



**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)
FINAL PROGRAMME¹ NARRATIVE REPORT**

REPORTING PERIOD: FROM OCTOBER 2009 TO DECEMBER 2010

Programme Title & Project Number
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme Title: M&E of Liberia PBF Programme Number: PBF/LBR/E-9 MPTF Office Project Reference Number:³ 00072488

Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results²
<i>Country:</i> Liberia Priority Area 3: Strengthening State Capacity for Peace Consolidation <hr/> <i>Priority area/ strategic results</i>

Participating Organization(s)
UNDP

Implementing Partners
Peacebuilding Office (PBO), Ministry of Internal Affairs

Programme/Project Cost (US\$)	
MPTF/JP Contribution:	US\$ 100,000 (PBF)
• <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i>	
Agency Contribution	-
• <i>by Agency (if applicable)</i>	
Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i>	-
Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i>	-
TOTAL:	US\$ 100,000

Programme Duration	
Overall Duration (<i>months</i>)	12 months
Start Date ⁴ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>)	02/10/2009
Original End Date ⁵ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>)	31/10/2010
Actual End date ⁶ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>)	31/12/2010
Have agency(ies) operationally closed the Programme in its(their) system?	Yes No X
Expected Financial Closure date ⁷ :	30/06/2011

Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.
Assessment/Review - if applicable <i>please attach</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Date: <i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>
Mid-Term Evaluation Report - <i>if applicable please attach</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Date: <i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>

Report Submitted By
<input type="checkbox"/> Name: Nessie Golakai
<input type="checkbox"/> Title: DRR- Programme a.i.
<input type="checkbox"/> Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP
<input type="checkbox"/> Email address: nessie.golakai@undp.org

¹ The term “programme” is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects.

² Strategic Results, as formulated in the Performance Management Plan (PMP) for the PBF, Priority Plan or project document;

³ The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to “Project ID” on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁴ The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](#)

⁵ As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

⁶ If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. As per the MOU, agencies are to notify the MPTF Office when a programme completes its operational activities. Please see [MPTF Office Closure Guidelines](#).

⁷ Financial Closure requires the return of unspent balances and submission of the [Certified Final Financial Statement and Report](#).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project contributed significantly to enhanced monitoring and evaluation of the expected Outcomes and Outputs related to (1) Justice and Security, and (2) National Reconciliation as set out in the Strategic Performance Management Framework of the Liberia Priority Plan (LPP) 2011-2013. More specifically, the project ensured that the various PBF-supported projects are implemented in accordance with annual work plans, including a validation of performance indicators, with quality project quarterly reports submitted timely to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) and regular on-site progress monitoring. A comprehensive Mid-Term Evaluation of the PBF project portfolio was conducted in 2010, with a number of useful and practical lessons, findings and recommendations identified, shared and implemented.

I. Purpose

The main objective of the project was to ensure effective monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Liberia Priority Plan (LPP) by the Peacebuilding Office (PBO) during 2010, more specifically to determine whether PBF-supported projects are implemented as planned and contributing to the desired change to foster sustainable peace in Liberia, and to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the PBF project portfolio.

II. Assessment of Programme Results

i) Narrative reporting on results:

The PBF support contributed significantly to enhanced monitoring and evaluation of the expected Outcomes and Outputs related to (1) Justice and Security, and (2) National Reconciliation as set out in the Strategic Performance Management Framework of the Liberia Priority Plan 2011-2013. More specifically, the project achieved the following:

Monitoring of LPP Outcomes:

- Ensured that the various PBF-supported projects are implemented in accordance with annual work plans, including a validation of performance indicators;
- Submission of PBF project quarterly narrative reports to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) via the PBO/PBF Secretariat with verification of progress conducted through on-site monitoring;
- Ensured that all PBF projects are implemented with a conflict sensitivity lens, and include mechanisms to mitigate unintended negative results.

Evaluation of LPP Outcomes:

- Conducted a comprehensive Mid-Term Evaluation of the PBF project portfolio (LPP) in Liberia;
- Lessons from the implementation of the LPP were identified and shared, and recommendations made to realign projects objectives and/or design where appropriate, to inform the design and implementation of future peacebuilding projects, including conflict sensitivity aspects;
- Enhanced understanding of the quality and effectiveness of projects and interventions that produced the highest peacebuilding impact and peace dividends for the people of Liberia.

Specific Outputs

The PBO over the reporting period developed and put in place a detailed monitoring framework. With the assistance of the CDA Collaborative Learning Project, a monitoring matrix was developed which covered both progress against outputs and changes in conflict factors.

During 2010 a total of six monitoring visits to project sites were conducted. Key findings were reported to all the partners involved and the Joint Steering Committee (JSC). The monitoring trips focused on verification of progress and compliance which informed the various project teams to take real-time actions where necessary. Projects monitored during 2010 included the Volunteers for Peace Project, the Tumutu Agricultural Training Project for ex-combatants, the Platform for Dialogue as well as the Psycho-social intervention project amongst others. Counties visited over the period included Grand Gedeh, Nimba, Lofa, Margibi, River Gee and Bong amongst others. Round table discussions were held with project teams to discuss key challenges and lessons related to the project implementation and achievements. An additional focus of the monitoring visits was to see whether projects were making the adjustments or realigning programme activities as recommended in the mid-term evaluation report.

Project sites visited included specific areas in Cape Mount, Gbarpolu and Bomi, where 11 Peace Huts have been constructed as part of the project deliverables, and in Maryland where two of the PBF projects were also being implemented. Field visits were also made to Grand Bassa, Sinoe, Grand Gedeh, River Gee and Rivercess counties.

The PBO also conducted six field visits to monitor the implementation of the PBF small grants projects. The PBO has been working with the JSC Ad-hoc Committee set-up by the JSC to oversee the implementation of the PBF small grants. A total of 15 projects were implemented under the small grants programme.⁸

One of the main lessons was that the Recipient Agencies agreed that more focus should be placed in monitoring change in certain critical areas of the priority plan, namely: fostering national reconciliation; building trust between groups; and strengthening state capacity through improvement of the rule of law institutional structures. In general terms monitoring of progress in critical conflict drivers is constrained by the fact that analytical tools, such as hotspot assessments, are strictly confidential, and usually such critical information is only shared at the senior management level. Addressing these challenges requires continuous attention by all partners involved.

Over the period January - December 2010 the following interventions were implemented:

- Mid-Term Evaluation of the PBF project portfolio conducted (see details in section iii).
- Elaborated the specific M&E deliverables in project proposals and updated the MPTF-O quarterly reports to reflect the impact on changes achieved in response to conflict drivers.

⁸ Mid-way in the allocation of the PBF the JSC allocated of US\$464,008 for small proposals from CSOs/NGOs. The objective was intended to ensure the participation of smaller CSOs/NGOs that otherwise could not meet the high criteria to access PBF funding. The small grant initiative was also an attempt to help strengthen the capacities of smaller CSOs in peacebuilding, effective financial and narrative reporting, programme design, and proposal development. These were areas identified where local CSOs needed to be capacitated. The JSC constituted an Ad-hoc Committee to develop the ToR and Criteria by which small proposals could be considered for funding. Slightly over 100 proposals were received from all over Liberia under the small grants programme, but only 15 were considered i.e. 1 per county. The PBO has also worked closely with UNHCR for the implementation of the small grants programme.

- Conducted various monitoring missions with joint participation from all key partners. The monitoring reports provided key recommendations to the JSC, PBO, Recipient Agencies and Implementing Partners for follow-up and corrective actions where necessary.
- Proposal formulated for a dedicated M&E Unit within the PBO for more regular and comprehensive progress monitoring of the LPP providing lessons learned and recommendations in terms of continued support.

Implementation Arrangements

The project was implemented by PBO staff located within the Ministry of Internal Affairs under the overall supervision of the Co-Chairs and members of the JSC. UNDP played a strong advisory role and often provided critical support, including administrative assistance in support of implementing the various activities of the project. UNDP as the Recipient UN Organization for this project implemented the project in line with UNDP's procurement and financial procedures and regulations.

iii) Evaluation, Best Practices and Lessons Learned

A comprehensive independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the PBF project portfolio was conducted in 2010. The CDA Collaborative Learning Project (Boston, MA, USA) was engaged to conduct training in monitoring and evaluation, and help to develop the TOR for the Mid-Term Evaluation. The evaluation addressed the following key criteria and evaluation questions:

Relevance:

- Are the funded interventions relevant to the Liberia Priority Plan?
- Are the funded interventions relevant to the conflict context?
- What are the gaps in programming? What is the PBFL not doing that needs to be done in order to prevent future violent conflict?
- Will there be additional needs after 18 months?

Effectiveness:

- What are the cumulative results of the PBFL to date, both positive and negative?
- How much progress has been made towards the three priorities in the Liberia Priority Plan? Which areas are on track and which areas are behind?
- What have been the principle challenges to achieving results?
- Within clusters of programming e.g. rule of law programming or youth focused programming, which were more effective and why?
- Has the PBFL affected government policy?
- Is the PBFL meeting the Government of Liberia Peacebuilding targets as established in the national Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS)?
- How well has the PBFL implemented a communication and visibility strategy?

Implementation Process Appraisal:

- What has been the overall quality and level of support the PBF Secretariat has provided to the implementing partners.
- What has been the overall quality and level of support provided to the PBF Secretariat by the PBSO.
- What could the PBF Secretariat and PBSO do better? Where should attention be given to making improvements in quality, form and amount of support to implementing partners? What lessons learned are there for future Secretariats?
- How effective have the partnerships between Recipient UN Organisations and their implementing partners been? What is the quality and durability of the relationship?

Sustainability:

- What indications are there that the changes catalyzed from this work will be sustainable?
- Will the recipient agencies and partners attempt to continue the peacebuilding work after the PBF funding has finished?

The evaluation report including key findings and recommendations was presented to the JSC, the PBF Secretariat, and the UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) in New York. Specific recommendations were followed up to address some of the pertinent evaluation findings.

Overall, during the implementation of the PBF M&E support project some delays were encountered with regard to organizing the various field monitoring visits and the design of the evaluation TOR. However, in order to ensure optimal quality and participation of all main stakeholders, more time had to be allocated to this as compared to what was originally planned. The fact that the PBO did not have a dedicated M&E Unit as such was one of the challenges addressed by this project as it put in place the main building blocks for M&E and a proposal was developed for a M&E Unit within the PBO for more regular and comprehensive progress monitoring of the LPP at outcome and output level.

iv) Specific Story

While not related to one specific intervention, the comprehensive Mid-Term Evaluation of the PBF project portfolio provided several significant findings and lessons from the implementation of the LPP since the start. The recommendations were very useful in terms of critically rethinking some of the interventions in the different areas as well as realigning project objectives and/or design to ensure optimal effectiveness and efficiency.