

Methodology

This section considers two methodological areas: i) the methodologies deployed in current evaluations, lessons learned studies, and ii) the methodological approach deployed in this review.

2.1 The criteria of success and failure in current evaluations

As noted by Spencer (1998), practice is ahead of theory and conceptual clarity within this field. In addition only relatively few evaluations of peace building activities/projects/programmes exist, and even fewer are available for reviewing. Among existing and available evaluations, there is no common norm or methodological criteria for evaluating peace building and still less baseline data and criteria for establishing links between inputs and outcomes.

Two main frameworks or sets of criteria are used in various forms and to varying extents in current evaluations of conflict management and peace-building activities. The first might be characterised as a ,mainstream' approach, exemplified by the criteria set out by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (see Spencer 1998): broadly these criteria are efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and relevance. The second approach might be characterised as humanitarian since it seeks to refine the more orthodox mainstream framework by injecting consideration of the human impact of interventions: this approach is exemplified by the criteria developed by the Active Learning Network on Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Assistance (ALNAP). The ALNAP criteria are appropriateness and timeliness; coherence and co-ordination; connectedness; cost-effectiveness; coverage; and impact/outcome. In line with the Terms of Reference, the ALNAP criteria are applied in this study.

2.2 The Methodology of this Paper

We have taken a broad view of ,peace-building', and understand it to include not only interventions which have an explicit peace building objective, but also the use of conventional forms of development aid for the purpose of changing conditions and dynamics of conflict (the incentives and disincentives discussed below), or which may otherwise be informed by a peace-building perspective.

As is indicated by the very terms ,Annotated Bibliography/State of the Art Report', this study aims both at providing an annotated bibliography of recent evaluations and lessons learned from peace building interventions and at ,stating the art' within the field. Whereas the first aim primarily has been met by collecting and summarizing recent evaluations with an eye to the most important lessons learned within each evaluated peace-building activity/project/programme (part 3), the second aim is attempted by reading across these evaluations in order to synthesize and systematize the findings (parts 4 & 5). While the bibliography part aims at representing the main content of and differences between specific evaluations, the synthesis of the lessons learned aims at assessing critically the content of peace-building interventions in a broader perspective.

2.2.1 State of the Art

General policy statements on peace-building and conflict prevention focus on the overall aim of activities and on the development of different instruments. The question of how specific contexts influence the applicability and the possible effects of these instruments is much less developed. Least developed is the question of which assumptions, what kind of knowledge, and which political agendas have fed into the development of these instruments.

It is not within the scope of this work to develop a methodology for categorising peace-building activities. However, for the analytical purpose of ,stating the art', we have examined peace-building instruments on the basis of their aims, the scope of their actions, and the agents implementing them, as they occur in Sida's Arbetspapper (1999) and in the evaluations reviewed. We distinguish

between:

- Instruments directly aiming at peace building (,reconciliation').
- Structural peace-building/conflict prevention.
- Indirect forms of peace building and conflict prevention.

Some of the instruments directly aiming at peace building are considered in the project specific evaluations. The structural and indirect peace-building/conflict preventing instruments form part of the synthesis reports and country studies, such as in the consideration of how conventional or mainstream development assistance contributes to peace building.

2.2.2 Bibliography

A total of 21 evaluations or ,lessons learned' reports have been included in the annotated bibliography. The basis for the inclusion of reports has been: availability within the two weeks set aside from Inception Report (June 30) to the deadline for handing in the work (July 14); coverage of three types of interventions (Track II interventions, locally based peace processes and institutional capacity building efforts), and representation of both multilateral and national/bilateral donors.

The evaluations reviewed are classified as *synthesis reports*, *country studies* and *project-specific evaluations*, although this division is not always clear-cut. Each evaluation is then reviewed by highlighting:

- the scope of the evaluation or study, outlining the activities involved in the project or programme
- the methodology used
- the lessons learned from the evaluation.