKO, and the development of key capabilities that enable women in military and police to perform from a leadership and power-balanced position.

Gender-sensitivity, Human Rights and Inclusion approach

62. Overall, the intervention showed a gender-sensitive and women empowerment approach. With donor funding and UNITAR’s technical support, the TPTC has visibly integrated a gender component in its strategic framework, and there have been several references from the TPTC/TPDF leadership to how this represents a leap in the way the TPTC addresses women’s participation and other gender-sensitive aspects of its operational framework, with a perceivable rising awareness over gender inequalities and power imbalances, and the pivotal role of women in conflict resolution and peacekeeping at all levels. UNITAR has therefore, as evidenced, consistently put the gender equality topic in the agenda at a strategic level in close alignment with the core action components to reach targets of the Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy: Creating an enabling environment, recruitment and training, communications and outreach, and leadership and accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training of Trainers 2021</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women leadership for peace</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Trainers - PTC Staff 2022</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on Women Leadership</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Evaluators design using desk review information.*
63. The intervention has a good alignment with Human Rights standards, especially regarding the rights of women, and a focus on improvement of performance of peacekeepers that, as mentioned in the project proposal, is also meant to impact their capacity to protect civilians, especially women, and children, in their countries and communities of deployment advancing the implementation of SDG 16 and “working towards sustaining peace, while ensuring that these activities meet the specific needs of conflict-affected and post-conflict countries, as well as the particular needs of men, boys, women and girls who are experiencing conflict”. The focus of the project in promoting gender-equality principles for PKO is also coherent with the acknowledged UN Resolution 1325 important role of women in the “prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peacebuilding, and their equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security”.

64. The evaluation did not identify a visible inclusion-related approach for UP and other participating in the project, which was clarified by the project team and other informants in the exclusionary policy for participation of persons with disabilities in [Tanzanian] peacekeeping missions. Except for the explicit mentions and activities regarding the inclusion of women in PKO conducted by the TPTC and TPF, the only other finding related to the inclusion criteria was the structural arrangements for access of persons with physical impairments to the infrastructure donated,21 where complementary learning and training activities are conducted, with the handicapped access ramp located at the entrance, which was evidenced during fieldwork. However, this does not necessarily impact access or inclusion at the UP level, as the Tanzanian Armed Forces have a clear policy that does not allow persons with disabilities to be part of their military training and operations, including peacekeeping missions.22

Effectiveness

65. Effectiveness was assessed against EQs proposed in four thematic areas:
   - Achievement of outputs and outcomes for phase I and II.
   - Factors affecting project performance.
   - Institutional capacity strengthening approach.
   - ToT, Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (GEEW) and female leadership

Achievement of the project’s outputs and outcomes

66. Most targets and activities were achieved with adjustments to some outputs. The following section presents a summary of phases I and II (full version of reconstructed log frame is presented in detail in Annex 1) with detailed progress of each outcome and output. Considering that after triangulation of records (UNITAR, IP reports and others) and data from interviews, the evaluator observed variations in data reflected in primary and secondary data gathered. The adjusted log frame version provides a breakdown of activities conducted under each result, targets achieved and observations on what has been evidenced versus reported, where necessary.

67. The short timeframe of project implementation and other constraints to effectiveness (responsiveness of stakeholders, the TPTC internal communication and decision-making

---

21 Composed of 7 individual offices, 1 shared space for trainers accommodating up to 8 persons, 1 classroom accommodating up to 50 persons, 1 multipurpose hall for up to 300 participants, 1 computer room with 30 stations, 1 e-library room with 32 stations, and 2 storage rooms.

22 As informed by leadership and reassured by project management when asked about inclusion arrangements.
structures, donor timelines and procedures, among others) were considered when assessing effectiveness and results, and often highlighted as a limitation posed by the project team and key stakeholders to fully conduct activities as planned, leading to changes in the scope or nature of some of the activities (see Table 2).

68. The project objective (same for phases I and II) set to “increase accessibility to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre” has been marked as not yet achieved given the lack of evidence of such “expanded accessibility” in the terms described by the project. There was also no indicator established (or required by the donor) for measurement at the level of the objective. Nonetheless, to achieve this, there is a need to work beyond the physical expansion of the centre’s infrastructure, which entails the strengthening of institutional/operational capacity and networks of the TPTC, to communicate value and get interest from other countries and stakeholders in the centre’s Peacekeeping training offer. As described further in the section, there has been progress achieved in several of the capacity-development areas, but not sufficiently to reach this level (consolidating a portfolio of services to external stakeholders).

Phase 1 – 2021

69. Most results of this phase were completed, although with changes to the nature and scope of some of the activities proposed.

70. The 2021 phase focused most efforts on Result 1.1., concerning “additional structures of the centre constructed and equipped”. This activity was completed, and the new building was satisfactorily delivered to TPTC in January 2022. Other inception activities were also conducted and reportedly completed which focused mainly on 1) the revision of the training offer of the centre and its operating framework; and 2) the development of a concept note for the enhancement of the Msata training facilities which as described in the note, “conceptualizes a simulation village designed for integrated training and simulation of personnel scheduled to deploy in UN mandated peace operations”.

71. For 2021, two activities were marked as partially completed (25 per cent) based on data collected. The first one is the creation of a “Research hub” for TPTC (Result 1.2.), associated with the project’s objective to “transform the TPTC into a fully integrated training and research centre for the preparation of East African UP deploying to the UN peace operations”. While the final report marks this activity as complete, the evaluator did not find sufficient evidence to mark this as completed, but acknowledge the assessment conducted. The second one is the “expanded partnership and donor base for the centre” (Result 1.7).

72. Concerning the establishment of the research hub, the TPTC has included as part of its goals to be, in the words of a key informant, a “knowledge hub for peacekeeping”, which

---

involves “developing human and technical capacity to conduct research and produce knowledge” from East Africa’s peacebuilding and conflict resolution experiences. Nonetheless, the extent to which the adoption of the “research hub” landmark is part of the TPTC’s strategic vision has been contradicted by project management informants who have clarified it was directly adopted by the partner GAFTAG.

According to the key informants from TPTC, “there hasn’t been much progress given that [the] TPTC has been focused on improving internal management and operating structures and consolidating its portfolio”. However, the TPTC leadership also signaled its continuity as a mid-term goal. This information is consistent with the centre’s 2023-2027 workplan shared with the evaluator by the PM where “conducting and publishing research and policy briefs” are marked as part of the key activities and supported under the current phase of the project (Phase III - 2023).

73. To achieve this (Research hub), UNITAR also entered into a partnership with RECSA. RECSA was awarded a grant to support the establishment of the research hub, and the revision of the operating framework of the TPTC (Result 1.3.). The evaluator annotates that no documented evidence was provided of the outputs corresponding to the Grant Letter of Agreement (LoA) with RECSA, that helps understand the extent of their involvement in the establishment of the research hub. However, it was marked as partially completed in acknowledgement of steps towards TPTC’s strengthening of its human and structural operational capacity to ultimately advance the “research hub”. In the final report submitted by RECSA, as well as the grant closure report submitted by Project Management, the activity is also referred to as completed, but with no accompanying narrative that describes the process or the results.

From conversations with the project team, it was explained that the support from RECSA shifted to consultancy for the analysis of TPTC’s operating framework to “understand what needs to happen in order to set up this research hub”. Nonetheless, the product or results of such analysis were not shared with the evaluator, nor recalled by interviewees inquired during interviews. The key informant from RECSA is no longer with the institution and the evaluator was informed that “nobody else had [institutional] memory of this specific collaboration with UNITAR.”

74. Regarding Result 1.724 (2021), “Partnership base expanded to include additional partners / donors”, no formal partnerships were established yet. The final 2021 report marks completion at 20 per cent, noting that “[d]espite initial discussions with relevant stakeholders in the field it wasn’t possible to formalize an expanded partnership in support of TPTC”. However, activities from Phase II, like participation of TPTC in IAPTC conference and their membership to this association are perceivable levers of recognition of the centre’s value offer and of potential collaboration with other PTCs regionally. In the current management structure, the TPTC is financially reliant on TPDF (Headquarters) and the MODANS, with a very centralized high-level decision-making structure, for which decisions, including establishment of formal or informal partnerships and donor agreements, must pass the revision and approval of headquarter officials. In the final report for 2022, the activity was marked as not completed, given that no partnerships were signed.

---

24 The evaluator only refers explicitly to Result 1.1. because of its relative weight in terms of funding allocated and the overall goal for this phase. Results 1.1. and 1.7. are highlighted since these were partially completed activities for this phase.
75. Phase II - 2022

Phase two focused on the support to the implementation of the centre’s action plan activities, aligned to capacity strengthening of the TPTC staff and the institutional assessment conducted. In sum, most activities from the log frame were achieved, although, as with phase I, with variations.

76. For Project Objective 1, reportedly, two activities from Result 1.2. were postponed and will be implemented in 2023: 1) the training of IT personnel for the “update and maintenance of the Website”, and other IT related activities, and 2) A “High-Level Event at TPTC, in the framework of the African Peace Support Trainers Associations”. Additionally, the evaluation found that the e-library has not yet been fully implemented, despite the provision of computers and other technological resources by the project. The remaining activities implemented as part of support to the implementation of the TPTC action plan were added to the revised log frame, since these were only described in the log frame.

77. The upgrading of some of the pre-deployment training equipment had been partially made and delivered to TPTC, but as confirmed by informants and the documentation received, the totality of funds had been transferred to the Centre for direct procurement.

78. Training conducted in this phase by UNITAR (Project Objective 2) was targeted to 1) a ToT for instructors of the centre; 2) The Women Leadership Training delivered to TPTC and TPDF female personnel; and 3) A training reported as ToT delivered to Tanzania Police Force instructors. Although the latter was not planned in the log frame, it was reported to UNITAR’s EMS, and corroborated as conducted by key informants.

79. Eight (8) training courses were directly managed and implemented by the TPTC and TPF under Project Objective 3, with financial support through the project. Figure 4 presents the breakdown of training courses that have been conducted by implementing partners and reported in the EMS.

80. The following sections describe the findings regarding contributions made by the project. The thematic analysis has been structured to answer EQs to the extent possible, but with a higher focus on harvesting intended and non-intended effects and significant changes from the intervention at the level of institutional capacity development dimensions.

Effectiveness of the Institutional Capacity Strengthening approach applied.

81. The IAF designed by the UNITAR Division for Peace has been piloted to assess six dimensions of institutional capacity of the TPTC. Given the relevance this pilot application of the tool has, and the alignment identified with the TPDF and TPTC strategic goal to consolidate the PTC as a centre of excellence, data collection focused on understanding the extent to which the support answers to the findings of the assessment, and the meaning attributed by informants to the results of capacity building and support actions in their narrative of change.

82. Overall, the thematic analysis from the interviews and triangulation, shows that contributions to institutional capacity strengthening are clearly identified in four of the six dimensions, organized in Table 6 from higher recurrency and agreement amongst interviewees, to lower. Contributions to the sustainability and legal and regulatory

framework dimensions were not identified in the thematic analysis.

Table 6: Thematic analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure and equipment</th>
<th>Thematic analysis of contributions</th>
<th>More work/support needed…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure: The new infrastructure is highly regarded as an enabling contribution to the enhancement of TPTC’s capacity to improve training through access to technology, and training conditions with better learning and instructing spaces. The infrastructure contributes to expanding the training offer, with courses, resources, and facilities available for peacekeeping training courses that can be conducted on site or virtually.</td>
<td>- Training of IT personnel to ensure maintenance and use of the physical IT infrastructure in place (Computers, video conferencing equipment, printers, server etc.). - Full functionality of the proposed e-library that extends access to resources beyond those transferred by UNITAR, as originally understood by the stakeholders. - Facilities are currently under-utilized, as was also noted by participants. When there are no trainings in place, the centre lacks an alternative calendar of activities, including those structured for an external audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Networks and relationships | Partnerships: Stakeholders expressed awareness of the opportunities in joining networks via membership to associations like the IAPTC to increase the centre’s visibility and to partner with other key actors regionally. - Engagement with the IAPTC and the African chapter, APSTA, has also contributed to exposure of participants to the work of other actors in peacekeeping and peacekeeping training, and notably enhanced international visibility of the centre. - Communications: Actions towards increasing TPTC’s outreach of stakeholders and visibility, including the Website and a renewed branding image of the Centre, are considered significant contributions to internationalization of the centre. | - The TPTC remains a locally based, highly centralized and locally operating training centre. Their scope is limited to the provision of training for Tanzanian contingents and staff deployed to UN missions and all strategic decisions are made at the Headquarters in Dodoma. - There is an optimistic vision of the potential in partnerships that is yet to be materialized in formal alliances, a strengthened diversified donor base, and a portfolio that extends the scope of TPTC’s work beyond sourcing military and police personnel to peacekeeping missions. - The personnel assigned to management, updating and maintenance of the Website and the server, as well as the communications personnel, will benefit from training at a more strategic level in the use and value added of these tools. |

| Institutional framework and operating systems | Creating strategic vision and plan: UNITAR’s support in the assessment of institutional conditions and the design of the 2023-2027 | While the institutional capacity strengthening process is at a very primary stage, the TPTC leadership was highly focused on the “critical importance” of |
| People and Human Resource Management | **ToT for instructors**: The training of instructors is acknowledged as a priority for the centre addressed by the project. The instructors and their supervisory officers both observe notable changes in class management of instructors who participated in the Level 1 ToT received.  
- **Language training contributes to improvement of training, performance and TPTC’s internationalization.** Although there was a short cycle of the English Training course provided under the project, participants and TPTC leadership acknowledge the relevance that improvement of English language has to the performance of instructors and pre-deployed personnel.  
- **Female leadership training is considered pivotal** to the Centre’s efforts to promote an inclusive and gender-sensitive operation across domains of action. | **Building additional training and accommodation infrastructures to expand its offer**, rather than in designing a portfolio of training that reflects a vision of specialized international offer, to attract clients outside core UN mission components.  
- **There was also a recurrent mention of the need for updated training curricula that reflects the challenges of contemporary peacekeeping in Africa and regionally, enshrined in the Capstone Doctrine**, but tailoring to the indigenous aspects of being a peacekeeper in Africa and how to face current and emerging threats to peace and stability, that could also be used by outside stakeholders.  
- **Language training contributes to improvement of training, performance and TPTC’s internationalization.** Although there was a short cycle of the English Training course provided under the project, participants and TPTC leadership acknowledge the relevance that improvement of English language has to the performance of instructors and pre-deployed personnel.  
- **Female leadership training is considered pivotal** to the Centre’s efforts to promote an inclusive and gender-sensitive operation across domains of action.  
- **There was also a recurrent mention of the need for updated training curricula that reflects the challenges of contemporary peacekeeping in Africa and regionally, enshrined in the Capstone Doctrine**, but tailoring to the indigenous aspects of being a peacekeeper in Africa and how to face current and emerging threats to peace and stability, that could also be used by outside stakeholders.  
- **Language training contributes to improvement of training, performance and TPTC’s internationalization.** Although there was a short cycle of the English Training course provided under the project, participants and TPTC leadership acknowledge the relevance that improvement of English language has to the performance of instructors and pre-deployed personnel.  
- **Female leadership training is considered pivotal** to the Centre’s efforts to promote an inclusive and gender-sensitive operation across domains of action. | **Participants interviewed and supervisory authorities of instructors believe there is a need for a comprehensive ToT certificate package to be scheduled during the year with iterative ToT cycles.**  
- **Learning by exposure was high on the narrative of what is needed.** The “need for more exposure” of instructors, male and female, and TPTC personnel to international practices, innovations and application of standards was thematically recurrent.  
- **Making English language courses available throughout the year**, the way it is done with French, with levels and times that respond to the assessment of needs of the centre’s staff.  
- **Generally, female participants referred to the importance of addressing gender-related power imbalances** in the military and the centre, with a sensitizing and capacity development package that includes also male personnel. |
Strategic vision and the “excellence” mindset

83. The assessment conducted by the project (hereinafter, the assessment) concluded there was no evidence of a documented strategy or strategic plan, [...] aside from the “full expansion plan” detailing the infrastructural development of the TPTC over the next two years. Making TPTC “a centre of excellence” is the statement that overall underpins TPTC’s statement of vision and mission and is embedded in the discourse of all informants interviewed at the leadership level. In the view of informants, expansion of the centre is one of the top priorities, alongside being “recognized” regionally and globally as such centre of excellence. This narrative, however, often does not reflect the critical reflection on the internal organizational and structural changes needed as found and recommended in the mentioned assessment.

84. During phase two, there were two meetings conducted with TPTC leadership, which involved participation from Headquarters, including the Director of Peace Support Operations. The first meeting to discuss the action plan, and the second to start conversations about the content of the strategic work plan, and, as informed to the evaluator, to promote reflection for the rewired of the vision, mission, and strategic priorities of the centre, understanding and further developing what “excellence” truly means as a change statement, aside from the infrastructural expansion and internationalization.

85. As a top-down, centralized, and hierarchical organization, the informants largely agree that the involvement of Headquarters officials (TPDF/MODANS) in meetings for the design of the Centre’s strategic plan 2023-2038 is a milestone achieved by the project. This was remarked as critical for adoption and appropriation of the changes proposed and the conversations around the shifts in management approach and organizational vision required to produce and sustain change in the longer term. However, the results in terms of organizational change and structural aspects of “how things work” at the TPTC are yet to be assessed. Workshops for the finalization of the strategic plan have already been finalized in the current phase (III) and the strategic plan has been finalized (See Likelihood of Impact), but the effectiveness is yet to be assessed at conclusion of the current phase.

86. From conversations with project management and the stakeholders, it was visible that UNITAR has worked intentionally in promoting ownership by active participation and decision-making of the stakeholders at the Centre throughout the process of assessing and discussing the strategic direction. While not established as a specific goal, the trust and recognition gained by UNITAR from stakeholders in the process is remarked as foundational to any institutional capacity development process and more so to one that involves working with military and defense institutions, where trust is an even more valued asset.

“Before this we didn’t really know UNITAR or what UNITAR does. We appreciate Germany and UNITAR as our partners in this process and all the support received for the improvement of our institution”.

Key informant interview, male, TPTC.

87. However, from the interviews, the evaluator also notes that the alternation of the key personnel at the TPTC hinders the possibility to keep the flow of activities to promote this change in organizational and operational mindset, and to give continuity to activities, as it is often not possible to pick-up where things were left when there is new staff appointed. Management has also acknowledged that this is a challenge, but the strategy to overcome these constant disruptions to the continuity of the institutional capacity strengthening process is not clear.
88. To which extent the institutional capacity development leads to a more operationally structured, independent, and international training centre, also relies on the centre’s capacity to identify and clearly convey a services portfolio that tells outside stakeholders **what the centre’s distinctive value is**. This, alongside the need for a clear and well-assessed growth projection in the form of a business-plan, as identified from the assessment, is concurrent with the evaluation findings. For the donor informant, for example, understanding clearly that the centre’s growth plan is based on an “analysis of the demand for their services”, is essential for funding and support to be provided.

**Communication, networks, and visibility**

89. The project has been effective at helping the TPTC rebrand its image and create channels for external communication of the Centre's purpose, vision, and activities. During phase I and II the project implemented several actions aimed at increasing TPTC visibility. These activities were agreed with the IP and (MODANS) and key stakeholders (TPDF/TPTC) as part of the 2021 action plan, with implementation extended during the 2022 phase.

90. The rebranding resulted from a consultative, and collaborative process as acknowledged by both project management and stakeholders. This visibility package included the design of the centre’s logo and communication materials, as well as the creation of a website. The site is already functioning, however, during fieldwork evaluation there were times where there was no access to the site. The key IT officer assigned to the TPTC indicated that these issues are directly fixed by the IT officer at Headquarters, who administers the server. Nonetheless, the site was observably up-to-date and is reportedly updated on a frequent basis. The evaluator requested a traffic report for the site to better assess the current reach, however, it was not provided.

91. As mentioned, the stakeholders interviewed all expressed the value of the communication and branding support given to improve their image and visibility. During the tour taken of the training centre’s Kunduchi facilities, the leadership proudly signaled the new image (logo) and how they feel it reflects their core of business in the “Linda Amani” statement (To protect peace).

92. Along with the site, the project also supported the dedicated domain, email addresses and Intranet, which will on the other hand enhance the internal communication, information management and institutional presence of the TPTC. These are, according to informants, being utilized, however, emails received from TPTC staff for evaluation purposes, typically came from personal domain accounts (i.e., Gmail). Communication via instant messaging is also common for professional purposes within the centre, as observed.

**Enabling TPTC operations through infrastructural and technological support**

93. The new facilities built with donor support (see Image 1) are fully functioning and occupied for the most part. During fieldwork the evaluator observed that the classroom on the first floor was booked daily for French lessons. Other rooms were intermittently used and as explained, it was because of the current pre-deployment training calendar that did not require activities in the building. The building also has the Wing
Commandant’s office and dedicated offices for GPOI staff coming to conduct pre-deployment training. These offices remain vacant when GPOI staff is not at Centre.

94. The building does not support the “expansion of training” capacity as said in the original project plan. Given the way in which the building is designed and projected to be used, it would likely serve the enhancement of training provided with better equipped rooms and computers available for all staff and pre-deployed personnel, rather than the increase in number of persons trained. The building, however, is an improvement of the observed old infrastructure, where the conditions of learning spaces has visibly deteriorated. It also includes a comfortable instructor’s room, also frequently used as observed and highly welcomed by some of the instructors interviewed.

95. Involvement from the German Armed Forces Technical Advisory Group (GAFTAG) in Tanzania in the management and operation of the construction component of the project enabled the culmination of the infrastructure in the short timeframe (about six months) established. However, from interviews conducted and documentation reviewed, it was found that the process has been conducted in a highly isolated way, with limited supervisory involvement from UNITAR and TPTC. This limited involvement also relates to the fact that, as stated by project management, the construction component was a direct request from the donor and not necessarily the result of a thoroughly coordinated assessment of the need. A statement from the construction management summarizes well the findings from data collected: “I did not report to TPTC or UNITAR because they don’t know anything about constructions, while I have been doing this for years and have a longstanding relation […] with GAFTAG [sic]”. This was unintendedly positive in a way that helped cut through much of the red tape from multistakeholder auditing of a very specialized domain such as infrastructural development, but also negative in a way that decreased mutual accountability. Finally, it helped achieve the construction within the timeline established of 6 months.

96. The computer room that is supposed to be the enabling technology for the e-library in the view of TPTC is used sporadically by TPTC staff and pre-deployed personnel to consult tasks related to their training and related information. However, as informed by a key informant, the e-library is yet to be functioning because the e-government authority (e-GA)26 which operates as a government-based ICT consultant for governmental agencies has submitted a “very expensive” quotation for the set-up and maintenance of this resource. A project management informant from UNITAR reported not knowing of this arrangement and having the understanding that the scope agreed for the e-library was the upload of training resources for instructors to the Intranet. This view, however, conflicts with the one from TPTC and TPDF leadership and staff where “the e-library is not functioning because of the high cost of implementing it charged by e-GA. […] but we are looking for ways to do this soon”.

97. In the discourse, there is a frequent reference to the need for more infrastructure if excellence is to be achieved. However, the TPTC leadership is not clear yet as to what extent the “business-plan” and value proposal are for the use of the new infrastructure by external clients. The findings show that UNITAR has focused on promoting TPTC’s critical reflection and work with leadership towards developing such a business approach to management of the centre, and a consistent value offer that positions TPTC as a preferred partner for external peacekeeping actors and donors.

98. There was no environmental management plan for the construction of the new building donated. From interviews with the constructor and construction manager, the evaluator

26 As said in their website, the e-Government Authority (e-GA) “is a public institution mandated to coordinate, oversee and promote e-Government initiatives as well as enforce e-Government related policies, laws, regulations, standards and guidelines in public institutions”.
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identified that the construction plan did not have any type of environmental impact assessment, responsible material sourcing, or any other type of environmental impact mitigation plan, because, as informed “The MODANS does not need to comply with such regulations when expanding its infrastructure”, and “these environmental permissions take time that we did not have”.27

ToT and supporting female leadership and gender-parity

99. The evaluation found that the Level 1 ToT conducted with a group of TPTC instructors has positively affected their instructional practice. From the focus group interview and the observation of training, the evaluation found that trainers highly value the opportunity to learn about better training and coaching practices and feel these have an impact in their level of confidence and competence to conduct training and support pre-deployed personnel in attainment of learning outcomes.

100. When asked about the most valuable learning outcomes from training, there was also general agreement on that, communicating to participants the learning objectives and outcomes at the beginning of training was not accustomed practice, but realized as valuable during the ToT. Other remarks pointed to learning on 1) the importance of icebreakers and participatory methods; 2) assessing possible learning gaps when closing training; 3) promoting divergence of opinions and critical reflection; 4) color coding and using flipcharts to keep participants expectant of contents; and 5) using games and ludic to keep increasing engagement.

“The contents we teach can be heavy for participants, so we can use all the methods we learn to increase engagement, avoid people falling sleep, and improve learning outcomes. […] This will have an impact on people’s learning and performance on the field”. Instructor, male, participant in focus group.

101. All instructors interviewed agreed that the training and training materials were designed with quality, and in a highly engaging and participatory way. They also remarked on the expertise of UNITAR’s trainers, and their command of all topics related to learning design, learning environment and classroom management as being essential to their learning outcome.

“Thank you for this opportunity. Honestly, all I can say is that it was great. They [the instructors] did a fantastic job. The had a plan laid out for the training, but they also wanted to hear from us, from our experiences. If you didn’t know the answer to something or you were straying away from the topic, they knew how to get you back on track. It was a good way of learning how to do it by just observing their own command of the room”.

102. Practical application of learning from ToT were visible during pre-deployment training observations conducted during fieldwork. The evaluator observed two training courses. One conducted by a participant in the ToT, and another conducted by a non-participating instructor. Using Level 1’s expected competences, the evaluator observed if instructors incorporated any of the instructional practices transferred during the ToT.

27 Key informant interview, male, construction contractor.
103. The instructor trained by UNITAR was highly confident and engaging, incorporating key practices like introducing learning objectives, icebreakers, case study examples with participation from trainees, and assessment of learning and learning gaps at close of training. The instructor displayed a strong classroom management competence. At the exit point, the instructor conducted random interviews with pre-deployed personnel trained, asking about perception of instructor’s methodology talked about the class being very participatory, engaging, and easy to follow with the demonstrative examples given by the instructor. They also believe this instructor was “more engaging than the previous one” who has not participated in the ToT. The instructor’s supervisor also remarked the visible attitudinal change and differences in training methods from those who participated in the ToT and those who has not.

104. Instructors interviewed expressed the need to have less spaced-out training moments, suggesting a yearly outlined ToT’s calendar that supports their continuous improvement and advance to upper certificate levels where they acquire training design knowledge as well. For instructors, this represents an opportunity for professional growth that should be standardized as part of TPTC’s plan to become a centre of excellence. In general, instructors expressed the importance of learning as well how to tailor the methods to larger audiences, as they often lead classrooms as large as 200 participants and felt that some of the methods were difficult to apply to classes this size. Furthermore, some instructors also suggested the inclusion of Swahili speaking instructors for ToTs, as this could present a learning barrier for some non-fluent English speakers that cannot fully capture at times what is being said.

105. Finally, several mentions were made on the importance of what they called “exposure”, referring to the need to exchange with peers from other centres, to conduct look and learn visits, and to access in person and virtual peer learning and coaching opportunities from those instructors conducting similar training and with more international experience. Instructors also remarked, in line with this international exposure, the need for updated curricula that is more contextualized to learning characteristics of local personnel, but also incorporates global PKO knowledge, use of technology and learning by doing with enhancement of equipment and training materials.

106. Tracing the connection between the enhanced competence of instructors, and the performance of pre-deployed personnel trained during deployment, is not yet possible under currently established mechanisms. Although there is a “lessons learned workshop” conducted at the end of every mission and after-action reviews to assess the learning experience of pre-deployed personnel, the first with participation of the mission lead and GPOI, there is not a systematic way at TPTC to assess performance and safety of deployed personnel in relation to quality of training or to measure impact of such performance in the communities they serve. This is indeed one of the findings of the assessment conducted which states that “[t]here is currently no monitoring and evaluation system to measure the impact created by the activities of the centre, nor a
reporting system. Such monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems are a guarantee of quality and a tool to gain confidence for potential new clients.\textsuperscript{28}

107. As mentioned by key informants, DPO conducts a pre-deployment visit for selected contingents close to deployment to assess readiness, but it is the TCC, Tanzania, which self-certifies the operational readiness of contingents in response to DPO relevant guiding documents.\textsuperscript{29} However, as mentioned in the Cruz Report, there is questioning of the extent to which the UN is able to monitor and enforce the implementation of these guidelines and ensure quality of training. The evaluation, therefore, identifies a gap in terms of joint (UNITAR, TPTC, other interested stakeholders such as GPOI) results and impact evaluation of ToTs, instructor performance and the results of missions and individual performance of deployed personnel.

108. Finally, as recommended by the GPOI informant, it will be ideal to “coordinate calendars with UNITAR” for a more aligned timing of the ToTs with the instructors training conducted by GPOI. There is also a recommendation to create synergies around content of such trainings in a “week-long planning and design” yearly visit to Tanzania, where they can also sit down with Headquarters and other stakeholders and donors to coordinate the technical assistance and training/learning priorities and agendas for improvement of pre-deployment and overall peacekeeping related training. This, as informed by UNITAR, is being advanced in the third phase of the project.

**Promoting female uniformed personnel leadership and meaningful participation in PKO**

109. During both phases, UNITAR conducted leadership training targeting female police (2021)\textsuperscript{30} and military (2022) personnel. The evaluation assessed effectiveness from focus groups, individual in-depth interviews with training participants and triangulation with male and female stakeholders.

110. During the focus group, there was general agreement on the importance that dedicated female leadership training has on their professional and personal development. Participants showed excitement when describing the experience with terms such as “transformational” and “empowering”. The remarks on the training and learning experience also where descriptive of the “safety” that the learning space provided them to express themselves, to make critical reflections on issues like gendered power imbalances, and the structural barriers to significant participation, as well as jointly reflect on their individuals and shared challenges as women in the military and peacekeeping without fear of judgement from peers or supervisors.

111. When asked about the most significant learning and changes from the training, some participants referred to the importance of improving their communication skills and confidence to express their opinions as equals in a highly male dominated setting.

\textsuperscript{28} Promoting the Institutional Development of the Tanzania Peacekeeping Training Centre (TPTC). Institutional Assessment, 2022, page 8.

\textsuperscript{29} DPKO-DFS 2016.08, Guidelines: Operational Readiness Preparation for Troop Contributing Countries in Peacekeeping Missions (2016); DPKO-DFS Ref. 2015.16, Policy: Operational Readiness Assurance and Performance Improvement, (2015) and others.

\textsuperscript{30} The evaluator did not receive any information regarding training of instructors, female leadership, or any other training conducted with IP TPF, aside from what is stated in final narrative report of the Letter of Agreement and reports from UNITAR. However, this information was not sufficiently backed by internal assessment or narrative of the process and outcomes, to support conclusive findings on effectiveness. Also, there evaluator did not have access to contact of participants in trainings or assessment of training.
There were also frequent references to learning about “assertiveness” and assertive leadership, which entail maintaining empathic listening and communicating while conveying decision-making authority. Furthermore, they highlighted coaching skills and the importance of discovering and strengthening their individual leadership styles, while keeping an open mind to that of their peers.

112. However, participants were also aware of the limited impact that “female empowerment” has unless it is extended to the training of male UP and elevates the conversation on gendered exclusionary narratives embedded in the military, coming all the way from how higher levels of leadership perceive the relevance of female involvement and their capacities against those of man. Thus, all participants concurred on suggesting that gender-equality and parity in the military is also addressed with male staff and is included by TPTC as crosscutting to all the centre’s domains of action.

113. On this, the evaluator was able to evidence the extent to which responses from some of the higher-level officials interviewed openly express a gender bias. One of them referred to the “many issues that women have to effectively perform in PKO, including pregnancy, childcare at home and other [quote] women stuff”. On several occasions the evaluator heard similar remarks from male interviewees to the question of challenges to effective and meaningful participation of women in PKO, and the achievement of targets and objectives of the Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy. In contrast, they also referred to the women leadership training as a milestone in their efforts to have a more inclusive approach to female leadership and female UP participation in PKO.

114. The evaluator also wants to call attention to the limited references to gender equality conditions in the document that contains results from the institutional assessment. Despite the inclusion of several gender markers in the criteria of the assessment, it did not reflect a through gender-responsive analysis of current enabling or hindering factors for participation of women in PKO, except for the mention of “spaces not specifically considering the specificities of beneficiaries (gender, age range, disabilities, with the exceptions of restrooms reserved for female participants)”.

Efficiency

115. Efficiency has been evaluated against three main criteria established:

   a. Efficiency in terms of timeliness and cost efficiency of outputs.
   b. Efficiency of the implementing partner(s) and arrangements made to deliver products and results.
   c. Efficiency of delivery of project inputs and resources.

116. Overall, the project has met its targets and has implemented activities as planned, with some outstanding variations specified below.

117. To achieve the project objectives, the project entered into partnership agreement with MODANS (2012-2022), RECSA (2021), the Tanzania Police Force (2022) and the East Africa Standby Force (2022). Funds allocated are summarized as follows in Table 7:

Table 7. Summary of implementing partners’ agreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Dates of Agreement</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount in USD</th>
<th>Percentage of Framework Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

34
2021 Implementation phase

118. During 2021 most funding (70 per cent) of the total budget was allocated to grants and the largest portion to MODANS (62 per cent) for the construction of TPTC’s new facilities. The facilities were built and handed to TPTC within the timeline agreed, despite the several challenges phased for the set off the construction project and the implementation arrangements which included a Tripartite Agreement with MODANS for the direct procurement and oversight of the construction. This agreement also included a joint bank account created where MODANS and GAFTAQ received the funds once they were available. As mentioned earlier, part of the construction arrangements had to do with management of the construction by GAFTAQ and support from MODANS to cover construction costs with further reimbursement once funding was transferred to UNITAR.

119. From the analysis of financial implementation and on-site observation of the quality of the infrastructure, furniture and equipment delivered, the evaluation identifies that the grant was implemented efficiently and that implementing arrangements made, contributed to the timely delivery. In the final financial statement submitted by MODANS, the evaluation did not identify major deviations from the original budget, with just minor adjustment to quantities of materials either because of price or availability. Approximately 20.7 per cent of the budget was allocated to the purchase of furniture and equipment.

120. The grant allocated to RECSA for support of activities related to the implementation of the research hub, is reportedly implemented in full, with no significant variations from the original budget. As per final financial report, 96.1 per
cent of the budget was allocated to consultants for the “review of the operating framework of TPTC in support of the establishment of the “research hub”, consultants travel and an activity described as a “workshop with PTC consultants”. The evaluator, however, did not receive any documentary or narrative evidence from TPTC informants or other stakeholders that these activities were conducted (RECSA informant was no longer available for interview), and thus cannot refer to cost-efficiency in terms of quality and timeliness of products delivered.

2022 Implementation phase
Efficiency related to the grant with MODANS (TPTC)

121. Grants allocated to partners during the 2022 phase represented approximately 47 percent of the total budget.

122. During this phase, support to TPTC through the Agreement with MODANS/TPDF reflected a continuation of activities associated with the technical and advisory support for the strengthening of instructor’s capacity, promoting female leadership in peacekeeping and across operations, and the implementation of activities from TPTC’s 2021 action plan, including the implementation of the assessment and revised strategic framework.31 To expand action in these areas and respond to TPTC’s expressed key areas of support, the original Letter of Agreement was amended twice with both financial additions and adjustments to activities.

Table 8. Summary of final financial report and percentage of budget items relative to the total budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget item</th>
<th>Actual project expenditure (USD)</th>
<th>Variance from original budget (USD)</th>
<th>Percentage of total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of TPTC strategic plan</td>
<td>$14,131.52</td>
<td>$441</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding / website / intranet / e-library/training IT staff</td>
<td>$7,992.62</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of IAPTC</td>
<td>$28,676.26</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language training</td>
<td>$2,747.56</td>
<td>-$9</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of trainers (Instructors)</td>
<td>45,864.78</td>
<td>-1161</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women leadership training</td>
<td>39,801.94</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership summit</td>
<td>91,661.06</td>
<td>-2962</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level summit</td>
<td>67,093.66</td>
<td>9494</td>
<td>12.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training equipment (including fuel for vehicles)</td>
<td>77,176.92</td>
<td>7478</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional activities (These activities include support to pre-deployment training)</td>
<td>150,805.22</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>27.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 The original budget only contemplated support to ToT, pre-deployment training and donation of training equipment.
The second Agreement was implemented in totality as per final financial report. No significant variations from the original budget were observed. **43.22 percent of the total budget was allocated to training related activities**, including the ToT of instructors, the Women Leadership Training, and logistical support for implementation of pre-deployment training, incorporated under additional activities in the original report. These activities were completed and delivered in a timely manner as found by the evaluation.

Training equipment related costs have been fully spent, however, as noted in previous sections, funding was transferred for procurement and purchase of the remaining equipment. Thus far, only medical equipment and training materials have been donated, including arrangements with TPTC to support delivery of equipment to countries from another project. However, the evaluation observed a purchase of medical equipment (Buddy first aid kits) for EMPABB, in the amount of 45,000 USD charged to the project. This, however, was not reported to the evaluation or accounted for in any of the reports.

A similar situation occurred with the transfer of funds for $76,067.45 to the Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation for the "Mwalimu Nyerere Pan-African Young Leaders' Fellowship Project". From interviews, and as stated in the project document provided by the informant, the overall objective of the programme is to “explore, research on and disseminate Mwalimu Julius Nyerere's leadership philosophy, style and practices which promote peace, unity and people-centered development to all African youth so as to transform them to resourceful and productive current and future leaders of the continent." The grant enabled the foundation to conduct their annual fellows' summit, fully funded by partners and donors, the largest being UNITAR. The evaluator was informed that 60 young African leaders participated in this summit.

The evaluator highlights potential conflict in the reporting and coherence of this activity with the project’s overall goal. In the interim 2022 report issued by UNITAR, the only activity marked as leadership training refers to the training of TPTC’s female personnel (women leadership training) with 16 women reportedly participating, which had a budget expenditure line allocated, as shown in Table 8. There is no other activity reported in UNITAR’s preliminary final report (dated January 30, 2023) that matches the description for this budget item, and the reported number of participants (60) in TPTC’s financial report, which indeed coincided with the participants reported by the Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation in documents shared with the evaluator.

During interviews with key leadership informants at TPTC, the evaluator inquired about this activity. Two of the informants were aware of the activity but one of them described it as “unrelated to TPTC PKO and activities agreed under the project” and the other was not sure about connection and signaled a direct request from UNITAR to proceed with funding. The evaluator then triangulated with informants from UNITAR, but the two persons inquired from project management were unable to provide a clear explanation or supporting documentation that could associate this activity to those under the action plan for TPTC.

The narrative reporting from IPs is also scarce in terms of the description of the activities, the process, the results, challenges, and other relevant aspects that could
help better understand what has enabled and hindered results, and why deviations occurred from the original plan.

Tanzania Police Force and East Africa Standby Force

129. As evidenced in the final financial report, nearly 81 per cent of the budget allocated to the TPF was used for Pre-SAAT, pre-deployment training (PDT), and protocol training activities. Approximately 18 per cent has been marked for “training equipment”. The evaluator only had access to one appointed key informant from the TPF, even though access was requested to participant’s lists and supporting documentation regarding training content and reports. This, however, was not received. Activities were marked as completed in reporting from UNITAR; however, the protocol training had not been added to activities planned in the original Logframe. In the reconstructed version annexed, the evaluator aggregated it and marked it as complete. It was nonetheless reported to EMS.

130. The evaluator did not receive a response from the EASF informant after several requests for interview. The lifespan of this project was very short, set for implementation of two pre-deployment trainings (less than two months) of EASF contingents. The received financial and outlined narrative report indicate that activities were completed. Only one of the training courses reported as conducted was uploaded to the EMS. The narrative report also refers to problems encountered “due to the late transfer of the funds. Even though the LOA was signed on 6 September 2022, funds were not released until 8 December 2022”. The delay in disbursement of funds, is nonetheless a finding common to all Agreements signed. Aside from the two mentioned reports, the evaluator did not receive any other evidence or way to assess the results of the training conducted.

131. The evaluator is mindful of the timeline and administrative disruptions that a project implemented in a relatively short period of time can have. However, the way in which information, monitoring and reporting has been managed can often lead to an evidenced mismatch in information across reporting mechanisms (financial and narrative reports, reports to EMS and quantitative indicator reports), thus questioning of accuracy and reliability of the information provided and strenuous efforts from the evaluator to reconstruct and validate the whole picture of activities and beneficiaries. Furthermore, this also makes it very difficult to connect operational aspects of the project with the benefits received by stakeholders and potential impact from the intervention.

Likelihood of Impact

132. This section presents findings on anticipated impact from the intervention associated with the longer-term outcome and objectives in these areas:

a. The extent to which ToT and pre-deployment training has had an impact on the performance of peacekeepers.

b. Impact of the intervention on the role of female officers.

c. The extent to which the project is likely to impact access to training and its enhancement through the infrastructure, technology and equipment upgraded.

d. The extent to which strategic organizational advisory support could impact operational and leadership capacity of the TPTC.

133. The analysis of potential impact of activities is also considering that the project
is currently in its third phase, and that actions have been taken to adjust based on consultative planning with TPTC for the design of the 2023-2028 strategic framework of the centre, as well as the already designed action plan for the same period.

134. Despite the short term of implementation of activities and diversified portfolio associated to capacity strengthening of the TPTC, the evaluation identifies that the project is likely to cause impact in several domains:

135. Potential impact to improve learning outcomes and performance of pre-deployed personnel if there is a continued, structured, and cycled plan to strengthen capacity of TPTC instructors with certified ToT training. From the high appreciation and observed use of learning from ToT participants, as well as the expressed interest to adopt a longer-term and sustained approach to human resource development within TPTC and clear reference in its new strategic framework to action to “strengthen capacity of personnel and their structures to perform their mandates”, the indicator in the action plan that refers to “attaining level I and II trainer certification for 100% of TPTC instructors by end of 2024” and learning visits to other centres, it is likely that the instructors continue their training pathway and therefore enhance their teaching and instructional design practices. However, it is difficult to assess how the improvement of instructors will really translate in potential for impact in performance of pre-deployed personnel, unless there are mechanisms in place developed to measure learning outcomes in further connection with individual assessment of pre-deployed personnel post-deployment and analysis of performance of contingents.

136. There is also higher likelihood of impact from the empowerment approach taken by UNITAR to support strengthening of female leadership in PKO, the design and implementation of dedicated female leadership training and from the explicit inclusion of a gender-sensitive component in the strategic plan for TPTC. However, impact is also contingent to the possibility of realizing such a gender-sensitive approach as cross-cutting to all training with special attention to gender discriminatory narratives and perceptions within the military and PKO of the role and capabilities of female personnel, which unless addressed through a pedagogy of gender-parity that includes both male and female personnel (including leadership) and is conducive of a more inclusive and enabling environment, positive impact for female officers trained will be structurally unattainable in spite of the self-perceived “empowerment” effect of training.

137. As for internal training and capacity development, TPTC did not have a plan for continued training extension and use of the computer rooms, the implementation of the e-library or the development of a concept for the research centre hub; being one of the foundational objectives stated for the facilities, however, there is “2023-2027 training expansion plan” received as part of the new workplan in line with the strategic framework. The extent to which this plan relies on use of current facilities is not known by the evaluator at this point.

138. Lastly, there is high identified potential for impact in the institutional strengthening capacity process conducted for the TPTC by UNITAR, if the 2023-2028 strategic framework is fully implemented and the governance, leadership strengthening, partnerships, and other aspects of the action plan connected to the framework are also fully realized. Even though actions have been diverse and less structured, as well as limited in scope and time for the evaluated implementation period, the acknowledged need and interest of TPTC’s leadership to pursue the goal

---

32 Strategic Framework 2023-2028. Strategic Objective 1: Action. Strengthen capacities of personnel and their structures to perform their mandates and contribute to peace and security in Africa.
33 Ibid. Strategic Objective 2: Analysis. Promote gender equality by translating policies into action.
to become and be recognized as an international centre of excellence and to work hand-in-hand with UNITAR and other stakeholders for this purpose, anticipates commitment to the established strategic framework and to changes needed in leadership capacity and other institutional levers of such excellence. There is however a caveat in terms of ensuring greater involvement from headquarters and staff across areas (male and female) to promote horizontal-vertical institutional development.

Likelihood of sustainability

139. Sustainability was assessed considering the evaluation questions, with findings across four domains:
   a. Extent to which project results are likely to endure beyond the implementation of activities.
   b. Major factors influencing achievement and non-achievement of sustainability.
   c. The existence of an exit strategy and its contribution to sustained capacity.
   d. Sustainability of institutional capacity efforts.

140. While not being in the timeframe assessed for this evaluation, the careful revision of the recently finalized strategic framework and workplan for TPTC, developed jointly with TPTC/TPDF and with participation of other stakeholders like GPOI, indicates a shift in the right direction towards a more comprehensive, structured and aligned set of actions designed to support the main gaps in TPTC’s capacity identified during the assessment process. This continuity with a revised and jointly developed package that also includes plans to expand the training offer, and the capacity of instructors, could potentially lead to increased sustainability and adoption of already implemented actions. This plan, however, has an ambitious 5-year roll-out, for which UNITAR currently has funding assured for 2023 only. The short cycle of implementation and the yet unassured possibility of leveraging additional funding or project extensions could be a hinderer of the possibility of longer-term sustainability and expansion of the scope of capacity strengthening activities.

141. In line with the above, the TPTC remains highly reliant on external funding and technical donor support, which hinders the possibility for eventual self-sustained action in areas like pre-deployment training implementation, adoption of ToTs, and even maintenance of new facilities and donated equipment. The donor and other stakeholders consulted expressed their concern regarding the likelihood of TPTC being a sustainably operating training centre with a business plan and value portfolio that draws external clients. For the donor representative, for example, there should be a clear exit timeline to see independent operative and financial capacity of TPTC, and increased capacity of staff to conduct most peacekeeping related training without external aid. GPOI also agrees that there needs to be a clear positive trend in the increase of TPTC’s capacity to manage and implement their training and sustain donated equipment, especially for a centre operating since 2003.

142. Some of the major factors influencing self-sustainability of the centre and thus the project’s activities have to do with the highly centralized TPTC operating system, which heavily relies on decision-making at the headquarters level for almost every aspect of its capacity development. This highly centralized decision-making structure makes it less likely to anticipate if, for example, the newly appointed staff for management and maintenance of computers, and technology donated, will be maintained through the years to guarantee the adequate use, availability, and preservation of equipment. Other aspects like defining appointment of female
personnel to peacekeeping missions, changes, and adaptations to curricula of trainings and establishment of partnerships, cannot be directly done by TPTC officials which disempowers its leadership to take direct action on structural changes needed to increase value and credibility of the centre to external stakeholders. While the project cannot change such structural factors, there was no evidenced anticipation of such environmental conditions to promote alternatives or governance arrangements for maintenance of the building and equipment, for example.

143. Coordination with other stakeholders is also observed as a possible hinderer of sustainability given the possible mixed and overlapping agendas from the different plans TPTC has with stakeholders like GPOI/USA and GAFTAG. However, the “governance body” planned for the current stage with leadership and technical support from UNITAR, could counter this in the current stage with potential to drive collective action of all stakeholders and supporting countries.

144. The evaluation, while seeing positive effects from the expanded training facilities, is unable to assess the extent to which this will reflect on longer term impact on performance of peacekeepers, a well-funded research centre, and enhanced technological access that also supports training and quality learning improvement. From data collected, it remained unclear how the longer-term sustainability plans of the recently added infrastructure considering the high reliance of TPTC on donors to conduct most of its training, maintain and acquire equipment and qualify personnel for most PKO of the centre. While the evaluator observed continued use of facilities in different ways, the training has not yet developed the “business plan” that will expand access to other interested stakeholders outside Tanzania and TPTC.

Conclusions

145. Overall, the evaluation concludes that the project, despite time constraints and other environmental factors, has achieved important milestones in its support to stakeholders, especially to the MODANS/TPDF and the TPTC. Through the project, TPTC has received substantial support to assess institutional conditions and areas of improvement to become a centre of excellence, leading to a revised strategic framework and action plan that will go into the ongoing third phase of the project. The intervention has also contributed to positioning gender-parity and equality in the military high in the stakeholders’ agenda, which could lead to changes in the way female participation peacekeeping is enabled and promoted.

146. Infrastructure donated could act as a conductor of training improvement and access to technology and information that enhance the performance of instructors and pre-deployed personnel, however, there needs to be a clearer and longer-term plan for the sustainable use of facilities. There were also no evidence of an environmental plan or mitigation measures to counter the impact of the construction.

147. The evaluation found value from the project support to pre-deployment training, equipment donated, and related pre-deployment support provided, however, there are no systems in place from the project to evidence the effects of pre-deployment training support in peacekeepers performance during their missions, and further, in connection with strengthened capacity of instructors.

148. Efficiency has been undermined by the short time in which activities are implemented, the limited reporting from partners which provides no detail of what was done and accomplished. This also includes little accountability and timeliness in terms of
information disclosed by stakeholders, including TPTC and others, that is relevant to the measurement of outcomes from the project, such as participants lists and gender-disaggregated data. This also connects to non-systematic information management, monitoring and internal evaluation on the side of UNITAR, which hinders an assessment of project’s contribution to change, at the level of the ToC.

Recommendations

The evaluation findings led to five recommendations.

Recommendation 1. Consolidate a ToT offer for TPTC and TPF that is cycled and scheduled, covering all UNITAR’s Division for Peace ToT levels (1-3), and agree with the participants and leadership on measures and tools to assess the use and impact of training on learning markers of pre-deployed personnel and performance of deployed personnel.

Furthermore, work on establishing arrangements with implementing partners to access gender-disaggregated data of results of pre-deployment trainings and peacekeeping missions, emphasizing the critical importance of understanding the impact that donor support through the project has on pre-deployment, deployment and post-deployment phases. To the extent that is possible, consider using Kirkpatrick’s 4-levels of evaluation to trace and connect performance of peacekeepers to the quality of training and training practices applied by instructors participating in ToTs.

Recommendation 2. Strengthen information management systems and monitoring and reporting practices. The evaluator highly recommends that in conjunction with the findings and recommendations from the institutional assessment, UNITAR places greater emphasis on the ways in which results are assessed, strengthening TPTC’s accountability as an implementing partner in terms of financial and results management and reporting. Also, to the extent possible, encourage greater transparency on aspects like participant’s information, and overall information sharing that also enables UNITAR to enhance its assessment on project performance and impact.

In line with this recommendation, the evaluator also recommends that the Division for Peace assess current staff capacity and systems in place for training assessment and information management, focusing on establishing an “evaluative mindset” across stages of projects, with increased and enhanced internal learning and evaluation moments, and clear definition of accountability mechanisms and roles to ensure that data is coherent and reliable across all reporting mechanisms (reports, log frame, beneficiary reporting, etc.). On this point, it is also important that UNITAR establishes an impact goal for projects, even if not requested by donors, so that the longer-term effects of interventions and changes that can be attributed to the interventions can be measured if needed or desired.

Recommendation 3. Continue to apply and refine the Institutional Assessment Framework package and work towards developing a descriptive narrative of the 156 criteria established for all six areas of measurement. Furthermore, develop a clear measurement system in place to understand where change is achieved, with an adaptive, human-centered and reflective iterative approach. Also, consider developing a “lite” version of the framework to assess institutional capacity when the availability of time and funding resources is limited.

Recommendation 4. Conduct a localized, context-sensitive, gender analysis in agreement and collaboration with the MODANS and TPDF and use it to develop a gender-transformative pedagogy to address barriers to effective and meaningful
participation of women in PKO and missions. Bring male and female UP to the process from across roles and institutional areas.

**Recommendation 5.** Avoid segmented, non-traceable and disconnected action across stakeholders by strengthening accountability and reporting mechanisms in place, joint monitoring and ensuring from design that interlinked action and coherence with project’s overall objective are clearly identified across and between IPs. Cases like the ones with RECSA and EASF, where there was evidenced limited accountability, scarce reporting, or no reporting (EASF) on the side of IPs, makes this recommendation critical to avoid gaps in efficient and effective use of funding in future opportunities.

**Lessons Learned**

**Lesson 1.** Institutional capacity development is a sustained, time-bound, and co-responsible effort that requires a human-centered and adaptive management approach from UNITAR, implementing partners, and donors. It also requires a strong relationship built to agree on key areas of capacity development and joint progress monitoring mechanisms.

From the pilot application of the IAF tool by UNITAR, there is learning regarding the importance of conducting a process where the interested parties are involved throughout the process, setting a clear understanding of what “institutional capacity” is referred to in each case. Although the tool has established areas and criteria, every time an assessment is conducted and a capacity development process is initiated, there needs to be a common strengthening pathway, with clear departure and expected arrival points, as well as mechanisms to measure what “progress” means.

Institutional capacity development processes also require the sustained involvement and commitment of the leadership of the strengthened institutions (in this case TPTC), as these are bi-directional and time-bounded processes. Open communication, reflection and trust are three pillars that sustain organizational change.

**Lesson 2.** To increase the effectiveness and likelihood of impact of UNITAR’s interventions in peacekeeping (and in general), there must be a coherent and interlinked design from the onset, that while keeping the adaptability and navigation of complexity as premises, clearly connects across impact goal, outcomes, results, and activities as a unified compass of action. A ToC is also necessary to guide the common rationale of conditions interwoven understood as drivers of change.

To manage the high complexity in which peacekeeping and the strengthening of PKO conducted by the training centres occurs, requires having a clear implementation framework, paired to a systematic and coordinated monitoring system is essential for effectiveness and increasing the possibility of achieving the desired outcome and impact. The critical importance of structuring the project’s rationale from developing a consultive (ideally collaborative) and validated ToC, is also an important lesson from the process. Lack of a ToC leads to venturing into the design of a Logframe without first defining and critically assessing assumptions of the process that is presumed to help training centres contribute to a writ-large peace, security, and stability goal.

In this sense, there is also a lesson concerning the involvement and level of interaction of the different IPs in the process. Cases like the one with RECSA (2021) and EASF (2022) where there is no clear evidence of the linkages of activities conducive to the overall project outcome, hint at the importance of outlining from the start how are partners expecting to participate and
contribute to the overall goal, ensuring also that monitoring and accountability mechanisms and joint reflection on what is and is not achieved is also planned for.

Lesson 3. The pedagogy of a gender-sensitive and gender transformational vision for the inclusion and equal access of women in UN missions and PKO within the military, stays at the surface unless a whole-institution approach is applied to all gender-equality areas of institutional capacity.

The military, as a highly male-dominated institution, faces the difficulty of critically addressing individual and institutional narratives embedded in the way female military personnel are considered capable and able to perform at the same capacity as their male peers. This clearly affects gender power imbalances and the possibility of more women gaining equal access to participation in peacekeeping missions. The lesson, in essence, refers to the importance of structuring a gender-parity agenda that gradually supports the most relevant existing frameworks, but is localized and indigenous, in the way of understanding how gender narratives and behaviors are constructed, and how these impact gender roles and stereotypes in Tanzania military and police institutions.

Lesson 4. Building infrastructure can be a substantial preparation for capacity development activity that impacts the access and quality of pre-deployment training and other peacekeeping training-related activities. However, to reach such effectiveness, there need to be arrangements in place that ensure a clear role of the parties involved, a high level of accountability, and a thorough assessment of need, potential use, and sustainability of the infrastructure as capacity development assets.

The many challenges identified for the construction of TPTC’s new building yield lessons in various areas. First, UNITAR’s stretched technical capacity to support the overseeing of the construction process is indicative of the need to structure with more clarity the roadmap of activities of this nature. All informants agreed that beyond the administrative limitations coming from delays in disbursement of funds, there was also a complex set up of the arrangements for management of the process and accountability. Second, there are lessons around the importance of understanding ahead why infrastructure is needed in line with impact goals and the institutional capacity strengthening agenda. The lack of such assessment also affects the extent to which infrastructure can be fully utilized, managed, and financially sustained.
## Annexes

### Annex 1: Reconstructed log frame of the project – 2021 and 2022 phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Description of objectives and results</th>
<th>Progress achieved (As per findings)</th>
<th>Evaluator remarks</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Objective (Impact)</strong></td>
<td>Expanded access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel (men and women) in East Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Objective 1 (Outcome)</strong></td>
<td>Accessibility to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of East African military and police officers trained in / by the staff of the regional centre for deployment to UN peace operations within 1 year from its establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 1.1 (Output)</strong></td>
<td>Additional structures of the centre constructed and equipped</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of modules built and equipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 1.2 (Output)</strong></td>
<td>Research hub established</td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td>Progress made, but not achieved: information received and triangulation with key stakeholders, did not provide indication that this activity has been completed, however, in the final narrative the report, the activity was marked as completed.</td>
<td>Number of research hubs established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.3 (Output)</td>
<td>Operating frameworks of the centre reviewed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>This activity was reported as completed; however, the evaluator did not receive the evidence from activities conducted by EASF for this purpose. In the final narrative report, the activity is marked as completed.</td>
<td>Number of operating frameworks reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.4 (Output)</td>
<td>Concept notes for the integration of high-tech learning solutions developed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Completed: A concept note was developed</td>
<td>Number of concept note drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.5 (Output)</td>
<td>Trainers’ roster system developed and implemented</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Completed: This activity is reportedly completed</td>
<td>Number of roster systems developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.6 (Output)</td>
<td>Modular training approach designed and developed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Completed: This activity is reportedly completed</td>
<td>Number of modular training approaches designed and developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.7 (Output)</td>
<td>Partnership base expanded to include additional partners / donors</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Some progress was made to assess the state of partnerships for the centre and to connect it with regional partners, but no formal partnerships were made.</td>
<td>Number of new partners supporting the regional centre by the end of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Objective 2 (Outcome)</strong></td>
<td>Strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact pre-deployment training for police personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of trainers meeting the completion requirements of the certification program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2.1 (Output)</td>
<td>Training delivered to trainers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>This activity is reported as completed; however, the evaluator was not able to triangulate this information with any of the KI interviewed, neither was given access to contact</td>
<td>Number of trainers certified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Objectives 2022

### Project Objective 3 (Outcome)

Strengthened capabilities and motivation of female police officers to occupy leadership positions in national forces and peace operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Result 3.1 (Output)

Training delivered to participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reconstructed LogFrame of the Project 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Progress Achieved</th>
<th>Evaluator remarks</th>
<th>Indicators (Reported Jan 31, 2023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective (Impact)</td>
<td>Expanded access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel (men and women) in East Africa</td>
<td>Not yet achieved</td>
<td>Work with the TPTC for phase 2021-2022 has focused on strengthening internal operational capacity, including expanding the infrastructure, and other activities that increase visibility and recognition of the TPTC as a centre of excellence and provider of quality and impactful pre-deployment training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objective 1 (Outcome)</td>
<td>Increased accessibility to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre</td>
<td>Progress made, but not yet achieved</td>
<td>While the infrastructure has been expanded and there has been support to strategic capacity strengthening actions agreed with the TPTC; organizational and infrastructural maturity isn't yet at the level of provision of training for pre-deployed uniformed personnel to countries outside of Tanzania.</td>
<td>% of East African military and police officers trained in / by the staff of the regional centre for deployment to UN peace operations within 1 year from its establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.1 (Output)</td>
<td>Equipment upgraded</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Completed: Reportedly, the TPTC has received funding for the procurement of additional training equipment. However, at the closing of evaluation, TPTC hasn't yet finalized the procurement process. Other medical training equipment was directly purchased and delivered to TPTC by UNITAR.</td>
<td>Stock of equipment upgraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity, visibility, and outreach: All Completed. All activities related to the collaborative design of TPTC's communication and branding strategy, information management, Website setup. Note: The only activity reportedly not conducted was the training of IT staff, postponed to 2023.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Design of TPTC's strategic 2023-2028 action plan with a series of co-design meetings conducted that included high-level TPDF and TPTC staff. Completed Note: Both the strategic framework and workplan have been finalized and approved in 2023.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Strengthened capacity of TPTC's human resources: Activities conducted to &quot;to reinforce the capacities of TPTC staff to operate in the framework of a centre of excellence opened to international students&quot;, namely: English language training: Completed Leadership Training of female uniformed personnel (Women leadership): Completed Training of trainers (TPTC Instructors): Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.2 (Output)</td>
<td>Priority actions of 2021 action plan implemented</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Result 1.3 (Output) | Partnership base expanded | Partially achieved | 100% | Strengthened TPTC networks: With UNITAR support, the TPTC attended the annual IAPTC conference in Bangladesh, and has formally been accepted as a member.  
- High-level event at TPTC APSTA  
Note: A high-level event planned to happen at TPTC in the framework of the African Peace Support Trainers Association was reported as postponed to 2023, as per final report. However, it appears as completed in the EMS. |

| Project Objective 2 (Outcome) | Strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact pre-deployment training | Achieved (within scope) | From records of training uploaded to the EMS, the training was conducted. The trainings are referred to by key informants from IPs and participants as highly relevant and contributing to enhanced performance and female leadership in the military. | 49% of trainers meeting the completion requirements of the certification program |

|  |  |  |  | Baseline: 0%  
Target: 80% |
### Result 2.1 (Output)

**Training of trainers delivered to PTC trainers**

100%

Activity conducted, registered in EMS and triangulated.

*Reported EMS: 21 instructors*

*In final report: 20 instructors*

**Number of trainers certified**

*Baseline: 15*

*Original target: 35*

*Revised target: 55 (20 military trainers and 20 police trainers)*

---

### Result 2.1.1

**Training of trainers delivered to TPF trainers**

100%

Activity conducted, registered in EMS and triangulated.

*Reported: 16 instructors*

---

### Result 2.2 (Output)

**Training on leadership delivered to PTC trainers (NEW)**

100%

Activity conducted, registered in EMS and triangulated with IP.

*Reported to EMS: (21 female participants)*

*In final report: (16 female participants)*

**Number of trainers certified**

*Baseline: 0*

*Target: 20*

---

### Project Objective 3 (Outcome)

**Strengthened capabilities and motivation of uniformed personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments**

Activities completed, but outcome is not measurable.

Activities under this outcome were supported by the project but directly implemented and managed by IPs (TPTC - TPF). Measurement of results was not possible from records or interviews conducted.

**% of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training program**

*Baseline: 0%*

*Target: 80%*

---

### Result 3.1 (Output)

**Pre-deployment training for United Nations Interim Force delivered to military personnel**

100%

Activity was completed, however the number of participants reported by TPTC was slightly below the target.

*Target: 150 UP*

*Reported: 146 UP*

**Number of participants trained**

*Baseline: 0*

*Target: 150*

---

### Result 3.2 (Output)

**Training on UN Logistics delivered to military officers**

100%

Activity was completed, however the number of participants reported by TPTC was below the target.

*Target: 52 UP*

*Reported: 100 UP*

**Number of participants trained**

*Baseline: 0*

*Target: 100*

---

### Result 3.3 (Output)

**Training on UN Civil-Military Coordination delivered to**

100%

Activity completed, however # of participants reported by TPTC was below the target.

*Target: 100 UP*

*Reported: 54 UP*

**Number of participants trained**

*Baseline: 0*

*Target: 100*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 3.4 (Output)</th>
<th>Pre-SAAT Training delivered to police officers</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Activity was completed, however the number of participants reported by TPTC was slightly below the target Target: 150 IPOs Reported: 146 IPOs</th>
<th>Number of participants trained Baseline: 0 Target: 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 3.4.1 (Output)</td>
<td>Protocol training IPO</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>This activity was in the final IP report and reported in the KII. Added by evaluator. Reported: 52 IPOs</td>
<td>Number of participants trained Baseline: 0 Target: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3.5 (Output)</td>
<td>Pre-deployment training delivered to Individual Police Officers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Activity completed, however # of participants reported by TPTC was below the target Target:100 IPOs Reported: 52 IPOs</td>
<td>Number of participants trained Baseline: 0 Target: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3.6 (Output)</td>
<td>Pre-deployment training delivered to TANBATT - 5&amp;6 (MINUSCA)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Activity completed above target as per TPTC reportTarget:500 UPReported: 532 IPOs</td>
<td>Number of participants trained Baseline: 0 Target: 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3.7 (Output)</td>
<td>Pre-deployment training delivered to TANBATT - 9&amp;10 (MONUSCO)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Activity completed above target as per TPTC report Target:500 UP Reported: 836 IPOs</td>
<td>Number of participants trained Baseline: 0 Target: 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators’ elaboration using desk review and primary data
Annex 2: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference –
Independent Evaluation of the “Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces” project

Background

1. The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) is a principal training arm of the United Nations, with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR’s mission is to develop the individual, institutional and organizational capacity of countries and other United Nations stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges.

2. UNITAR’s first Strategic Objective calls to “Promote peace and just and inclusive societies”. The sub-objective SO 1.1 “Support institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace” focuses on increasing institutions and individuals' capacities to prevent and resolve violent conflicts, restore the rule of law, and build lasting peace. Special focus is placed on strengthening knowledge and skills of women as change agents in conflict analysis, negotiation and mediation; and strengthening engagement of men and boys as agents of change in efforts to work towards ending sexual and gender-based violence and reducing the stigmatization.

3. UNITAR has been supporting Tanzania military and police forces since 2016 in the framework of the respective pre-deployment training programmes. The current project fits in this framework by reinforcing the peacekeeping training centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces, implemented in two phases. Phase I, or the 2021 phase, implemented between July and December 2021 and Phase II, or the 2022 phase, implemented between 15 April and 31 December 2022.

4. The prime goal of the project is to strengthen the impact of peace operations by directly addressing the challenges related to deficient pre-deployment training, with a particular focus on uniformed personnel. It will do so by transforming the existing Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces into a fully integrated training and research centre for the preparation of East African uniformed personnel deploying to UN peace operations. The training centre will take into account the specific needs of female personnel, complement the activities of existing centres in the region, and act as reference for high-impact training.

5. The project long-term outcomes is “expanding access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel (men and women) in East Africa”. Short-term outcomes of the project are i) Increased accessibility to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre; ii) Strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact pre-deployment training; and iii) Strengthened capabilities and motivation of uniformed personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments.

6. In its two phases, the project entails six components: i) Structural expansion of the training centre and provision of training equipment; ii) Establishment of the research hub35 “Peacekeeping Training Centre” to document best practices and lessons learned in East Africa peacekeeping activities, and to develop and support a culture of best practices in UN peacekeeping; iii) Review (and implementation) of the centre's internal operational framework; iv) Creation (and expansion) of a

---

34 High-impact training is based in six principles: i) performance, ii) human-centredness; iii) innovation; iv) transformation; v) inclusivity; vi) interactivity; and vii) sustainability.

35 The research hub is the name of the training centre’s new building.
roster of certified trainers associated with the centre; v) Establishment of a technology-enhanced learning environment (concept note); vi) Expansion of the centre’s partnership basis; and vii) Delivery of pre-deployment training to uniformed personnel.

7. The project is subject to an independent evaluation as per UNITAR Evaluation Policy.

Purpose of the evaluation.

8. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the project; to identify good practices as well as any problems or challenges that the project has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on design, implementation and management. The evaluation’s purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project’s improvement, strategic direction, and broader organizational learning. The evaluation should not only assess how well the project has performed, but also seek to answer the ‘why’ question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful delivery of the results.

9. While the evaluation will include an assessment of all six OECD/DAC criteria, gender, disability and human rights, and environmental considerations will be taken into account. Since Phase I and Phase II are interlinked, the evaluation will cover both phases when assessing the evaluation criteria. In addition to serving as accountability function, the evaluation’s purpose is also to be as forward-looking as possible to inform decisions on the design and planning of possible future phases and focus areas of this or similar projects, with emphasis on institutional assessment and support.

Scope of the evaluation

10. The evaluation will cover Phases I and II of the project (June 2021 to December 2022). Although the scope of the evaluation does not include the previous project phase 2021, also funded by Federal Republic of Germany – Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, the evaluator should take the other phase into account when framing the evaluation’s findings and conclusions. In addition to assessing the results achieved in 2021 and 2022 with a particular focus on the impact criterion, the evaluation should provide forward-looking recommendations to inform possible future phases.

Evaluation criteria

11. The evaluation will assess project performance using the following criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact, and likelihood of sustainability. The evaluation questions related to gender equality and the empowerment of women dimensions are marked with “GEEW”. Questions related to environmental sustainability are marked with “ENVSUSE”. Disability and human rights considerations should also be considered throughout the evaluation.

- **Relevance**: Is the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries’ needs and priorities, and designed with quality?
- **Coherence**: To what extent is the project coherent with relevant UN/international frameworks and policies, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international norms and standards?
• **Effectiveness**: How effective has the project been in delivering results and in reinforcing the peacekeeping training centre of Tanzanian armed forces, local trainers and training participants’ capabilities?

• **Efficiency**: To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?

• **Likelihood of Impact**: What are the potential cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes?

• **Likelihood of Sustainability**: To what extent are the project’s results likely to be sustained in the long term? How is environmental sustainability addressed in the project?

**Principal evaluation questions**

12. The following questions are suggested to guide the design of the evaluation, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with project management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible with regard to the project’s future orientation. The focus of the evaluation shall be on the impact criterion and the questions falling under it.

**Relevance**

a. To what extent is the project aligned with the Institute’s efforts to helping Member States implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the UNITAR strategic framework 2018-2021 and 2022-2025, and particularly SO 1.1, and SDG 16?

b. How relevant are the objectives and design of the project (all its components) to the needs and priorities of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces and to the capacity needs, priorities and performance improvements of the beneficiaries of the training centre? Are they building on the “Training Facility for Integrated Exercises for Uniformed Personnel” report commissioned by UNITAR and the institutional assessment of the training centre (2021)? Were the objectives formulated sufficient to lead to a behavioural change/performance growth?

c. How relevant is the project to supporting gender equality and women’s empowerment in the peace and security field? (GEEW)

d. How relevant is the project to the local, national, international and/or historical context?

**Coherence**

e. How well is the project aligned with and complements other UNITAR programming, including those aiming at strengthening the deployment-related training offerings of training centres in the African continent (Supporting the yearly trainings program of the Ecole Maintien de la Paix (EMPABB) Mali), Training and Advanced training of West African Security Forces (Ghana), etc.)?

f. How well is the project aligned with UNITAR standards for training of trainers? How well is the project aligned with international frameworks, including the WPS Agenda, the UN Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy, Cruz Report, Action for Peacekeeping (A4P), Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations, Blue Marble principles, amongst others? (GEEW, ENVUSE)36

**Effectiveness**

g. To what extent have the planned outputs and objectives for Phase I and II been achieved? What are the factors affecting the project’s, organisation’s, and the individual’s or centre’s performance?

---

36 A non-exhaustive list of relevant frameworks is included in Annex C.
h. Has the project’s structure, with its multiple components, and partnerships been effective in delivering results, including the performance of the three implementing partners of phase I? (see annex H)

i. To what extent are human rights-based approach, disability considerations, and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project and in the design and delivery of ToT events (both men and women) and pre-deployment training? (GEEW)

j. To what extent and how is the project contributing to changed behaviour (motivations) and improved performance (capabilities) of the certified trainers and the armed forces in the served communities? What is missing, if anything?

k. To what extent is the environmental sustainability taken into account when constructing the training centre and research hub or when providing the equipment? (ENVSUSE)

l. To what extent has the project supported the centre’s institutional development, and has it been effective and sustainable?

m. To what extent are human rights-based approach, disability considerations, and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project and in the design and delivery of the specific training for Operating Theatre team? (GEEW)

Efficiency

a. To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including all the implementing partners (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches)? Were the project’s resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?

b. How efficient has the Ministry of Defence and National Service of the United Republic of Tanzania (MODANS)’ procurement rules and regulations, contractual arrangements with vendors procedures been in providing the necessary inputs for the project results (e.g., the construction work in the training centre, the establishment of the research hub, the technology-enhanced learning environment, etc.)?

c. To what extent are the project’s inputs/resources deployed in an efficient manner (e.g., cost-efficient, constructing the centre, supplying the equipment) to realize the activities? (ENVSUSE)

Likelihood of impact and early indication of impact (the following questions shall be considered the focus of this evaluation)

d. What real difference has the project made to the role of female officers during the pre-deployment phase and after when being deployed the training in the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces? (GEEW)

e. To what extent has the project strengthened the training centre, local trainers’ and officers benefiting from the offerings of the training centre capacities? How did the trainings impact the specific training needs of uniformed (men and women) personnel and the served communities?

f. What other observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended), and strengthened capabilities (increased, decreased) have occurred?

g. Did the project expand the access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel, by increasing the accessibility to dedicated peacekeeping training, by upgrading the equipment, by expanding the partnership base?

Likelihood of sustainability and early indication of sustainability

h. To what extent are the project’s results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term and under which conditions?

i. What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project and can be mitigated by project stakeholders?
j. To what extent are the current design and exit strategies likely to contribute to sustained capacity of the training centre, including the establishment of the research hub, roster of certified trainers, and expansion of partnerships (Phase I)?

k. What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming, particularly in institutional assessment and support?

l. Did the institutional support for the training centre turned out to be sustainable?

m. To what extent is environmental sustainability taken into account when considering the long-term use of the training centre building? (ENVSUSE)

Gender Equality and Women Empowerment (GEEW)

The evaluation questions with gender equality and women empowerment dimensions are marked with “GEEW” in the above. Disability considerations should also be considered throughout the evaluation.

Environmental Sustainability in Evaluation (ENVSUSE)

The evaluation questions with the evaluation sustainability dimension are marked with “ENVSUSE” in the above.

Evaluation Approach and Methods

13. The evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the UNITAR Evaluation Policy, the operational guidelines for independent evaluations and the United Nations norms and standards for evaluation, and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines. The evaluation will be undertaken by a supplier or an international consultant (the “evaluator”) under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME). PPME shall support the evaluation team in gathering background documentation and other data collection processes.

14. In order to maximize utilization of the evaluation, the evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process, including the project implementation team, project partners, the beneficiaries, the donor and other relevant stakeholders. Data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings and draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder analysis; surveys; review of the log frame (reconstructed) baseline data and the theory of change; key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if possible, field visits. These data collection tools are discussed below.

15. It is recommended to look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:

- **Individual dimension** relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skill levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training and competency development.
- **Organizational dimension** relates to public and private organizations, civil society organizations, and networks of organizations. The change in learning that occurs at individual level affects, from a results chain perspective, the changes at organizational level.
- **Enabling environment dimension** refers to the context in which individuals and organizations work, including the political commitment and vision; policy, legal and economic frameworks and institutional set-up in the country; national public sector budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms; power structures and dynamics.

Table 9: Capacity areas within the three dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Skills levels (technical and managerial skills)</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Essential knowledge, Cognitive skills, Interpersonal skills, Self-control, Attitude towards behaviour, Self-confidence,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>Mandates</td>
<td>Horizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>Motivation and incentive systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling environment</td>
<td>Policy and legal framework</td>
<td>Political commitment and accountability framework</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The evaluator should engage in quantitative and qualitative analysis in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate.

**Data collection methods:**

*Comprehensive desk review*

The evaluator will compile, review and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the project, including a results framework indicator tracking review. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex C. If baseline data available allows for it, the evaluator should consider using quantitative approaches to assess the impact assessment related evaluation questions. The evaluator should also consider whether Outcome mapping / Outcome harvesting / outcome evidencing, process tracing, contribution analysis, episode study, or other theory-based approaches to evaluate outcomes, are suitable tools for answering the evaluation questions.

**Stakeholder analysis**

The evaluator will identify the different stakeholders involved in the project. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited to:

- Implementing partner institutions (see annex H);
- The donor (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany);
- Beneficiary institution: Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces;
- Beneficiaries/participants at all levels;
- Trainers/facilitators;
- UNITAR project team;
- Host (local and national) governments;
- Etc.

*Survey(s)*
With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultant will develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.

**Key informant interviews**

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. The list of contacts is available in Annex A. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global, at the national or local level.

**Focus groups**

Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders at the local levels to complement/triangulate findings from other collection tools.

**Field visit**

A field visit for interviews and focus groups with logistical support from Project Management shall be organised to Tanzania. Observation may also prove useful if activities are being implemented simultaneously to the local field visit.

17. The evaluation shall look for synergies and benefit from the evaluation undertakings of the projects “Supporting the yearly training programmes of the Ecole de Maintien de la Paix” and “Training and Advanced Training of West African Security Forces”, taking place in parallel. PPME will be liaising with the evaluation teams and schedule joint meetings that allow for exchange.

**Gender, disability and human rights, and environmental sustainability**

18. The evaluator should incorporate human rights, gender, disability, and environmental sustainability perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, UN country status/classification, disability, and age grouping and be included in the draft and evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

19. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow ethical and professional standards (UNEG Ethical Guidelines).

**Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review**

20. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from November 2022 (recruitment of the evaluator) to June 2023 (publication of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.

21. The consultant shall submit a brief evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial key informant interviews. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The Evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise.

22. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.
23. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex D. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 30 pages, excluding annexes.

24. Following the submission of the zero draft, a draft report will then be submitted to Project Management to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex G by 29 May 2023. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 12 June 2023. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report, and present the findings and recommendations to Project Management and other invited stakeholders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>November 2022</th>
<th>December 2022</th>
<th>January 2023</th>
<th>February 2023</th>
<th>March 2023</th>
<th>April 2023</th>
<th>May 2023</th>
<th>June 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator selected and recruited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation design/question matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the evaluation emerging findings and lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments and recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Deadline*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation design/question matrix</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>12 December 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on evaluation design/question matrix</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>19 December 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero draft report</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>24 April 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on zero draft</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>1 May 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>15 May 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned</td>
<td>Evaluator/evaluation manager</td>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>to be defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on draft report</td>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>29 May 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>12 June 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination and publication of report</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be adjusted depending on the contract signature and to be agreed upon with the Evaluation Manager.

**OPTIONAL:** A reference group is considered a good practice in independent evaluations. Members of the reference group could be a representative from project management, from the donor and several representatives from the implementing partners for example. These stakeholders would then be included throughout the evaluation phases and would e.g., be able to provide comments on the draft report.

**Communication/dissemination of results**
25. The evaluation report shall be written in English. The final report will be shared with all partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public.

**Evaluation management arrangements**

26. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) (‘evaluation manager’).

27. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR’s Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR’s evaluation function’s independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.

28. The evaluator should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g., accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

**Evaluator Ethics**

29. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project’s design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with UNEG Ethical Guidelines.
Professional requirements
30. The evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:

- MA degree or equivalent in international relations, peace and conflict studies or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in training design and delivery, including training of trainers approaches and in areas related to peacekeeping and police training.
- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of capacity building. Knowledge of United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of peacekeeping related topics, as well as contemporary developments in multilateral efforts to develop policing capacities in broader peacekeeping missions. Knowledge of or experience in institutional assessments/support.
- Field work experience in Africa, particularly East-Africa.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick method is an advantage.
- Excellent writing skills.
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel.
- Fluency in oral and written English. Working level of Swahili is an advantage.

PPME may also hire a team of up to two evaluators (local and international) or an evaluator (team leader, evaluation design) and a subject matter expert (team member, training-related expert).

Annexes:
A. List of contact points
B. Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System
C. List of documents and data to be reviewed
D. Structure of evaluation report
E. Project logical framework
F. Audit trail
G. Evaluator code of conduct
B: Event data available on the Event Management System from 1.06.2021-30.09.2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin entity</th>
<th>Start date (Y-m-d)</th>
<th>End date (Y-m-d)</th>
<th>Event title</th>
<th>Learning outcome</th>
<th>Registratio n type</th>
<th>Accepted participan ts</th>
<th>Certificate s of participati on</th>
<th>Certificate s of completi on</th>
<th>% Over all</th>
<th>% 4-5</th>
<th>% Job relev ance</th>
<th>% 4-5</th>
<th>% New info</th>
<th>% 4-5</th>
<th>% Inte nt of use</th>
<th>% 4-5</th>
<th>% Ov eral l use fuln ess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme</td>
<td>2021-10-04</td>
<td>2021-10-25</td>
<td>Training of PTC Trainers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private – by invitation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTP / Peacekeeping Training Programme</td>
<td>2021-10-04</td>
<td>2021-10-25</td>
<td>Women Leadership for Peace</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private – by invitation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 Events for 2022 were not yet uploaded to the Event Management System.
Annex C: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Interim and final narrative and financial reports
- Legal Agreement
- Logical Framework and outcome areas
- Project Description
- UNITAR website content
- Event Management System Data
- Documents related to the 2021 earlier project phase
- Documents related to the three implementing partner
- Institutional assessment of the training centre
- Report commissioned by UNITAR “Training Facility for Integrated Exercises for Uniformed Personnel”
- Concept note of the research hub and technology-enhanced learning environment.
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation
Annex D: Structure of evaluation report

i. Title page
ii. Executive summary
iii. Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction
2. Project description, objectives and development context
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons Learned
9. Annexes
   a. Terms of reference
   b. Survey/questionnaires deployed
   c. List of persons interviewed
   d. List of documents reviewed
   e. Evaluation question matrix
   f. Evaluation consultant agreement form

Phase I
Logframe

German Federal Foreign Office - Division S03

*Förderbereich / Programm vom AA vorzugeben*

**Funding Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of Allocation</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>15 Jul - 31 Dec 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status / Date</td>
<td>30 June 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Description of objectives and results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Assumptions and Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective (Impact)</td>
<td><em>Expanded access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel (men and women) in East Africa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objective 1 (Outcome)</td>
<td>Accessibility to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre</td>
<td>% of East African military and police officers trained in / by the staff of the regional centre for deployment to UN peace operations within 1 year from its establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                             |                                                                                 | Baseline: 0%  
Target: 50%  
Report of regional centre's activities  
(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |
| Result 1.1  (Output) | Additional structures of the centre constructed and equipped | Number of modules built and equipped |
|                             |                                                                                 | Baseline: 0  
Target: 1  
Report of regional centre's activities  
(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |
| Result 1.2  (Output) | Research hub established | Number of research hubs established |
|                             |                                                                                 | Baseline: 0  
Target: 1  
Report of regional centre's activities  
(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |
| Result 1.3  (Output) | Operating frameworks of the centre reviewed | Number of operating frameworks reviewed |
|                             |                                                                                 | Baseline: 0  
Target: 1  
Report of regional centre's activities  
(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 1.4 (Output)</th>
<th><strong>Concept notes for the integration of high-tech learning solutions developed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of concept note drafted</strong></th>
<th><strong>Report of regional centre’s activities</strong></th>
<th>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0  <strong>Target:</strong> 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.5 (Output)</td>
<td><strong>Trainers’ roster system developed and implemented</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of roster systems developed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Report of regional centre’s activities</strong></td>
<td>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0  <strong>Target:</strong> 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.6 (Output)</td>
<td><strong>Modular training approach designed and developed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of modular training approaches designed and developed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Report of regional centre’s activities</strong></td>
<td>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 0  <strong>Target:</strong> 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.7 (Output)</td>
<td><strong>Partnership base expanded to include additional partners / donors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of new partners supporting the regional centre by the end of the project</strong></td>
<td><strong>Report of regional centre’s activities</strong></td>
<td>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline:</strong> 1  <strong>Target:</strong> 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Objective 2 (Outcome)

**Strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact pre-deployment training for police personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of trainers meeting the completion requirements of the certification program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report of training event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| (please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |

#### Result 2.1 (Output)

**Training delivered to trainers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of trainers certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report from training event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| (please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |

### Project Objective 3 (Outcome)

**Strengthened capabilities and motivation of female police officers to occupy leadership positions in national forces and peace operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report from training event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| (please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |

#### Result 3.1 (Output)

**Training delivered to participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report from training event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| (please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc) |

---

**Phase II**
# Logframe

**German Federal Foreign Office - Division S03**

**Funding Area**  
Förderbereich / Programm vom AA vorzugeben  
Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces

**Project Recipient of Allocation**  
UNITAR

**Duration Status / Date**  
15 Apr - 31 Dec 2022  
25.07.2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions Logic</th>
<th>Description of objectives and results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
<th>Assumptions and Risks</th>
<th>Interim Report 1 (Period: 15.04.22 - 31.08.22) Target Value / Value achieved</th>
<th>Final Report Target Value / Value achieved</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective (Impact)</td>
<td>Expanded access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel (men and women) in East Africa</td>
<td>Please leave these fields empty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objective 1 (Outcome)</td>
<td>Increased accessibility to a dedicated regional peacekeeping training and research centre</td>
<td>% of East African military and police officers trained in / by the staff of the regional centre for</td>
<td>Report of regional centre’s activities (please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result 1.1 (Output)</th>
<th>Equipment upgraded</th>
<th>Stock of equipment upgraded</th>
<th>Report of regional centre’s activities</th>
<th>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.2 (Output)</td>
<td>Priority actions of 2021 action plan implemented</td>
<td>% of priority actions of 2021 action plan implemented</td>
<td>Report of regional centre’s activities</td>
<td>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.3 (Output)</td>
<td>Partnership base expanded</td>
<td>Number of additional partners / donors secured</td>
<td>Report of regional centre’s activities</td>
<td>(please refer to assumptions and risks section in the project doc)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objective 2 (Outcome)</td>
<td>Strengthened capabilities and motivation of local trainers (women and men) to deliver high-impact pre-deployment training</td>
<td>% of trainers meeting the completion requirements of the certification program</td>
<td>Report of training event</td>
<td>(please refer to assumption s and risks section in the project doc)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2.1 (Output)</td>
<td>Training delivered to PTC trainers</td>
<td>Number of trainers certified</td>
<td>Report from training event</td>
<td>(please refer to assumption s and risks section in the project doc)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objective 3 (Outcome)</td>
<td>Strengthened capabilities and motivation of uniformed personnel (women and men) from the region to operate effectively in high-risk environments</td>
<td>% of participants meeting the completion requirements of the training program</td>
<td>Report from training event</td>
<td>(please refer to assumption s and risks section in the project doc)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 3.1 (Output)</td>
<td>Training delivered to personnel from East Africa prior to deployment to UN or other peace operations (thematic area to be defined based on PTC training calendar / needs)</td>
<td>Number of participants trained</td>
<td>Report from training event</td>
<td>(please refer to assumption s and risks section in the project doc)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex F: Evaluation Audit Trail Template

(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)

To the comments received on (date) from the evaluation of the “Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces” project

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Para No./ comment location</th>
<th>Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report</th>
<th>Evaluator response and actions taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex G: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form*

The evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. He/she should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. He/she must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. He/she are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncovers evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. He/she should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he/she must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/she should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom he/she comes in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, he/she should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/she is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _______________________________________________

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): __________________________

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Signed at place on date

Signature: ______________________________________

*This form is required to be signed by each eval

38www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct
Annex H: list of implementing partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Amount in local currency</th>
<th>Amount in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INADES Formation Kenya</td>
<td>Non-Governmental organisation</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1'295'471 KSHS</td>
<td>10'698.94 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1'036'377 KSHS</td>
<td>8'559.16 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>259'094 KSHS</td>
<td>2139.79 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Not an Implementing partner in 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Defence and National Service of the United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>Governmental organisation</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1'514'107'916.76 TZS</td>
<td>649'274.41 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168'234'212.97 TZS</td>
<td>72'141.60 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>164'085'152.12 TZS</td>
<td>10'392.18 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Centre of Small Arms in the Great Lakes Region, the Horn of Africa and Bordering States</td>
<td>Intergovernmental organisation</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>10'260'800.00 KES</td>
<td>84'729.98 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8'208'640.00 KES</td>
<td>67'789.58 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2'052'160.00 KES</td>
<td>164'947.39 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>636'000.00 KES</td>
<td>5'252.29 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Not an Implementing partner in 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tanzania Police Force</td>
<td>Governmental organisation</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>124'565'357.28 TZS</td>
<td>53'438.27 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41'521'785.76 TZS</td>
<td>17'812.76 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 Exchange rates may vary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The East Africa Standby Force</th>
<th>Regional organisation</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Upon receipt and acceptance of final reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,208,601.60 KES</td>
<td>2,302,150.40 KES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upon agreement</td>
<td>76,047.58 USD</td>
<td>19,011.9 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upon receipt and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acceptance of final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon receipt and acceptance of final reports

41,521,785.76 TZS

17,812.76 USD
## Annex 3: Lists of persons interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Role/Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner</td>
<td>Erick Kayiranga</td>
<td>RECSA</td>
<td>Principal Officer-WAM/RECSA Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comm. Renata Mzinga</td>
<td>Tanzania Police Force</td>
<td>Liaison - Tanzania Police Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITAR project team</td>
<td>Claudia Croci</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyril David</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evariste Karambizi</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freddie Bategereza</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td>Focal Point for UNITAR in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiona Fredy</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td>TPDF Liaison Officer for UNITAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andreas Andersson</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td>Consultant, Lead trainer - ToT 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITAR Learning Solutions – Peace</td>
<td>Tissione Parmar</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
<td>Team Leader - Learning Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contractor</td>
<td>Benson Maeda</td>
<td>Cosco Company</td>
<td>Contractor for the infrastructure component of the 2021 phase (Owner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackeline Maeda</td>
<td>Consultant for the German Armed Forces Technical Advisory Group - GAFTAG</td>
<td>Project Manager - Infrastructure component of the 2021 phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania Peacekeeping Training</td>
<td>Lt Colonel Anita Mbwali</td>
<td>Tanzania Peacekeeping Training</td>
<td>Acting TPTC Wing Commandant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brig. Gen. George Itan’gare</td>
<td>Tanzania Peacekeeping Training</td>
<td>TPTC Wing Commandant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel Deogratias J.</td>
<td>Tanzania Peacekeeping Training</td>
<td>Former Acting TPTC Wing Commandant (WC) - Current Chief Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mulishi</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Former Chief instructor (CI) - Current Training Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lt. Colonel Karoli</td>
<td>Tanzania Peacekeeping Training</td>
<td>Information Officer - TPTC Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-SGT Yusuph Ally</td>
<td>Tanzania Peacekeeping Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation</td>
<td>Joseph Brighton Malekela</td>
<td>Mwalimu Nyerere Foundation</td>
<td>Program Officer - Mwalimu Nyerere Pan-African Young Leaders Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania People's Defense Forces</td>
<td>Lt. Colonel Magembe Majura</td>
<td>Tanzania People's Defense Forces</td>
<td>Liaison officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TPDF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(TPDF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Tanzania People’s Defense Forces (TPDF)</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. General C J Ndiege</td>
<td>Chief of Operations and Training (COT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Wibonela</td>
<td>Director of Defence Foreign Relations (DDFR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Ally</td>
<td>Director of Peace Support Operation (DPSO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant General Othamn</td>
<td>Chief of Staff Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major IL Mwayilala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. Ephraim Mwalusamba</td>
<td>Participant in ToT (2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Ashirafu R. Matingas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Zidina Henry Ngililea</td>
<td>Participant in IAPTC Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Omary Athuman Kisokile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Saidi Idrisa Ikaji</td>
<td>Participant in ToT (2022)</td>
<td>Pre-deployment training to UNFIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Maokola</td>
<td>Participant in trainings observed – Trained by ToT instructor</td>
<td>Pre-deployment training to UNFIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Maria Majiiji</td>
<td>Participant in trainings observed – Trained by ToT instructor</td>
<td>Pre-deployment training to UNFIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. Naumi Daimoni Ulimboka</td>
<td>Women’s leadership Training (2022)</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Elizabeth Geoffrey Namalowe</td>
<td>Women’s leadership Training (2022)</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Hilda Godfrey Mwanyamba</td>
<td>Women’s leadership Training (2022)</td>
<td>Instructor – Junior Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. AM Mangula</td>
<td>ToT (2022)</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Maro</td>
<td>ToT (2022)</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOII NJ Kidoba</td>
<td>ToT (2022)</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt Tellah Meshack</td>
<td>ToT (2022)</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4: List of documents reviewed
1. 2021 Events List extracted from EMS
2. 2021 Participants list extracted from EMS
3. 2021 Statistics extracted from EMS
4. Letter of Agreement UNITAR and INADES Formation Kenya
5. Evaluation Form for Implementing Partners INADES
6. Grant closure report INADES Formation Kenya
7. Annex Interim Narrative Report INADES Foundation Kenya
9. Routing slip INADES Foundation Kenya
10. Financial Report Machakos Project Feasibility Study
11. LOA between UNITAR and MODANS
13. Declaration of honour TPDF and UNITAR.
14. Evaluation Ministry of Defence Tanzania (G2021.TARPT084.TNZTPDF)
15. Financial statement from 1 July- 31 December 2021 of the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzania People's Defence Forces-Construction of Research and Training Centre Building.
16. Closing report of the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzania People's Defence Forces-Construction of Research and Training Centre Building.
17. IEOC Report
19. Waiver Request to Policy Guidelines for Agreement with the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzania People's Defence Forces project.
20. LOA the Regional Centre of Small Arms in the Great Lakes Region, the horn of Africa and Bordering States (RECSA).
21. Evaluation RECSA (G2021.TARPT084.RECSA)
22. Final narrative report by RECSA (G2021.TARPT084.RECSA)
23. G2021.TARPT084.RECSA- Grant closure report RECSA
24. G2021.TARPT084.RECSA Routing slip of RECSA
26. Application for allocation from the Federal Foreign Office Funds by UNITAR.
27. TARPT084 - Routing Slip Letter of Request German MFA 29.06.2021

28. Original logframe of the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project from 1 July - 31 December 2021.

29. Project budget Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project.


31. Interim report TARPT084 (31 December 2021)

32. 2022 Events list extracted from EMS

33. 2022 participants list extracted from EMS

34. 2022 Statistics extracted from EMS

35. Letter of agreement between the Ministry of Defence and National Service of the United Republic of Tanzania People's Defence Force (TPDF) and United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).

36. Amendment letter of agreement between the Ministry of Defence and National Service of the United Republic of Tanzania People's Defence Force (TPDF) and United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).

37. Second amendment letter of agreement between the Ministry of Defence and National Service of the United Republic of Tanzania People's Defence Force (TPDF) and United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).

38. TPDF Interim Narrative Report


40. IP evaluation Ministry of Defence

41. Due Diligence Assessment (DDA) for TPDF

42. Letter of agreement between the Tanzania Police Force and United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR).

43. Interim narrative report from June to August 2022 for the Reinforcement of Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian People's Defence Forces project and an interim financial report from June to August 2022 for the Reinforcement of Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian People's Defence Forces project.

44. Final narrative report from June to December 2022 of the Reinforcement of Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian People's Defence Forces project.

45. Final financial statement from June to December 2022 with expenditures budgeted of the Reinforcement of Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian People's Defence Forces project.

46. IP evaluation Tanzania Police Force.

47. Agreement routing slip Tanzania Police Force.

48. LOA The East Africa Standby Force and UNITAR

49. Routing slip of the East Africa Standby Force implementing partner.
50. Agreement between the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) for the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project implemented from April 2022 to December 2002.

51. Agreement routing slip TARPT107

52. Amendment of Agreement between the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) for the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project implemented from April 2022 to December 2002. Contains financial details.

53. Logframe of the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project from 15 July - 31 December 2021.

54. Logframe of the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project from 15 April - 21 December 2022

55. TARPT107 Budget Amendment

56. Agreement routing slip TARPT107. Application for an allocation from Federal Foreign Office Funds for the support of crises prevention, stabilization and post/ conflict reconstruction projects implemented by UNITAR in Tanzania.

57. Interim Narrative Report TARPT107.DEUMFA from April 2022 to December 2002 of employment of the Reinforcement of Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project.

58. Logframe from April 2022 to December 2022 of Support to the Ecole de Maintien de la Paix "Alioune Blondin Bèye" (EMPABB) Annual Program for 2022.

59. Logframe of the Reinforcement of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces project from 15 April - 31 December 2022 TARPT107 (15 Nov 2022).

60. Description of other projects implemented by PDTA team.
Annex 5: Evaluation question matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Proposed adjustment to question</th>
<th>Sub questions</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Limitation(s)</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 1</td>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong>: Is the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are activities relevant to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, and designed with quality?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review KI Interviews with project management other stakeholders</td>
<td>-Project design and implementation reflect alignment with the 2030 SDG Agenda and UNITAR's strategic framework</td>
<td>No significant limitations have been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 2</td>
<td>How relevant are the objectives and design of the project (all its components) to the needs and priorities of the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces and to the capacity needs, priorities and performance improvements of the beneficiaries of the training centre?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Are they building on the “Training Facility for Integrated Exercises for Uniformed Personnel” report commissioned by UNITAR</td>
<td>Desk review KI Interviews Project documents/reports</td>
<td>- Project stakeholders identify the Project as relevant to their objectives and the organizational change priorities of the TPTC. ’- Actions taken by the Project support the TPTC objectives</td>
<td>No significant limitations have been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 3</td>
<td>How relevant is the project in supporting gender equality and women’s empowerment in the peace and security field? (GEEW)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [Number of] female participants in trainings that perceive trainings as relevant to their empowerment and promotion of gender equality in peacekeeping operations.
- Degree of gender sensitivity of the trainings delivered
- Relevance to women’s access to deployment for peacekeeping missions, in safe and secure conditions.
- Improvement in enabling conditions for female personnel access to

Access to informant s who have participat ed in the trainings conducted might hinder triangulati on of this question.

Triangulati on with desk review data and possible interviews in the field with female participan ts in ToT and leadership training.

and align with results of the Institutional Assessment conducted.

and the institutional assessment of the training centre (2021)? Were the objectives formulated sufficient to lead to a behavioural change/performance growth?

Desk review
KI Interviews
Interviews with trained female participants (Fieldwork)
Survey (TBD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EQ 4</strong></th>
<th>How relevant is the project to the local, national, international and/or historical context?</th>
<th>How relevant is the project to the national, international and/or historical peacekeeping/peac ebuilding context?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Desk review KI Interviews</th>
<th>-The project design and implementation reflect awareness of the national, regional and international peacebuilding/peacekeeping context.</th>
<th>No significant limitations have been identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence:</strong> To what extent is the project coherent with relevant UN/international frameworks and policies, complementing other programmes and projects and adhering to international norms and standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 5</td>
<td>How well is the project aligned with and complements other UNITAR programming, including those aiming at strengthening the deployment-related training offerings of training centres in the African continent (Supporting the yearly trainings program of the Ecole Maintien de la Paix (EMPABB) Mali), Training and Advanced training of West African Security Forces (Ghana), etc.)?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Are there any visible articulations with other projects identified?</td>
<td>Desk review KII with project management</td>
<td>- The project is aligned and [to the extent possible] complements other UNITAR projects/programs. - The project benefits from lessons learned and experience of UNITAR supporting other training centres.</td>
<td>No significant limitations have been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 6</td>
<td>How well is the project aligned with UNITAR standards for training of trainers?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review KII with project management</td>
<td>Project documents</td>
<td>No significant limitations have been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 7</td>
<td>How well is the project aligned with international frameworks, including the WPS Agenda, the UN Uniformed Gender Parity Strategy, Cruz Report, Action for Peacekeeping (A4P), Elsie Initiative for Women in Peace Operations, Blue Marble principles, amongst others? [GEEW, ENVSUSE][1]</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review KII with project management</td>
<td>KI other stakeholders Surveys (TBD) Interviews with participants during (fieldwork)</td>
<td>- The project design and implementation indicate alignment with key international gender equality, peacebuilding and sustainability frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 8</td>
<td>Effectiveness: How effective has the project been in delivering results and in reinforcing the peacekeeping training centre of Tanzanian armed forces, local trainers and training participants' capabilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Where there adjustments made to the original project design or variations in outputs? Are there any factors identified as hinderers of implementation? How were these addressed by the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review - Reports KII Logframe progress review</td>
<td>- Outputs have been achieved effectively (as planned and with quality).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significant limitations have been identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 9</th>
<th>To what extent have the planned outputs and objectives for Phase I and II been achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review KII with IPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From desk review, it has been identified that participation of IPs from phase I &amp; II, especially in the case of the EASF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluator will try, to the extent possible, to reach out to all IPs. If not possible, the evaluation will rely on data from other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Has the project’s structure, with its multiple components, and partnerships been effective in delivering results, including the performance of the three implementing partners of phase I? |
|---|---|
| None | No |
| From desk review, it has been identified that participation of IPs from phase I &amp; II, especially in the case of the EASF |
| The evaluator will try, to the extent possible, to reach out to all IPs. If not possible, the evaluation will rely on data from other |
| EQ 10 | To what extent are a human rights-based approach, disability considerations, and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project and in the design and delivery of ToT events (both men and women) and pre-deployment training? (GEEW) | None | To what extent is the project making a difference in inclusion and gender equality aspects of female training? | Desk review Non participant observation (Fieldwork) Surveys KII | - The project design and ToT training events incorporated a human rights-based approach, disability considerations, and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy. - Access to ToT training content and to pre-deployment training content and to deployed uniformed Personnel (UP) that has participated in this trainings. - Access to ToT training content. - Access to ToT training content. - Access to ToT training content. - Access to ToT training content. - Access to ToT training content. | The evaluator will request to the Chief Training Officer, access to these materials prior or during fieldwork, with triangulation in interviews with uniformed personnel who participated in ToTs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 11</th>
<th>To what extent and how is the project contributing to changed behaviour (motivations) and improved performance (capabilities) of the certified trainers and the armed forces in the served communities?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>What is missing, if anything?</th>
<th>Desk review Non participant observation of training (Fieldwork) Surveys KII</th>
<th>- [Number of surveyed] trainers trained with perceived changes in behaviour and level of competence to perform duties, as a result of training. ' - TPTC leadership perceived value and contribution of training to improvement in performance and behaviour change of trainers trained.</th>
<th>Access to [certified] trainers either prior or during fieldwork.</th>
<th>The evaluator is awaiting access to participants' contact information. The alternative will be in-depth interviews to a convenient sample during fieldwork.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 12</td>
<td>To what extent is the environmental sustainability taken into account when constructing the training centre and research hub or when providing the equipment? (ENVSUSE)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review Observation (Fieldwork) KI Interview with TPTC leadership</td>
<td>- The construction of the TPTC centre has taken into account minimum environmental sustainability standards. ' - The purchase of equipment has taken into account minimum environmental sustainability standards</td>
<td>Reports received from the construction contractor are brief, limited in scope and don't have details regarding environmental standards held.</td>
<td>Information will be gathered with observation on site of the facilities built, interview with contractor (if possible) and other KI interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 13</td>
<td><strong>To what extent has the project supported the centre’s institutional development, and has it been effective?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the project been effective in assessing and implementing actions to support the centre’s institutional development efforts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review KII (TPTC leadership, MoD and PM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The project identified stakeholder’s institutional needs and developed actions to support where needed within scope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholders acknowledge effective and timely contribution of the project to its institutional strengthening needs and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Institutional Assessment Framework is a recently developed tool, with implementation at a primary stage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Short timeframe of implementation of both phases makes it challenging to measure effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency:</td>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The evaluator will adjust the scope of inquiry using the main dimensions of the IA tool, and the recently created strategic plan, keeping the scope aligned with implementation timeframe for Phases I and II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including all the implementing partners (e.g., in comparison with alternative approaches)? Were the project’s resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?

To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, in comparison with alternative approaches?

Were the project’s resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?

Desk review (Request of additional records, if available.)

Observation (Fieldwork)

- Project outputs have been delivered in full and in a timely manner.
- Project outputs have been delivered as planned, and variations have not impacted (or minimally impacted) outcomes or their quality.

Access to financial records and to implementing partners.

Measuring Cost Efficiency will be challenging with existing information.

Cost-efficiency will not be a fully developed exercise, but will be limited to the understanding of implementation and utilization of resources to achieve objectives and outputs in a timely and efficient manner.

How efficient has the Ministry of Defence and National Service of the United Republic of Tanzania (MODANS)’ procurement rules and regulations, contractual arrangements with vendors, procedures been in providing the necessary inputs for the project results (e.g., the construction work in the training centre, the establishment of the research hub, the technology-enhanced learning environment, etc.)?

None

Observation (Fieldwork)

- The MODANS regulations and procedures have enabled project results in the improvement of infrastructure and enhancement of TPTC visibility and technology use

The limited flow of information and accountability from the partner in terms of detailed budget utilization

Efficiency will be measured against collaboration during implementation, and outputs achieved, but will not be at the extent
| EQ 16 | To what extent are the project’s inputs/resources deployed in an efficient manner (e.g., cost-efficient, constructing the centre, supplying the equipment) to realise the activities? | None | None | Desk review KII | - IPs (MODANS and TPTC) perceive resources have been deployed in an efficient manner. | No significant limitations have been identified |

**Likelihood of Impact:** What are the potential cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes?
| EQ 17 | What real difference has the project made to the role of female officers during the pre-deployment phase and after when being deployed the training in the Peacekeeping Training Centre of Tanzanian Armed Forces? (GEEW) | None | Desk review KII with trainers Survey (only if access to participant’s list is granted) | Evaluation questions on pre-deployed personnel will be very difficult to triangulate and substantiate amidst the already anticipated lack of access to pre-deployed male and female personnel, with no contact data available, but also minimal direct intervention in training or assessment of learning outcomes from UNITAR in Tanzania. This will be kept at the level of trainers, rather than female deployed personnel. Other key informants will be asked about perceived effects of training in capacities of pre-deployed personnel for triangulation. However, the evaluator acknowledges this as a significant information gap. |
| EQ 18 | **To what extent has the project strengthened the training centre, local trainers’ and officers benefiting from the offerings of the training centre capacities? How did the trainings impact the specific training needs of uniformed (men and women) personnel and the served communities?** | **To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of the training centre and local trainers, to provide training services, and the capacities of uniformed personnel receiving this training?** | **How did the trainings impact the specific training needs of uniformed (men and women) personnel and the served communities?** | **Perceived improvement and expanded access to training by TPTC stakeholders**
- Perceived level of impact of training and responsiveness to the trainees needs [by trainees responding to survey (or interview)]
- Perceived level of impact of training and responsiveness to the participants needs [by participants responding to survey (or interview)]

- Access to participants in ToTs
- Limited access to Pre-deployed uniformed personnel

- Access to diverse TPTC stakeholders, and direct in-depth interviews during fieldwork.

**Desk review**
**Survey**
**In-depth interviews with trainees**
**KII**

Triangulation with diverse TPTC stakeholders, and direct in-depth interviews during fieldwork.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 19</th>
<th>What other observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended), and strengthened capabilities (increased, decreased) have occurred?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Desk review KII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Short timeframe of implementation of both phases makes it challenging to observe changes at this point. The scope of the question and substantiation of results will keep into account this factor, accounting for time and other possible hindering factors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 20</th>
<th>Did the project expand the access to high-impact pre-deployment training for uniformed personnel, by increasing the accessibility to dedicated peacekeeping training, by upgrading the equipment, by expanding the partnership base?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>- Stakeholders perceive the organizational change support provided as potentially impactful for the strengthening of the TPTC as a centre of excellence. - Stakeholders have taken initial steps in the implementation of their strategic work plan, with support from the project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Short timeframe of implementation of both phases makes it challenging to observe changes at this point. The scope of the question and substantiation of results will keep into account this factor, accounting for time and other possible hindering factors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood of Sustainability:</strong> To what extent are the project’s results likely to be sustained in the long term? How is environmental sustainability addressed in the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 21</strong></td>
<td>To what extent are the project’s results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term and under which conditions?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review Observation on site KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 22</strong></td>
<td>What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project and can be mitigated by project stakeholders?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review Observation on site KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 23</strong></td>
<td>To what extent are the current design and exit strategies likely to contribute to sustained capacity of the training centre, including the establishment of the research hub, roster of certified trainers, and expansion of partnerships (Phase I)?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review Observation on site KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 24</strong></td>
<td>What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming, particularly in institutional assessment and support?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review Observation on site KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 25</td>
<td>Did the institutional support for the training centre turned out to be sustainable?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Desk review, Observation on site, KII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessing sustainability might be challenging at this point. The Institutional Assessment Framework has been implemented at the end of phase I, and the strategic was designed at the end of phase II. Other actions have also been limited in time and scope given the short implementation window.

The scope of the question and substantiation of results will keep into account this factor, accounting for time and other possible factors limiting the analysis of sustainability at this point.
| EQ26 | To what extent is environmental sustainability taken into account when considering the long-term use of the training centre building? *(ENVSUSE)* | None | None | Desk review Observation on site KII | - The TPTC stakeholders incorporate environmental sustainability considerations to the management of the centre and are likely to implement measures to counter environmental impact in the future. | No significant limitations have been identified |
Annex 6: Evaluation consultant agreement form

Annex: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

The evaluator:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

---

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Aura Liliana Lopez

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): ______________________

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to a potential conflict of interest.

Signed at place on date: Quito, Ecuador: 13 November 2022

Signature: ________________________________

Firmado digitalmente por Aura Liliana Lopez

Firma: 2022.11.13
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By signing this pledge, I hereby commit to discussing and applying the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and to adopting the associated ethical behaviours.

INTEGRITY
I will actively adhere to the moral values and professional standards of evaluation practice as outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and following the values of the United Nations. Specifically, I will be:
- Honest and truthful in my communication and actions.
- Professional, engaging in credible and trustworthy behaviour, alongside competence, commitment and ongoing reflective practice.
- Independent, impartial and incorruptible.

ACCOUNTABILITY
I will be accountable for all decisions made and actions taken and responsible for honouring commitments, without qualification or exception; I will report potential or actual harms observed. Specifically, I will be:
- Transparent regarding evaluation purpose and targets, establishing trust and increasing accountability for performance to the public, particularly those populations affected by this evaluation.
- Responsive as questions or events arise, adapting plans as required and referring to appropriate channels where corruption, fraud, sexual exploitation or abuse or other misconduct or waste of resources is identified.
- Responsible for meeting the evaluation purpose and for actions taken and for ensuring accuracy and recognition as needed.

RESPECT
I will engage with all stakeholders of an evaluation in a way that honours their dignity, wellbeing, personal agency and characteristics. Specifically, I will ensure:
- Access to the evaluation process and products by all relevant stakeholders – whether powerful or powerless – with due attention to factors that could impede access such as sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBT status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability.
- Meaningful participation and equitable treatment of all relevant stakeholders in the evaluation processes, from design to dissemination. This includes engaging various stakeholders, particularly affected people, so they can actively inform the evaluation approach and products rather than being solely a subject of data collection.
- Fair representation of different voices and perspectives in evaluation products (reports, webinars, etc).

BENEFICENCE
I will strive to do good for people and planet while minimizing harm arising from evaluation as an intervention. Specifically, I will ensure:
- Explicit and ongoing consideration of risks and benefits from evaluation processes.
- Maximum benefits for systemic (including environmental), organizational and programmatic levels.
- No harm. I will not proceed where harm cannot be mitigated.
- Evaluation makes an overall positive contribution to human and natural systems and the mission of the United Nations.

I commit to playing my part in ensuring that evaluations are conducted according to the Charter of the United Nations and the ethical requirements laid down above and contained within the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. When this is not possible, I will report the situation to my supervisor, designated focal points or channels and will actively seek an appropriate response.

Aura
Lina
Lopez

(final name)
(Signature and Date)