



LIBERIA

PROJECT HALF YEARLY PROGRESS UPDATE

PERIOD COVERED: JANUARY – JUNE 2014

Project No & Title:	PBF/LBR/A-9: Support to the establishment of a land disputes prevention and resolution system in Liberia - Phase 2 (Project ID 00088029)		
Recipient Organization(s)¹:	UN-Habitat		
Implementing Partners (Government, UN agencies, NGOs etc):	Land Commission		
Location:	Monrovia and 6 counties (Montserrado, Margibi, Nimba, Lofa, Bong, Maryland)		
Total Approved Budget :²	USD 2,000,000		
Preliminary data on funds committed :³	USD 1,195,000	% of funds committed / total approved budget:	60%
Expenditure⁴:	USD 633,000	% of expenditure / total budget: (Delivery rate)	32%
Project Approval Date:	4 October 2013	Possible delay in operational closure date (Number of months)	Not anticipated at this time
Project Start Date:	30 October 2013		
Expected Operational Project Closure Date:	31 March 2015		
Project Outcomes:	1. Alternative land dispute resolution system fully operational and managed by a new national Land Agency 2. Overlaps eliminated and synergies established with the Justice and Security Hubs 3. Policies and transition strategy established for alternative dispute resolution 4. Improved land administration capacity for Land Commission/New Agency		

¹ Please note that where there are multiple agencies, only one consolidated project report should be submitted.

² Approved budget is the amount transferred to Recipient Organisations.

³ Funds committed are defined as the commitments made through legal contracts for services and works according to the financial regulations and procedures of the Recipient Organisations. Provide preliminary data only.

⁴ Actual payments (contracts, services, works) made on commitments.

⁵ PBF focus areas are:

1: Support the implementation of peace agreements and political dialogue (Priority Area 1):

(1.1) SSR, (1.2) RoL; (1.3) DDR; (1.4) Political Dialogue;

2: Promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflicts (Priority Area 2):

(2.1) National reconciliation; (2.1) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Management of natural resources;

3: Revitalise the economy and generate immediate peace dividends (Priority Area 3);

(3.1) Short-term employment generation; (3.2) Sustainable livelihoods

4) (Re)-establish essential administrative services (Priority Area 4)

(4.1) Public administration; (4.2) Public service delivery (including infrastructure).

	5. Improved understanding of urban disputes, and their effects on women, as well as the displaced, for Land Commission/New Agency
PBF Focus Area ⁵	Management of natural resources (including land)

Qualitative assessment of progress

<p><i>For each intended outcome, provide evidence of progress during the reporting period.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, for each outcome include the outputs achieved. (500 words max.)</i></p>	<p>Outcome 1: ADR system fully operational and managed by the Land Commission (LC), while the new National Land Agency Act is being prepared.</p> <p>Estimates from LC/Land Coordination Centre (LCC) staff indicate an increase in the number of persons that are aware of their land rights and preferred to use the ADR system in the target districts where LCCs are active. 92% of key informants (officials) and 64% of the general population in the ten districts are aware of their land rights, ADR option and the Land Commission. Estimates were generated by LCC outreach to officials/KIs in their areas and by LC “spot checks” of the general population (10-20 pax questioned in each target district). However, the June 2014 PBO Justice & Security Perception Survey showed lower levels of awareness in the general population countywide in Bong, Lofa and Nimba: only 11% (13% of men and 9% of women) were aware of LCCs.</p> <p>158 land dispute cases recorded and 21 resolved (13%). 41 cases were reported by women and 117 by men. 94% of resolved cases have stayed resolved 1 year after closure of the case files and monitoring of disputants' compliance to MOUs.</p> <p>Output 1.1: 1,675 males and 852 females participated in outreach activities. Spot checks in the areas indicate that 34% of Liberians in the project areas express willingness to use the land ADR system (15% are women).</p> <p>Output 1.2.1: Two performance reviews of LC and LCC staff were conducted; 580 dispute resolvers trained.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.2.2: LCC staff followed up 50 resolved cases.</p> <p>Outcome 2: Collaboration strengthened with the Regional Justice and Security Hub in Gbarnga) and enhancement of information network on earlier warning signs to prevent violent land conflict. The Hub is a part of the Bong LCC Land Dispute Resolution Taskforce (LDRT). 6 joint meetings held</p>
---	--

	<p>between the LCC and the Hub.</p> <p>Outcome 3: Transitional strategies have included: advocacy and involvement of county judges to support the ADR system in County where the LCCs are operating. Engagement of the MOJ and Justice sector for the practice of ADR system. Importantly, a Working Forum held at the end of May 2014 finalised the LC’s National Land ADR Policy Intent Statement. This is a key deliverable of the LC’s overall mandate and will guide the drafting of Liberia’s eventual national ADR policy.</p> <p>Output 3.1 Two LDRT meetings held at national level/eighteen at county level.</p> <p>Outcome 4: This outcome is delayed due to the complicated system - not well understood when the project was designed - for deploying surveyors in Liberia. The number of licensed surveyors is very limited, and only one applied for the LC advertised vacancy. The LC is in the process of vetting applicants and designing a system for certification of work done by non-licensed surveyors. Once this is done the surveyors will commence work (estimated August).</p> <p>Output 4.1: not yet achieved. Outputs will be realized quickly once the surveyors are in place, as there are many cases just waiting for surveys in order to be resolved.</p> <p>Outcome 5: We have combined the two studies into one to save money on consultants.</p> <p>Output 5.1: Consultant is employed and working. The study covers both original thematic areas (urban land disputes and resettlement solutions and is due by 30 July 2014.</p>
<p><i>Do you see evidence that the project is having a positive impact on peacebuilding? (250 words max.)</i></p>	<p>The LCCs have reduced the threat and frequency of violent land conflict and impacted positively on the peace building process, at the decentralized levels involving other stakeholders. The LCCs have trained communities' mediation practitioners and established communities' mediation committees that have help resolved cases using tradition mediation methodology, which might have otherwise resulted in violence among people and communities, if the LCCs were not present. Traditional methodology is overlaid with additional training and revised dispute-solving structures, including women and youth. The LCCs are helping to strengthen the local capacity for land conflict management and lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development. ADR has been accepted by the residents and</p>

	<p>endorsed by the Counties and Communities authorities, including the Judiciary.</p> <p>The free and efficient services of the LCCs are very much appreciated by the local communities, and the outreach functions also help sensitize people to their land rights, helping to prevent disputes before they start. Former disputants who have had their cases resolved by LCCs have also recognized the efficiency and timeliness of the ADR system and are encouraging members of their communities to utilize the same, by taken cases to the LCCs.</p> <p>Community and family relations are also being consolidated.</p>
<p><i>Were there catalytic effects from the project in the period reported, including additional funding commitments or unleashing/ unblocking of any peace relevant processes? (250 words max.)</i></p>	<p>County Authorities are requesting for extension of the work of the LCCs in other districts of their counties where the LCCs are not operating and have continuously requested the LCCs to intervene in land cases in their communities. Similarly, other County Authorities are also requesting the services of the LCCs in their counties where the LCCs are currently not operating.</p> <p>LCC community mediation practitioners also provide an early warning function; being on the ground in communities, they are able to alert their local LCC of potential violent disputes brewing, allowing the LCC or the LC to intervene at an early point. In addition, LCC-trained community mediation practitioners are also being called upon by their communities to solve other disputes by ADR, thus increasing the overall peace.</p> <p>The proactive work of the Land Commission in developing and finalizing a National Land ADR Policy Intent Statement is helping to jog the Ministry of Justice into working harder on their own development of an overall National ADR Policy.</p>
<p><i>If progress has been slow or inadequate, provide main reasons and what is being done to address them. (250 words max.)</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delayed UNH signing of the MOU between UNH and the LC meant a slowdown of operational funds to the LCCs and a diminishment of activities for the first months of the project. The issue was raised by UNH Liberia with the Deputy Executive Director of UNH and she personally apologized to the LC for delays; money was transferred in April 2014. 2. Delays in transfer of funds for operations from the LC to some LCCs, which has caused a hiatus in carrying out some activities in the field. This is being addressed by the LC finance section and it

	requires regular visits by a staff member to assist coordinators in preparing their programmatic and financial reports.
<i>What are the main activities/expected results for the rest of the year? (250 words max.)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide support for strengthening LDRT (Land Dispute Resolution Taskforce) activities at the county level. • Mentoring and Refresher training for dispute resolvers. • Internal evaluation of the LCCs. • Monitoring visit to all the LCCs. • Receiving and resolving more cases. • Supporting more joint activities with the Regional Justice and Security Hub.
<i>Is there any need to adjust project strategies/duration/budget etc.? (500 words max.)</i>	<p>There is a need to increase funding for the LCCs because some of the donors (LCRP and NRC) who were co-supporting the LCCs have ended their programs. UNH has requested a budget revision and has received email approvals from the JSC Co-Chairs; we are awaiting the final signatures on the budget revision form in order to go ahead with the revision. The project activities remain the same, but more money is being allotted to operational functions of the LCCs and less to international consultants to ensure that the LCC operations are adequately supported, given the closure of the other partners. The budget revision will cover the most crucial gaps, but LCCs will still have to operate on very tight budgets for the project period.</p> <p>The LCCs need to increase their targeted outreach to women. LCC coordinators and outreach officers have been encouraged to come up with creative solutions to reach out to female audiences--targeting e.g. social clubs, market women, women's savings clubs, churches, mosques, other women's projects, and any other places where women predominantly gather.</p>
<i>Are there any lessons learned from the project in the period reported? (500 words max.)</i>	<p>Initially, some of the county land commissioners, surveyors and chiefs felt that the functions of the LCCs were going to overlap with their roles, which was not the case. After seeing the impact of the ADR they are willing to work with them and are even transferring cases to LCCs.</p> <p>Employing surveyors is complicated due to the limited number in Liberia, most of whom are fully employed.</p>

	<p>Despite some improvements, land is still seen in many places as “man’s business” and women may still be intimidated to claim their land rights, as seen in the disparity of those bringing cases (41 women vs 117 men) and participating in outreach activities (852 vs 1675). There are no female case intakers or outreach officers at the LCCs and none applied for those jobs (although there are two LCC heads who are female); better outreach for hiring could be implemented next time. Female-targeted education and outreach needs to be designed & implemented.</p>
<p>What is the project budget expenditure to date (percentage of allocated project budget expended by the date of the report) – preliminary figures only? (250 words max.)</p>	<p>32% by 30 June 2014. We are just over a third of the way through the project and have spent almost a third of the funds so we are on track.</p>
<p>Any other information that the project needs to convey to PBSO (and JSC) at this stage? (250 words max.)</p>	<p>The envisioned number of referrals between the Bong LCC in Gbarnga and the Gbarnga Justice and Security Hub has not come about. However, we believe this is good news, as it seems that the communities bring court cases to the court and land cases to the LCCs. We believe that the outreach of both entities has been effective in helping communities know which place to bring their case, according to their needs/preferences.</p> <p>Sustainability is a major concern. Overall the LCCs are performing very well and seen as a valuable addition to their communities. It is strongly hoped that the Government will see this and provide for support to the LCCs in the next budget allocation for the LC, since currently the LCCs are entirely donor-funded. The transitioning of the role of the LCCs into the envisioned new Land Agency also needs to figure into the design of the Agency and the transition strategy between the LC and the new Agency. The LC is working on this with other Government institutions, including in the context of decentralization. Further donor funding may also be mobilized for the LCCs for the remainder of the LC’s life, but obviously national ownership is preferable.</p>

INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT: *Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document- provide an update on the achievement of key indicators at both the outcome and output level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation in the qualitative text above.*

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Outcome 1 Alternative land dispute resolution system fully operational and managed by a new national Land Agency	Indicator 1.1 Percentage of people who are aware of land rights, alternative land dispute resolution options and the Land Commission (disaggregated by men/women)	(Sep 2012): 35% of key informants (officials) and 9% of the general population (10% men, 8% women)	(Jan 2015): 70% of key informants (officials) and 45% of the general population of which at least 30% of women (disaggregated by % men/women)	Estimates of 92% of key informants (officials) and 64% of the general population in the ten Districts where the LCCs operate; genpop knowledge in three counties (Bong, Lofa and Nimba) is lower, with only 11% awareness (13% men, 9% women)		
	Indicator 1.2 Number of cases taken in by Land Coordination Centres and resolved (disaggregated by number of cases submitted by	(June 2013): 148 cases taken by LCCs 17 cases resolved by LCCs (not yet disaggregated by cases submitted by men/women and	(May 2015): 550 cases taken by LCCs 200 cases resolved by LCCs, disaggregated by number of cases submitted by men/women and	158 cases taken by LCCs and 21 resolved. Disaggregated by 41 cases submitted by women and 117 by men.		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	men/women and cases resolved involving men/women) % cases holding after 1 yr	cases resolved involving men/women June 2013: no info	cases resolved involving men/women May 2015: 75% have held (disaggregated by cases involving women)	94% of cases stayed resolved 1 year after closure of the case files and monitoring of disputants' compliance to MOUs.		
Output 1.1 Support to LC and LCC outreach work -core support; technical assistance	Indicator 1.1.1 Number of persons directly participating in county outreach activities by LC and LCCs (including at least 35% women); % of Liberians (gender disaggregated) expressing willingness to use	Jun 2013: 2850 Jun 2013: no data	May 2015: at least 10,000 Mar 2015: 50% of genpop and 50% of women expressing willingness	1,675 males and 852 females directly participated in county outreach activities. An estimated 34% of Liberians in the project areas expressing willingness to use land ADR		Outreach activities will no longer be supported by partner USAID; target should be reduced to 5,000

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	land ADR system			system (15% are women).		
Output 1.2 5 LCCs supported - core staff funded and operational 1 new LCC set up -staff recruited, trained -dispute resolvers trained	Indicator 1.2.1 Performance reviews of LC nd LCC staff Dispute resolvers trained	June 2013: 0 performance reviews Jun 2013: 273 community members trained, (209 men and 64 women/30% women)	May 2015: 30 (1 per LCC staff member) May 2015: 750 (including at least 40% women)	Five LCCs supported and one new LCC (Montserrado LCC) being established; building and equipment supplied and core staff recruited. One performance review per LCC staff conducted 580 Community members trained		
Outcome 2 Overlaps eliminated and synergies established with the Justice and Security Hubs	Indicator 2.1 Joint activities undertaken with Hubs	June 2013: 0 joint activities	May 2015:6 joint activities	6 joint meetings between LCC and Gbarnga Hub.		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Output 2.1 Harmonised activities with Hubs - Joint outreach trips - Land trainings by LC to Hub staff -Referrals	Indicator 2.1.1 # of referrals by Hubs to LCCs or vice versa	Jun 2013: 1 referral	May 2015: 30 referrals	none yet	no cases were brought to the incorrect venue which required referral	Target may need to be adjusted downwards (10?) as the community seems to be understanding well the difference between the Hub and the LCC, which is a positive development
Outcome 3 Policies and transition strategy established for alternative dispute resolution	Indicator 3.1 Policy drafted; transition strategy agreed	June 2013: 0 policies/strategies	1. May 2014: Land dispute resolution policy statement drafted; 2. Aug 2014: Transition strategy finalized; 3. Jan 2015: ADR policy drafted	1. June 2014: land dispute resolution policy statement drafted and reviewed by practitioners 2. June 2014: Land Commission in discussion on transition policy; 3. LC input will form part of overall national ADR policy		3. overall national ADR policy responsibility is now transferred to Ministry of Justice,

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
						so the LC is no longer in charge of it; this indicator should be removed
Outcome 4 Improved land administration capacity for Land Commission/ New Agency	Indicator 4.1 Surveying capacity at LCCs	Jun 2013: 0 surveyors	May 2015: 4 mobile surveyor teams (covering all 6 LCCs)	0	Negotiations with Ministry of Lands, Mines & Energy on vetting & supervising surveyors has delayed deployment of surveyors; few qualified applicants for surveyor positions	# of teams may need to be reduced depending on # of applicants who are deemed qualified
Output 4.1 Surveying teams established and utilised -core support to teams -surveys undertaken	Indicator 4.1.1 # surveys requested/carried out	Jun 2013: 0	May 2015: 300	0	As above	Target should be reduced to 200 due to delay in deploying surveyors
Outcome 5.0 Improved understanding of urban disputes, and	Indicator 5.1 Number of studies on urban land disputes, including effects	Jun 2013: 0 studies	May 2015: 2 studies	Consultant is employed and doing research; the study covering both thematic areas is due 30 July	We have changed the strategy in this outcome to save money on consultants and produce the output sooner. We have combined	Target should be revised to 1 study

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	their effects on women, as well as the displaced, for Land Commission/ New Agency	on women, and resettlement solutions		2014.	the two studies into one.	
Output 5.1 Study on urban land disputes and women -research Study on resettlement -real-time case studies -research	Indicator 5.1.1 Recommendations produced for urban land dispute systems, improving women's urban tenure security, and resettlement solutions	Jun 2013: there is currently no urban land disputes policy in place/operational	Apr 2015: urban land dispute issues including effects on women incorporated into land disputes policy	As above		