



**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)
ANNUAL PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT
COUNTRY:**

REPORTING PERIOD: 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2014

Programme Title & Project Number
<p>Programme Title: Contributing to Myanmar Peace Dividend Projects in Mon and Kayin States, Myanmar</p> <p>Sub-Project Titles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthening Government social services in ethnic minority areas and improved collaboration with non-state actors led by UNICEF. 2. Creating a favourable protection environment for IDP and refugee returnees and supporting durable solutions through monitoring, capacity building and documentation led by UNHCR. 3. Empowerment of Mon women through participation in peacebuilding and prevention of and response to gender-based violence led by UNHCR and UN Women. 4. Empowering ethnic youths as peacebuilders in Mon and Kayin States led by IOM. 5. Capacity development of mass media institutions in support of peace-building and local development in Mon and Kayin States led by UNESCO and UNDP. <p>Programme Number (if applicable) PBF/IRF-75</p> <p>MPTF Office Project Reference Number:¹ 00088269</p>

Recipient UN Organizations
<p>List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: 1. UNICEF; 2. UNHCR; 3. UNHCR & UN Women; 4. IOM; 5. UNESCO & UNDP</p>

Implementing Partners
<p>List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations: 1. UNICEF with State and township Government agencies in Mon & Kayin States with local CSOs.</p> <p>2. UNHCR only.</p> <p>3. UNHCR with Marie Stopes International and UN Women with Metta Foundation, Mon Women's Organisation et al.</p> <p>4. IOM with Kayin Baptist Convention, Mon Youth Educators Organisation, UNFPA, UNAIDS.</p> <p>5. UNDP and UNESCO through State and township Government agencies as well as selected local journalists, CSOs, youth and women groups.</p>

¹ 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](#)

Programme/Project Budget (US\$)
PBF contribution (by RUNO) Total: 1,600,000 comprised of UNICEF: \$450,000, UNHCR: \$450,000, UNWOMEN: \$200,000 IOM: \$300,000 UNDP: \$100,000 UNESCO: \$100,000
Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i> None
Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i> UNHCR: \$472,580 UNICEF: \$250,000
TOTAL:

Programme Duration
Overall Duration (<i>months</i>) 18
Start Date ² (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>) 30.11.2013
Original End Date ³ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>) 31/05/2015
Current End date ⁴ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>) 31/05/2015

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

Report Submitted By
Name: David Eizenberg
Title: Coordination Officer
Participating Organization (Lead): UN RCO
Email address: david.eizenberg@one.un.org

² 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](#)

³ As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

⁴ 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.

PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Assessment of the current project implementation status and results

For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project is contributing:

<i>Priority Plan Outcome to which the project is contributing.</i>
<i>Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project is contributing.</i>

For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project’s overall achievement of results to date: on track

For both IRF and PRF projects, outline progress against each project outcome, using the format below. The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes.

Outcome Statement 1: Social cohesion and multi-ethnic trust are increased with vulnerable groups (IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities) being given a voice in peace negotiations and programming.

Outcome 1.1: Women’s priority needs and concerns are addressed in peace negotiations and discussions on post-conflict recovery by the conflicting parties.

Outcome 1.2: Increased awareness of sexual and gender-based violence and exploitation in communities. Women’s vulnerability to GBV is reduced leading to improved physical and psychological well-being, enhanced participation within the community.

Outcome 1.3: Target youths are openly discussing the peace process and reconstruction issues. Youths’ voices (concerns and hopes) on the peace process expressed and fully documented.

Outcome 1.4: Lack of trust and suspicion in target communities addressed through open dialogue and community participatory activities involving youths.

Outcome 1.5: Felt sense of peace dividends in communities.

Outcome 1.6: Existence of mechanisms for youths to network and provide support to each other.

Outcome 1.7: Proven model for engagement with youth as peace-builders in Myanmar field-tested and is available to be replicated by stakeholders in other ceasefire States.

Outcome 1.8: National, local and ethnic news media outlets are engaged in conflict sensitive reportage and promote peace as a desired value.

Outcome 1.9: Local community leaders and members use community media as platform to actively participate in peace-building initiatives, have greater sense of ownership of the process, and confident of its full attainment.

Outcome 1.10: Local communities have greater awareness, understanding, appreciation and tolerance of other ethnic groups through exposure to media content.

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

Indicator 1: Outcome Indicator 1.1: (1) number of women included in the peace negotiations including discussions on identification of needs after ceasefire	Baseline: Under Indicator 1.1.1: One women in the negotiation team of the NMSP. Under Indicator 1,1.2: To be determined. Under Indicator 1.1.3: To be determined. Target: Under Indicator 1.1.1: At least 30%
--	--

<p>agreements, (2) percentage of women in women's groups targetted for action who feel that the peace process is taking into account the needs of women and (3) percentage of leadership of the New Mon State Party (NMSP) surveyed that agree that women's views are important in the peace process.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Outcome Indicator 1.2: (1) number of women participating in awareness training feel and express that they are empowered to take on an active role in their own protection and (2) number of documented cases of GBV in Mon State in which services are provided.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Outcome Indicator 1.3.1: number of discussions on peace and development held among youth in target area, issues identified and actions taken. Outcome Indicator 1.4.1: increase in the percentage of perception of improved trust among communities in Mon and Kayin States. Outcome Indicator 1.5.1: increase in the percentage of targeted communities' sense of the improved quality of life as a result of increased access to services and opportunities as a result of cessation of conflict. Outcome Indicator 1.6.1: the youths targeted by the project become a part of the larger youth networks which provide support to each other. Outcome Indicator 1.7.1: quality and availability of a field-tested model of engagement with youths as peacebuilders. Outcome Indicator 1.8.1: percentage of news media coverage of the peace process which display qualities of depth, accuracy and precision, objectivity, fairness, language sensitivity, etc. Outcome Indicator 1.9.1: number of communities using community media to actively participate in peace-building initiatives and number of communities with greater sense of ownership of the peace process and confident of its success. Outcome Indicator 1.10.1: percentage of community members who report greater awareness, understanding, appreciation and tolerance of other ethnic groups.</p>	<p>in different roles in peace negotiations. Under Indicator 1.1.2: At least 50% increase. Under Indicator 1.1.3: At least 50% increase. Progress: Under Indicator 1.1.1: Progress has been made to enhance the skills and knowledge of potential Mon women leaders, particularly on UNSCR 1325 and its implications in the Mon context. The orientation meeting and trainings of the trainers were conducted in mid-October, with the key objective to enhance women's political participation in peace negotiations and preparation for the upcoming elections in 2015. Under Indicator 1.1.2: Progress has been made to train women leaders on GBV at the township/village level which are main conflict-affected areas in Mon state. The exact percentage of increase in women who feel that the peace process is taking into account of their needs will have to be determined at the end of the project. Under Indicator 1.1.3: This will be part of the second component of the sub-project which has not been implemented so far. Selection of the right partners to facilitate the dialogue between different conflicting parties has been done carefully and taken longer than expected.</p> <p>Baseline: Under Indicator 1.2.1: Undetermined Under Indicator 1.2.2: Undetermined. Target: Under Indicator 1.2.1: At least 50% of the women participating in the awareness trainings. Under Indicator 1.2.2: 50%. Progress: Under Indicator 1.2.1: Not available. Under Indicator 1.2.2: Not available.</p> <p>Baseline: Under Indicator 1.3.1: Zero. Under Indicator 1.4.1: Zero. Under Indicator 1.5.1: Zero. Under Indicator 1.6.1: None. Under Indicator 1.7.1: Not existing. Under Indicator 1.8.1: To be determined. Under Indicator 1.9.1: Not existing.</p>
--	---

	<p>Under Indicator 1.10.1: Not existing. Target: Under Indicator 1.3.1: 15. Under Indicator 1.4.1: 30% of target population report improved trust and decreased suspicions among communities in Mon and Kayin States. Under Indicator 1.5.1: 60%. Under Indicator 1.6.1: Yes. Under Indicator 1.7.1: Field tested model exists and is disseminated to partners and stakeholders. Under Indicator, 1.8.1: At least 50% of national media and 60% of local and ethnic news media are engaged in conflict sensitive reportage. Under Indicator 1.9.1: One community media (CMC or community radio) set up in a selected township of Mon and Kayin States. All townships with community media established, report active community participation in local peacebuilding. Under Indicator 1.10.1: At least 25% of community members in project sites believe they have greater awareness, understanding, appreciation and tolerance of other ethnic groups. Progress: Under Indicator 1.3.1: 40. Under Indicator 1.4.1: Not measured to date. Under Indicator 1.5.1: Zero. Under Indicator 1.6.1: Ongoing. Under Indicator 1.7.1: To be reported. Under Indicator, 1.8.1: On track. Under Indicator 1.9.1: To be reported. Under Indicator 1.10.1: To be reported.</p>
--	---

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Under Outcome 1.1, TOT and awareness-raising on UNSCR 1325, GBV and peace issues for Mon women leaders. Trainings on GBV in 4 townships.

Under Outcome 1.2, SGBV campaigns conducted along with trainings and advocacy meetings. Medical, psychosocial and legal support provided along with response packages and dignity kits.

Under Outcome 1.3, 40 youths participated in training camps where they developed action plans for sharing knowledge on peace in their communities.

Under Outcome 1.4, youths shared their views on peace with peers and communities (474 people).

Under Outcome 1.5, quick impact/community rehabilitation activities to start in 2015.
Under Outcome 1.6, 2 youth networks established and meetings held.
Under Outcome 1.7, to be reported.
Under Outcome 1.8, local NGO selected as implementing partner.
Under Outcome 1.9, strategy paper prepared on Township Community Dialogue and Learning Centres.
Under Outcome 1.10, media consultant's report on community media prepared.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

Under Outcome 1.1, progress has been made empowering Mon women leaders with skills and knowledge, particularly on UNSCR 1325. The orientation meeting and trainings of the trainers focused on UNSCR 1325 and a review of laws in relation to constitutional provisions that discriminate against women to enhance understanding among Mon women groups as well as potential women leaders who are likely participate in peace negotiations and the 2015 election. Efforts have been made to focus on training on GBV with a focus on women, youth and community leaders in conflict-affected areas at the township/village level. The first training covers 4 out of 10 townships and will expand to cover other areas and stakeholders.

Under Outcome 1.2, SGBV awareness raised with positive engagement by the authorities and NSAs. The mapping of services is developing. The time span is too short to show any dramatic shifts in addressing SGBV but including SGBV in a peacebuilding project sends a signal that this is an important issue that needs to be addressed in the peace process. MSI's expertise has been a vital piece of hardware. A reduction in the reports of SGBV will be a vital indicator for an improving peaceful and secure environment. The greater awareness and documentation of SGBV, as well as the service provision and training, are helping to build an SGBV prevention and response system.

Under Outcome 1.3, of the 40 youths in Mon and Kayin States who developed action plans, 15 were prepared to discuss peace issues with their peers. For the other 25 youths, they preferred that the message on peace would be incorporated into other discussions on other topics covered during the trainings, such as development, gender, health, human rights, land rights, and drug abuse. The discussions took place in group and individual formats. The issues related to peace and development were documented during the youth camps, during the trainings, and during the knowledge sharing activities in the communities.

Under Outcome 1.4, this outcome has not been measured yet as the discussions and activities in the communities will be ongoing until project completion. However, positive feedback on the peace training has been received from youth participants.

Under Outcomes 1.5-1.7, none reported.

Under Outcome 1.8, local NGO engaged to conduct a needs analysis and CSR training sessions, organise media-CSO fora focusing on peace issues, and undertake media content monitoring and analysis.

Under Outcome 1.9, Township Community Dialogue and Learning Centers (TCDLC) to be established to help fill the gap in dialogue and information on the peace process.

Under Outcome 1.10, The media consultant' report identified entry points for community radio media development by CSO and media groups, as well as alternatives in advance of community radio licencing. UNDP will support capacity development for production of local audio content, particularly by women and youth.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

Under Outcome 1.1, none reported.

Under Outcome 1.2, there have been challenges in engaging in Kayin State due to Government security concerns, which has meant less access in many areas to undertake activities, including SGBV. The environment continues to see a heavy presence of military personnel and armed actors. A weak rule of law in many parts of the Southeast and challenges in the area of justice has resulted in low confidence among SGBV survivors. The Southeast is a fragile peacemaking/peace-building environment that is led by national actors. The situation may improve as the peace process moves forward.

Under Outcomes 1.3 - 1.7, none reported

Under Outcome 1.8, none reported.

Under Outcome 1.9, Trust building entailing separate and joint stakeholder discussions among local government, CSOs and media has required time to discuss the proposed TDCLC initiatives and their appropriate operations and governance. Grantmaking to local organizations is also restricted by slow CSO registration processes in Myanmar.

Under Outcome 1.10, Community radio development has been delayed by lack of legal enabling environment. The recently passed Broadcasting Law still needs development of bylaws for implementation of licencing. UNDP is seeking permission to establish community radio in pilot locations, and if secured, will support the pilots and provide capacity support. UNDP has been also been exploring alternative ways to implement community media initiatives.

Outcome Statement 2: The Government is more responsive to the needs of vulnerable groups (IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities) living in ceasefire areas.

Outcome 2.1: State and township level authorities perform their duties effectively and become more responsive to the needs of ethnic minorities living in ceasefire areas.

Outcome 2.2: State and township level government planning and response to the needs of the communities are done with active consultation, participation and collaboration of non-state actors, civil society groups and representatives from ethnic minorities.

Outcome 2.3: Basic social services (education, health and WASH) in selected ethnic minority ceasefire areas in Mon and Kayin are established and improved.

Outcome 2.4: Government and aid agencies responsiveness to needs of IDP and refugee returnees enhanced, due to improved and informed programming, and better positioning to address arising challenges.

Outcome 2.5: IDP and refugee returnees provided with citizenship rights and durable solutions in accordance with international standards, contributing to sustainable peace.

Outcome 2.6: IDP and refugee returnees provided with citizenship rights and durable solutions in accordance with international standards, contributing to sustainable peace.

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

<p>Indicator 1: Under Outcome Indicator 2.1.1, conflict-affected communities interviewed feel that the Government is paying attention to their social needs.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Under Outcome Indicator 2.2.1, non-state actors, civil society groups and representatives from ethnic minorities expressed satisfaction over improved participation and collaboration with the government.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Under Outcome Indicator 2.3.1, by the end of the project period those communities identified through the baseline survey for education/health/WASH inputs have received them. Under Outcome Indicator 2.4.1, number of verified return locations (communities verified as having received refugee or IDP returnees in which Government or aid agencies provide targeted re-integration support). Under Outcome Indicator 2.5, (1) percentage of verified return villages in which returnees hold civil documentation and (2) percentage of verified return villages in which returnees report having faced pressure to return or limitations on freedom of movement. Under Outcome Indicator 2.6, number of government officials/civil society actors and members of non-state armed groups participating in capacity-building workshops on international standards related to durable solutions to displacement.</p>	<p>Baseline: Under Indicator 2.1.1: Using the ranking method, a survey will be conducted in selected communities and with non-state actors and CSOs to gauge their perceptions in the government’s performance and delivery of social services. Results of the survey will provide the baseline. Target: Under Indicator 2.1.1: A similar survey by the end of the project period will be done showing marked increase in the respondents’ level of satisfaction. Progress: Under Indicator 2.1.1: Community respondent survey completed for selected townships in Kayin State and Mon State. Results being analyzed.</p> <p>Baseline: Under Indicator 2.2.1: Using the ranking method, a survey will be conducted in selected communities and with non-state actors and CSOs to gauge their perceptions in the government’s performance and delivery of social services. Results of the survey will provide the baseline. Target: Under Indicator 2.2.1: A similar survey by the end of the project period will be done showing marked increase in the respondents’ level of satisfaction. Progress: Under Indicator 2.2.1: A rapid survey was conducted among local government planning officers and NSA representatives regarding their approach to inclusive planning. Results being analyzed.</p> <p>Baseline: Under Indicator 2.3.1: Rapid needs assessment conducted with local Government, CSOs, community members and non-state actors in selected townships to select specific project locations. Under Indicator 2.4.1: 0. Under Indicator 2.5.1: Undetermined. Under Indicator 2.5.2: Undetermined. Under Indicator 2.6.1: 0. Target: Under Indicator 2.3.1: Endline survey of basic service needs in specific</p>
---	--

	<p>project locations reveal basic service needs have been addressed.</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.4.1: 20.</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.5.1: 80%</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.5.2: 0%</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.6.1: 215</p> <p>Progress: Under Indicator 2.3.1: Rapid needs assessment completed in selected township to establish baseline for WASH interventions.</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.4.1: 48 villages (29 in Mon State and 19 in Kayin State) were assessed. UNHCR made visits to 116 villages in Southeast Myanmar to verify refugee and IDP returnees. Among those total visits, 32 villages (28%) had refugee returnees (28%), while 28 had IDP returnees (24%). These totals include 11 villages where both IDP and refugee returnees were found.</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.5.1: 0.</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.5.2: 0.</p> <p>Under Indicator 2.6.1: 360 Government, NSA and CSO participants in 18 training workshops conducted in 4 States & Regions with the aim to building capacity to support durable solutions for refugees and IDPs.</p>
--	---

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Under Outcome 2.1, health, education WASH contribute to improving the capacity of officials to become more repsonsive to community needs.

Under Outcome 2.2, interventions strengthening consultation, participation and collaboration with NSAs in identifying community needs as part of the sectoral planning process.

Under Outcome 2.3, notable progress made under education, health and WASH towards improving basic services in villages in both government and NSA controlled areas.

Under Outcome 2.4, an Information Management Unit was established and a system for monitoring spontaneous returns was developed. Partners were trained to report on returns.

Under Outcome 2.5, UNHCR refers those without adequate civil documentation to the Immigration Department and has made a standing offer to assist the Department.

Under Outcome 2.6, 18 trainings were conducted in 4 States & Regions to build capacity among Government, NSAs & CSOs to support durable solutions for IDPs and refugees.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome

contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

Under Outcome 2.1, a survey was undertaken to establish a baseline for community perceptions towards government performance in service provision. In general, the perception was that little attention is given to addressing social needs and no evidence is used to carry out proper sector planning. With sectoral capacity building being undertaken for evidence-based planning, improvement is expected. Engagement of NSAs in the process is expected to contribute towards peacebuilding.

Under Outcome 2.2, A rapid survey was conducted and 20 local government planning officers and NSA representatives were surveyed on their approach to inclusive planning. Most officials were found to have limited understanding or application of inclusivity in the planning process. Where they did, it tended to be paternalistic, narrowly issue specific, and based on eliciting community labour or financial support rather than opinion. NSA respondents were found to have a deeper understanding of the need for inclusion. With participatory and inclusive planning workshops, improvement is expected.

Under Outcome 2.3, In the 3 selected townships of Kayin, some progress has been made to improve the basic social services targeting the communities on both the government and NSA sides. Apart from the provision of hardware (construction, furnitures, learning materials), some capacity building of government, NGOs and Community volunteers was also undertaken. The engagement of government & NSAs in the selection of villages for provision of services helps build trust towards peacebuilding.

Under Outcome 2.4, Return monitoring continues to produce excellent results and is already feeding into UNHCR's plans and preparations for return. It has enhanced UNHCR's ability to engage with Government and other stakeholders in terms of mapping potential needs of IDP and refugee returnees, and will be a vital tool for 2015 programming. The return of refugees from Thailand will be a key indicator of enduring peace in South-East Myanmar.

Under Outcome 2.5, UNHCR continued to work closely with the authorities to stress the importance of civil documentation, especially for protecting persons of concern. Due to the spontaneous return of refugees and ongoing return monitoring conducted at the community-level, the identification of returnees in need of documentation is not comprehensive.

However, cases are referred to authorities when identified. Training and advocacy with the authorities emphasises the need for documentation for returnees. The engagement with the authorities has been generally positive although returnees are not their main focus.

Under Outcome 2.6, The project has contributed to efforts to prepare for eventual return of IDPs and refugees, however, the operational environment remains not conducive for returns. While spontaneous returns are taking place, UNHCR is not yet at the stage of facilitating or promoting return. There was some slow progress in the second half of 2014.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

Under Outcome 2.1 and 2.2, timely engagement with the government and NSAs in consultations and workshops was a challenge. Local authorities often hesitate to take decisions to facilitate implementation. Skirmishes between government and some NSAs has delayed some consultations and workshops.

Under Outcome 2.3, Skirmishes between government and some NSAs has hindered progress by limiting staff mobility. Most villages identified for school construction and WASH facilities are very remote and accessing those especially during the rainy season has

been a challenge. Village selection for education and WASH services often required long discussions and agreement with government and NSAs.

Under Outcome 2.4, Access due to security permissions has slowed progress, especially in Kayin State. UNHCR was able to begin return assessments immediately in Kayah, Mon and Tanintharyi in June 2013, but government approval for monitoring in Kayin required far longer negotiations, and only since mid-2014 has UNHCR been able to comprehensively embark upon return monitoring in Kayin. The Southeast is a difficult environment logistically with poor infrastructure exacerbated during the rainy season.

Under Outcome 2.5, The environment remains complex and different levels of achievement and access are determined on a State basis.

Under Outcome 2.6, The project has succeeded in reaching its targets, however, the operational environment is complex and depends on advances in the peace process.

Outcome Statement 3:

Rate the current status of the outcome: Please select one

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

Outcome Statement 4:

Rate the current status of the outcome: Please select one

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

Output progress

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit). Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress

Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?

1.2 Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender in the reporting period

<p><u>Evidence base:</u> What is the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report (1000 character limit)?</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.1, none reported. Under Outcome 1.2, regular meetings are held and monthly updates on progress with close coordination between MSI and UNHCR on protection-related issues. Under Outcomes 1.3-1.7, discussions and feedbacks are compiled into workshop reports and trainings are conducted. All community-level discussions facilitated by the youths were documented by the youths themselves. Under Outcomes 1.8-1.10, UNDP's community media consultant established baselines in selected communities on access to media and information related to the peace process, which have been shared and discussed with stakeholders</p>
--	--

	<p>Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, UNICEF staff are involved in regular monitoring and reports are received from IPs. Periodic meetings and discussions are held to assess progress and reports received from IPs are validated during the field visits.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 2.3-2.6, no evaluation carried out but report based on information gathered by UNHCR as part of its M&E cycle.</p>
<p><u>Funding gaps:</u> Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.1, critical funding gaps in peacebuilding are being filled through an impartial and neutral approach towards building the peace agenda and incorporating marginalized women in the peace process.</p> <p>Under Outcome 1.2, there are few resources to address prevention or response of SGBV in the Southeast. It is important to build awareness of SGBV for building confidence in the peace process.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 1.3-1.7, youth are being inspired to address issues that they can initiate at the community level in the context of the peace process.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 1.8-1.10, none were reported.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, various workshops and consultations were conducted which are expected to contribute to identifying common ground and building trust between the Government and NSAs that could be scaled up to address gaps.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 2.3-2.6, UNHCR received no specific funds for this activity and needed to use broadly earmarked programme funds from other donors, with PBF funds, to ensure activities could be carried out. Filling the funding gap has contributed to UNHCR's strategic objectives for peacebuilding in the Southeast.</p>
<p><u>Catalytic effects:</u> Did the project achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional funding commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/accelerate peace relevant processes? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.1, a space is provided for parties to the conflict to discuss the women's peace agenda by building local ownership and networks.</p> <p>Under Outcome 1.2, the project allowed UNHCR to engage in a wider discussion with key actors on peacebuilding to present SGBV as an important component of the peace process.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 1.3-1.7, the target youths designed the training program for themselves, & subsequent activities such as knowledge sharing sessions & community-level activities. Target youths from different conflict backgrounds went through similar processes, and then they will share their experiences and learn from each other.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 1.8-1.10, none were reported.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, the work is symbolic in demonstrating the type of peace dividend project that all could support. Some of the approaches could be applied in UNICEF's regular programme in the Southeast. The relationship built with the local authorities and NSAs can be used for advocacy on agency mandates.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 2.3-2.6, UNHCR's coordination efforts are bringing together organisations active in the Southeast and those interested in working in the region to share information and</p>

	<p>views on addressing protection and development issues. While individual projects are able to make specific advances, the PBF intervention must be viewed holistically across projects, in particular the role of the RCO to create space for projects to work.</p>
<p><u>Risk taking/ innovation</u>: Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.1, none were reported. Under Outcome 1.2, in raising awareness on SGBV, radio was found to be the most effective medium since most households have battery-run radios. Outreach to NSAs was an important advance. Under Outcomes 1.3-1.7, youth in the Southeast were linked with youth from other post-conflict areas in Myanmar. They openly shared their experiences on political, security, and social conditions and changes that took place as a result of peace building and their benefits and challenges. Under Outcomes 1.8-1.10, none were reported. Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, despite the fact that there has been recent skirmishes between government and some NSAs in Kayin State and some of the project locations were not easy to access, local IPs made efforts to reach those areas to ensure continuity in project implementation. Under Outcomes 2.3 - 2.6, UNHCR has collaborated closely with UNHCR Thailand for planning for preparedness for potential refugee returns, including cross-border meetings. Due to the need for sensitivity in the Southeast and the fragile peace efforts by all parties, caution has been exercised in activities. With the RCO, UNHCR was an active team member in sensitizing the authorities and NSAs on the aims of the PBF project, ensuring that the UN is developing a space in which it can offer complementary assistance to ongoing national efforts to secure peace.</p>
<p><u>Gender</u>: How have gender considerations been mainstreamed in the project to the extent possible? Is the original gender marker for the project still the right one? Briefly justify. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.1, gender considerations were central due to the nature of the sub-project. Under Outcome 1.2, Girls and women were engaged but it was difficult to engage boys and men due to the SGBV subject matter. There were cultural and language barriers but engagement with local agencies and communities proved helpful. Under Outcomes 1.3-1.7, Equal numbers of male and female youth participated. Gender sessions were conducted during the trainings. Under Outcomes 1.8-1.10, Gender balance will be required for activities with journalists and gender disaggregated baseline information has been collected. Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, gender considerations have been mainstreamed. While improving WASH facilities in schools, gender separated latrines are being provided to give privacy to girl students. Good hygiene practices were promoted among the female population. Out of the 2,919 school children benefitting from improved learning environment, 1401 are boys and 1518 are girls.</p>

	<p>Under Outcomes 2.3-2.6, disaggregated demographic and gender data has been collected to ensure that gender dynamics are taken into consideration when assessing community needs and responses. Training on protection matters, including durable solutions and statelessness, have sought to ensure gender issues are discussed and understood.</p>
<p><u>Other issues:</u> Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that should be shared with PBSO? This can include any cross-cutting issues or other issues which have not been included in the report so far. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.1, given that this is the first PBF project implemented by UN Women in Mon state, the implementation has taken longer than anticipated to ensure the ownership of women organizations as well as to identify specific national and local expertise. The selection of IPs required careful considerations due to the high political sensitivity among conflicting parties.</p> <p>Under Outcome 1.2, the reporting requirements for a project with a modest budget have been very heavy, placing an additional burden on resources at field level. Streamlining reporting should be examined.</p> <p>Under Outcomes 1.3-1.10, no other issues have been reported. Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, no other issues have been reported. Under Outcomes 2.3-2.6, An offer to do training on birth registration and citizenship has been extended to Kayin State officials but procedural requirements imposed by the Government stipulating permission must be sought from the relevant Union level line ministry led to the training being postponed.</p>

PART 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY

2.1 Lessons learned

Provide at least three key lessons learned from the implementation of the project. These can include lessons on the themes supported by the project or the project processes and management.

<p>Lesson 1 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.1, the sustainability of the project will largely depend on the engagement and ownership of the local stakeholders. Therefore, the project needs to partner with an implementing partner that understands political sensitivity, local context, relevant stakeholders, and particularly the local language. Given the political sensitivity of this project and the need to coordinate with different conflicting parties, it is critical to partner with local NGOs and stakeholders to drive the implementation, create ownership and build trust among local partners. UNWOMEN in collaboration with external consultant, experts and international NGOs provide an impartial and neutral space for constructive discussion and negotiations, while providing technical advice and support to ensure the quality of the project implementation and build long-term capacity among the local partners.</p>
<p>Lesson 2 (1000</p>	<p>Under Outcome 1.2, the joint mission of RCO and agencies to raise</p>

<i>character limit)</i>	awareness of the PBF project as one project with strategic value has been a good initiative this year. It possibly could have benefitted by being held earlier. Advice from the Government on approaches in the Southeast and how to align the project with peacemaking/building efforts by all actors in the Southeast were also valuable. Further contacts with the Myanmar Peace Centre should also be developed and strengthened as a means of advocating with key stakeholders around project concerns and challenges.
Lesson 3 (1000 <i>character limit)</i>	Under Outcomes 1.3-1.7, trainings of this kind need careful selection of the youth, as the project expects them to be the leaders and facilitators for the communities. Two different approaches were taken in the selection of youth - in Kayin State, the project identified the communities and then asked each community to select a youth who they think can represent the community. In Mon State, announcement was circulated widely and those who want to be a part of the project applied and were selected through competitive screening. There are pros and cons of both approaches. Since the target areas are highly impacted by out-migration of youth (especially those who are capable), some communities did not have appropriate youth to participate or the selected youth were not sufficiently motivated.
Lesson 4 (1000 <i>character limit)</i>	Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, conflict sensitive programmes require time intensive processes. Given the new spaces that have been opened up with the reforms and peace building process, new norms of engagement with local governments, NSAs and communities that were hitherto inaccessible are being set. Significant engagement is required with state and township authorities in planning and implementing activities. Despite the shift from centralized top down planning to a more bottom up approach, the local authorities are still not ready to take up additional authorities and responsibilities. This becomes more challenging when leadership is expected by local authorities to enter into dialogue and setup conflict-sensitive consultative mechanisms engaging all parties concerned.
Lesson 5 (1000 <i>character limit)</i>	Under Outcomes 2.3-2.6, the progress of the project is linked to the environment. Despite optimism regarding a national ceasefire, the process has continued to take time to complete and has added new challenges to the operational environment with tensions rising in parts of the Southeast in 2014 and continued clashes between the Government and NSAGs. There is a need to work with all actors to ensure that there is universal recognition of the value of the work being undertaken by the PBF projects and within individual projects. The RCO-led mission to sensitize the authorities and NSAs and other civil society actors on the PBF grant aims has been a good initiative and should be further pursued, not just as a means of achieving relevance for UN efforts within the largely national-led process, but also to ensure consistency and cohesion among projects in the PBF action as a package and their synergies with peace-building objectives.

2.2 Success story (OPTIONAL)

Provide one success story from the project implementation which can be shared on the PBSO website and Newsletter as well as the Annual Report on Fund performance. Please include key facts and figures and any citations (3000 character limit).

The Joint UN Sensitization Mission to the South East accompanied by the Myanmar Peace Center was instrumental to get commitment from the State authorities of both Mon and Kayin and to facilitate the implementation of the project on the ground. This coordinated approach by the UN agencies together with the UNRCO at the outset of the project can be taken as a success case as it helped individual agencies to secure support from the local authorities to organize consultations, discussion with NSAs and approval to access areas which normally is not readily available.

PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, slightly delayed, or off track: on track

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters maximum):

Under Outcome 1.1, there have been implementation delays due to the operational challenges and high political sensitivity of the sub-project. A 3-month no cost extension may therefore be needed.

Under Outcomes 2.3-2.6, UNHCR has yet to spend \$106,000 due to a change in implementation modality for the activity. UNHCR requires the funds be de-linked from the budget line (support to partners) in order to allow UNHCR to use the funds in the first half of 2015.

Please provide an overview of expensed project budget by outcome and output as per the table below.⁵

Output number	Output name	RUNOs	Approved budget	Expensed budget	Any remarks on expenditure
Outcome 1: Social cohesion and multi-ethnic trust are increased with vulnerable groups (IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities) being given a voice in peace negotiations and programming.					
Output 1.1	Outcome 1.1: Women's priority needs and concerns are addressed in peace negotiations and	Outcome 1.1: UNWOMEN	Outcome 1.1: \$200,000	Outcome 1.1: \$49,300	Outcome 1.1: Expensed budget includes expended & committed funds to be spent by 31 December, 2014 and advances to

⁵ Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of annual financial report to the Administrative Agent.

	discussions on post-conflict recovery by the conflicting parties.				an implementing partner (Metta).
Output 1.2	Outcome 1.2: Increased awareness of sexual and gender-based violence and exploitation in communities. Women's vulnerability to GBV is reduced leading to improved physical and psychological well-being, enhanced participation within the community.	Outcome 1.2: UNHCR	Outcome 1.2: \$100,000	Outcome 1.2: Not Available.	
Output 1.3	Outcome 1.3: Target youths are openly discussing the peace process and reconstruction issues. Youths' voices (concerns and hopes) on the peace process expressed and fully documented. Outcome 1.4: Lack of trust and suspicion in target communities addressed through open dialogue and	Outcomes 1.3-1.7: IOM	Outcome 1.3: \$83,331 Outcome 1.4: \$3,080	Outcome 1.3: \$64,336 Outcome 1.4: \$3,080	Outcome 1.3: January - September, 2014 Outcome 1.4: January-September, 2014

	<p>community participatory activities involving youths.</p> <p>Outcome 1.5: Felt sense of peace dividends in communities.</p> <p>Outcome 1.6: Existence of mechanisms for youths to network and provide support to each other.</p> <p>Outcome 1.7: Proven model for engagement with youth as peace-builders in Myanmar field-tested and is available to be replicated by stakeholders in other ceasefire States.</p> <p>Outcome 1.8: National, local and ethnic news media outlets are engaged in conflict sensitive reportage and promote peace as a desired value.</p> <p>Outcome 1.9: Local community leaders and members use</p>	<p>Outcomes 1.8-1.10: UNESCO & UNDP</p>	<p>Outcome 1.5: \$61,597</p> <p>Outcome 1.6: \$18,479</p> <p>Outcome 1.7: \$15,399</p> <p>Outcome 1.8: \$100,000</p> <p>Outcome 1.9: \$50,000</p>	<p>Outcome 1.5: Zero</p> <p>Outcome 1.6: Zero</p> <p>Outcome 1.7: Zero</p> <p>Outcome 1.8: \$9,750</p> <p>Outcome 1.9: \$4,870</p>	<p>Outcome 1.8: Final payment of existing contract of \$4,770 due in March, 2015. Additional contracts valued at over \$57,000 to be prepared by the end of 2014.</p> <p>Outcome 1.9: \$45,000 will be made available to fund TDCLC initiatives.</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

	community media as platform to actively participate in peace-building initiatives, have greater sense of ownership of the process, and confident of its full attainment. Outcome 1.10: Local communities have greater awareness, understanding, appreciation and tolerance of other ethnic groups through exposure to media content.		Outcome 1.10: \$50,000	Outcome 1.10: \$35,130	Outcome 1.10: Additional contract valued at \$15,000 is being prepared.
Outcome 2: The Government is more responsive to the needs of vulnerable groups (IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities) living in ceasefire areas.					
Output 2.1	Outcome 2.1: State and township level authorities perform their duties effectively and become more responsive to the needs of ethnic minorities living in ceasefire areas.	Outcome 2.1: UNICEF	Outcome 2.1: 20,000	Outcome 2.1: 3,633	Outcome 2.1: Expected utilization under this output by end of the project will be less than approved budget.
Output 2.2	Outcome 2.2: State and township level government	Outcome 2.2: UNICEF	Outcome 2.2: 18,000	Outcome 2.2: 3,632	Outcome 2.2: Expected utilization under this output by

	planning and response to the needs of the communities are done with active consultation, participation and collaboration of non-state actors, civil society groups and representatives from ethnic minorities.				end of the project will be less than approved budget
Output 2.3	<p>Outcome 2.3: Basic social services (education, health and WASH) in selected ethnic minority ceasefire areas in Mon and Kayin are established and improved.</p> <p>Outcome 2.4: Government and aid agencies responsiveness to needs of IDP and refugee returnees enhanced, due to improved and informed programming, and better positioning to address arising challenges.</p> <p>Outcome 2.5: IDP and</p>	<p>Outcome 2.3: UNICEF</p> <p>Outcome 2.4: UNHCR</p> <p>Outcome 2.5: UNHCR</p>	<p>Outcome 2.3: 382,570</p> <p>Outcome 2.4: Not available</p> <p>Outcome 2.5: Not available.</p>	<p>Outcome 2.3: 315,697</p> <p>Outcome 2.4: Not Available</p> <p>Outcome 2.5: Not available.</p>	<p>Outcome 2.3: Expected utilization under this output by end of the project will be slightly higher than the approved budget</p>

	<p>refugee returnees provided with citizenship rights and durable solutions in accordance with international standards, contributing to sustainable peace.</p> <p>Outcome 2.6 Sustainable return and reintegration of IDPs and refugees is supported through increased knowledge of Government officials/civil society actors on key human rights and protection standards, enabling an environment for returnees to enhance their participation and contribute to the processes involved in building a sustainable peace at different levels.</p>	<p>Outcome 2.6: UNHCR</p>	<p>Outcome 2.6: Not available.</p>	<p>Outcome 2.6: Not Available</p>	
Outcome 3:					
Output 3.1					
Output					

3.2					
Output 3.3					
Outcome 4:					
Output 4.1					
Output 4.2					
Output 4.3					
Total:					

3.2 Comments on management and implementation arrangements

Please comment on the management and implementation arrangements for the project, such as: the effectiveness of the implementation partnerships, coordination/coherence with other projects, any South-South cooperation, the modalities of support, any capacity building aspect, the use of partner country systems if any, the support by the PBF Secretariat and oversight by the Joint Steering Committee (for PRF only). Please also mention if there have been any changes to the project (what kind and when); or whether any changes are envisaged in the near future (2000 character maximum):

Under Outcome 1.1, no comments were provided.

Under Outcome 1.2 and Outcomes 2.3-2.6, the lead and coordination of the RCO has been vital for presenting the project as a joint UN effort to Government and the Myanmar Peace Centre.

Under Outcomes 1.3-1.7, The partnership with national NGOs has worked very well, especially since IOM built their capacities in the course of the project to enable them to continue the same activities beyond the end of the project. No changes are envisaged towards completion of remaining activities by the end of the project.

Under Outcomes 1.8-1.10, no comments were provided.

Under Outcomes 2.1-2.3, the implementation of the project has been undertaken maintaining a close partnership with State and township authorities in Mon and Kayin States and also engaging local NGOs to support community-based interventions. No changes are envisaged towards completion of remaining activities by the end of the project.