


Bautista Logioco
MARCH 2024

A PBF catalytic effect could be of a non-financial and/or of a financial nature. After consultations with stakeholders, including, PBF Secretariats, PBSO staff, selected funding

Determining the catalyst effects requires three-steps:

STEP ONE: Determine whether a claimed effect is effectively a PBF catalyst effect.

(1) no catalyst effect (2) yes, catalyst effect

STEP TWO: Assess the significance of the PBF catalyst effect/s identified in step one by the evaluator.

(2) some catalyst effect (3) Significant catalyst effect

STEP THREE: If relevant, calculate financial catalyst effect.

The below criteria will help determine whether a claimed catalyst effect is, indeed, the consequence of the specific PBF allocation being evaluated:

PBF allocation prior in time to the claimed catalyst effect: A

concerning peacebuilding and conflict prevention priorities in the country, and/or increased dialogue between the UN System, national stakeholders, and other partners on how to prioritize and address peacebuilding challenges in a specific country setting.

Links with PBF Allocation: PBF catalytic effects need to be reflected in peacebuilding efforts - including policies, programmes, projects, etc. - that show some kind of link with the original PBF allocation. Ideally, the claimed catalytic effect would be aligned with the PBF priority or focus area addressed by the specific PBF allocation being assessed.. This happens for instance, when the original PBF allocation focused on conflict prevention/management (PBF focus area 2.3) and the claimed catalytic effect is also related to conflict prevention/management.

As such, this link allows to demonstrate an objective connection between what is being claimed as a PBF catalytic effect and the original PBF investment.

Prior interaction between the PBF and stakeholders: PBF catalytic effects are usually the result of explicit interaction between the UN, RUNOs, NUNOs and other stakeholders, including national or local governments, civil society, donors, among other. This interaction not only contributes to ensure local ownership of the original PBF engagement, but it also fosters dialogue and coordination of actions in support of peacebuilding priorities.

Those PBF allocations that cannot determine any catalytic effect as per the criteria described in the above section should report (1) No Catalytic Effect, and the assessment stops at this stage.

The PBF allocation reporting (2) go to step 2 below.

When it has been determined that a claimed catalytic effect is the result of a PBF allocation, such effect should be assessed on the basis of the following guiding questions:

To determine the significance of a PBF catalytic effect¹, evaluators of PBF allocations will not only determine whether the assessment of such effect responds to one or more of the above questions but also the degree to which it does so.

For instance, the assessment of a PBF catalytic effect that responds positively to all three questions would most certainly demonstrate to be of a significant nature, whereas one that responds to only one could represent "some catalytic effect". However, there could also be cases in which an assessment determines that the PBF catalytic effect contributes to "only" remove barriers to political or peacebuilding processes, but of such a magnitude (e.g. dialogues or peace talks that lead to political or peace agreements; inclusive consultations that lead to constitutional, legislative or institutional reforms, etc.) that it merits qualifying those effects as significant.

¹ I.e. Some Catalytic Effect or Significant Catalytic Effect

