



[**COUNTRY: MYANMAR**]

PROJECT HALF YEARLY PROGRESS UPDATE

PERIOD COVERED: JANUARY – JUNE 2015

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------|
| <p>Project No & Title:</p> | <p>PBF/IRF-75 Contributing to Myanmar Peace Dividend Projects in Mon and Kayin States, Myanmar. The project has five components as follows: 1. Strengthening Government social services in ethnic minority areas and improved collaboration with non-state actors. 2. Creating a favourable protection environment for IDP and refugee returnees and supporting durable solutions through monitoring, capacity building and documentation. 3. Empowerment of Mon women through participation in peacebuilding and prevention of and response to gender-based violence. 4. Empowering ethnic youths as peacebuilders in Mon and Kayin States. 5. Capacity development of mass media institutions in support of peacebuilding and local development in Mon and Kayin States.</p> | | |
| <p>Recipient Organization(s)¹:</p> | <p>1. UNICEF; 2. UNHCR; 3. UNHCR & UN Women; 4. IOM; 5. UNESCO & UNDP</p> | | |
| <p>Implementing Partners (Government, UN agencies, NGOs etc):</p> | <p>1. UNICEF with State and township Government agencies in Mon & Kayin States with local CSOs. 2. UNHCR only. 3. UNHCR with Marie Stopes International and UN Women with Metta Foundation, Mon Women's Organisation et al. 4. IOM with Kayin Baptist Convention, Mon Youth Educators Organisation, UNFPA, UNAIDS. 5. UNDP and UNESCO through State and township Government agencies as well as selected local journalists, CSOs, youth and women groups.</p> | | |
| <p>Total Approved Budget :²</p> | <p>1600000</p> | | |
| <p>Preliminary data on funds committed :³</p> | <p>1307430</p> | <p>% of funds committed / total approved budget:</p> | <p>81.7%</p> |

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:

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; (2.2) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Conflict prevention/management;

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

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-------|
| Expenditure⁴: | 1206737 | % of expenditure / total budget: (Delivery rate) | 75.4% |
| Project Approval Date: | 13 August, 2013 | Possible delay in operational closure date (Number of months) | None |
| Project Start Date: | 30 November, 2013 | | |
| Expected Operational Project Closure Date: | 31 December, 2015 | | |
| Project Outcomes: | <p>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.</p> <p>Outcome 1.1: Women's priority needs and concerns are addressed in peace negotiations and discussions on post-conflict recovery by the conflicting parties.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Outcome 1.4: Lack of trust and suspicion in target communities addressed through open dialogue and 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 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.</p> <p>Outcome 1.10: Local communities have greater awareness, understanding, appreciation and tolerance of other ethnic groups through exposure to media content.</p> <p>Outcome 2: The Government is more responsive to the needs of vulnerable groups (IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities) living in ceasefire areas.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: State and township level government planning and response to the needs of the communities are done with active consultation, participation</p> | | |

(3.1) Employment; (3.2) Equitable access to social services

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

(4.1) Strengthening of essential national state capacity; (4.2) extension of state authority/local administration; (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources (including JSC/ PBF Secretariats)

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>and collaboration of non-state actors, civil society groups and representatives from ethnic minorities.</p> <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 refugee returnees provided with citizenship rights and durable solutions in accordance with international standards, contributing to sustainable peace.</p> <p>Outcome 2.6: IDP and refugee returnees provided with citizenship rights and durable solutions in accordance with international standards, contributing to sustainable peace.</p> |
| <p>PBF Focus Area⁵ (select one of the Focus Areas listed below)</p> | <p>Priority Area 3: Revitalise the economy and generate immediate peace dividends.</p> |

Qualitative assessment of progress

*For each intended outcome, provide **evidence** of progress during the reporting period.*

In addition, for each outcome include the outputs achieved. (1000 characters max per outcome.)

Outcome 1:

1.1-2: Women and girls have increased access to SGBV prevention, response and support services through awareness campaigns, information provided to 16,329 persons, and 19 trainings provided to 445 persons from 37 agencies. Medical and psychosocial support provided to survivors through clinics upgraded with response packages.

1.3-7: 40 trained youths developed and implemented community projects to benefit 38,000 people sustained by small grants. Project M&E provided by community working groups. Youth improved their project management, proposal writing and coordination skills. 15 communities raised \$23,135 to fund project activities. 2 peace youth networks established.

1.8-10: 8 conflict sensitive reporting training workshops held for 126 journalists who produced 200 stories. 2 media-CSO forums organised. Communities better informed and more engaged in the peace process (e.g. community media, Mon State Civil Societies Forum of Peace). Ultimate impact yet to be measured.

Outcome 2:

2.1-3: Development of a Kayin State WASH plan in consultation with stakeholders was supported. 5,405 households from 60 villages gained access to improved water supply and 60 primary schools were provided with WASH facilities. 50 officials were trained on education planning and information management. Engagement of NSAs with the Government was facilitated. 36 temporary learning spaces were refurbished. Learning and teaching materials were provided with 32 teachers trained. Medicines and equipment for treatment of childhood illnesses were provided to health staff in remote villages along with 18,000 long-lasting insecticidal nets.

2.4-6: An Information Management Unit and a system for monitoring spontaneous returns of refugees and IDPs was developed, including needs assessments in villages of return. 159 return assessments were conducted. There has been 38 verified return villages. Training workshops were conducted on humanitarian standards to stakeholders.

Outcome 3:

| | |
|---|---|
| | Outcome 4: |
| <i>Do you see evidence that the project is having a positive impact on peacebuilding? (1000 characters max.)</i> | <p>1.1-2: SGBV has a detrimental impact on peacebuilding, especially when carried out by national or ethnic group armed forces. Growing awareness of SGBV and ability to discuss these issues openly are helping address impunity.</p> <p>1.3-7: Participating youth and their communities are being given opportunities, knowledges, skills and resources to reflect on the peace process and identify issues and actions.</p> <p>1.8-10: Journalists were trained in Conflict Sensitive Reporting for the first time and stories written after the training showed evidence of conflict sensitivity.</p> <p>2.1-3: Relationship-building between government and NSAs is contributing to non-discriminatory social services and policies. Peacebuilding is being strengthened through educating youth and training teachers.</p> <p>2.4-6: Verification and aggregation of data on return assessments is helping to coordinate and focus attention on areas of high potential return. Training on durable solutions is bringing Government and NSAs together.</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? (1000 characters max.)</i> | <p>1.1-2: Catalytic effects were greater documentation of SGBV, increased awareness of mechanisms for tackling SGBV, and fairer treatment and more adequate support for persons of concern.</p> <p>1.3-7: Catalytic effects included 15 communities voluntarily raising \$23,135 while the project contributed \$40,000 to these activities, several communities developed inter-community projects such as building bridges and roads. The project was approached by the UNICEF-funded Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding to be used as a Myanmar case study.</p> <p>1.8-1.10: The Mon State Civil Societies Forum of Peace mobilized CSOs who were previously reluctant or fearful of engagement on peace issues to start engaging communities in the peace process.</p> <p>2.1-3: UNICEF/PBF-supported programmes in Mon and Kayin States were studied by joint UK-Dutch university research team.</p> <p>2.4-6: Government and NSA participation in durable solutions training is a positive indicator for cooperation around eventual returns.</p> |
| <i>If progress has been slow or inadequate, provide main</i> | <p>1.1-2: There are legal delays in dealing with SGBV cases, community reticence to discuss SGBV, a lack of referral services and difficulties engaging males in awareness sessions. Provision of clinical</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>reasons and what is being done to address them. (1000 characters max.)</i></p> | <p>and psychosocial support is challenging and language barriers can impede community participation. There is lack of trust in law enforcement and an unclear legislative framework.</p> <p>1.3-7: The project extension will enable all activities to be implemented within the new extended project duration.</p> <p>1.8-10: Progress with community radio has been delayed because the licensing law has not yet been passed. While licenses are being sought, work is underway to provide alternative community media platforms.</p> <p>2.1-3: Field implementation has been slowed down because of Government administrative processes and requirements for Government authorisation at the Union and State levels.</p> <p>2.4-6: Project implementation has been challenging in Kayin State due to a restrictive operating environment.</p> |
| <p><i>What are the main activities/expected results for the rest of the year? (1000 characters max.)</i></p> | <p>1.1-2: Targets for the SGBV project component have been achieved. Services were provided in 85% of the cases referred to MSI. However the total number of incidents is believed to be much larger and there is still no systematic monitoring of SGBV cases in Mon State.</p> <p>1.3-7: A youth forum on peace and development centered on drug issues.. Knowledge sharing on agriculture and livestock. Project impact survey with communities. Youth exchange meeting and a learning visit to an NGO working on peace. Project evaluation with youths and local partners. Workshop on sharing the PBF project model.</p> <p>1.8-10: Pursue community radio pilot license from government and implement community radio pilots in at least 3 townships or alternatively organize workshops with CSOs and local/ethnic media on the peace process.</p> <p>2.1-3: Most activities have been completed but some health and WASH activities will continue.</p> <p>2.4-6: Return assessments will continue and 3 durable solutions training workshops are planned.</p> |
| <p><i>Is there any need to adjust project strategies/ duration/budget etc.? (1000 characters max.)</i></p> | <p>1.1-2 MSI plans to open a new office in Hpa-An to enable improved service delivery and clinical response provision which will improve timely coordination and reporting mechanisms with UNHCR and other stakeholders.</p> <p>1.3-7: In order to design future projects of this kind, the project timeframe should be at least 3 years, and the expected roles of stakeholders such as the government and NSAs should be embedded in the project design.</p> <p>1.8-10: Project strategies have been adjusted for alternative approach in light of delays in legislative action for licensing of community radios and pursuit of special pilot licensing permission.</p> <p>2.1-3: None.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>What is the project budget expenditure to date (percentage of allocated project budget expended by the date of the report) – preliminary figures only? (1000 characters max.)</i></p> | <p>2.4-6: None.</p> <p>1.1-2: UNHCR's project expenditure is 100% of the RUNO's budget for this project component.</p> <p>1.3-7: IOM's project expenditure is \$227,303 which is 76% of the RUNO's budget. It is envisaged that all remaining funds will be spent by the end of the project.</p> <p>1.8-10: UNDP's project expenditure is \$46,549 which is 47% of the RUNO's budget and UNESCO's project expenditure is \$59,381 which is 59% of the RUNO's budget.</p> <p>2.1-3: UNICEF's project expenditure is \$423,503 of PBF funds which is 94% of the RUNO's budget for this project component.</p> <p>2.4-6: UNHCR's project expenditure is 100% of the RUNO's budget for this project component.</p> |
| <p><i>Any other information that the project needs to convey to PBSO (and JSC) at this stage? (1500 characters max.)</i></p> | <p>1.1-2: Prevention of and responding to gender-based violence is a key component of UNHCR's work in South-east Myanmar. UNHCR is working with Marie Stopes International (MSI) as its implementing project partner. UNHCR signed its first Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) with MSI on 3 July, 2013 to implement SGBV activities, which are seen as part of the overall PBF funded project as UNHCR inputs. UNHCR has developed activities to prevent and respond to SGBV focusing on community mobilization. MSI has treated survivors presenting to MSI for clinical and psychosocial support services. The project activities with MSI were primarily implemented in Mon State in selected townships such as Bilin, Mawlamyine, Ye, Thaton, and to a lesser extent in Hpa-An, Kayin State.</p> <p>1.3-7: None.</p> <p>1.8-10: None.</p> <p>2.1-3: None.</p> <p>2.4-6: None.</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. (250 characters max per entry)*

| | 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 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 | Indicator 1.1 .Number/percentage of IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities who are engaged in the peace process and peacebuilding. | As set by media coverage and number of IDPs, women and young people participating in different parts of the ceasefire discussions and the peace process including the political dialogues. | Significant increase on baseline. | To be determined. | N/A | N/A |
| | Indicator 1.2 Number/percentage of IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities who | As set by relevant documentation and attitudinal | Significant increase on baseline. | To be determined. | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | feel safer and see more impact on their lives as a result of the peace process and peacebuilding. | surveys. | | | | |
| Output 1.1 Women's priority needs and concerns are addressed in peace negotiations and discussions on post-conflict recovery by the conflicting parties. | Indicator 1.1.1 Number of women included in the peace negotiations including discussions on identification of needs after ceasefire agreements. | One woman in the negotiations team of the New Mon State Party. | At least 30% in different roles in peace negotiations. | UN Women to provide. | UN Women to provide. | UN Women to provide. |
| | Indicator 1.1.2 Percentage of women in women's groups targeted for action who feel that the peace process is taking into account the needs of women. [Template does not allow for inclusion of Indicator 1.1.3. Information available on | To be determined. | At least 50% increase. | UN Women to provide. | UN Women to provide. | UN Women to provide. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|--|---|---|------------------|
| | request.] | | | | | |
| Output 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. | 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. | To be determined. | At least 50% of the women participating in the awareness training. | More than 50% female participation. Challenge is to gain broader male participation. | Not applicable. | Not applicable. |
| | Indicator 1.2.2 Number of documented cases of GBV in Mon State in which services are provided. | To be determined. | 50% | Services were provided in 85% of the cases referred to MSI. However, the total number of incidents is believed to be much larger with no systematic monitoring of SGBV cases in Mon State, in part due to the reticence of survivors to come forward. | Not applicable. | Not applicable. |
| Output 1.3 Target | Indicator 1.3.1 Number of | Zero | 15 | 40 discussions on peace and | Each participating youth returned to their communities and led the discussions. | Increased to 40. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>youths are openly discussing the peace process and reconstruction issues. Youths' voices on the peace process expressed and fully documented. [Template does not allow for inclusion of Outputs 1.4-1.10. Information available on request.]</p> | <p>discussions on peace and development held among youth in target area, issues identified and actions taken.</p> | | | <p>development conducted in Kayin & Mon States. The project is currently documenting these discussions and actions.</p> | <p>Consequently, the discussions took place in 40 communities instead of 15 as initially targeted.</p> | |
| <p>Information available on request.]</p> | <p>Indicator 1.3.2</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Outcome 2 The Government is more responsive to the needs of vulnerable groups</p> | <p>Indicator 2.1 Number/percentage of IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities in ceasefire areas who are being reached by</p> | <p>Documentation of the type and number of services provided by the Government.</p> | <p>Significant improvement on baseline.</p> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| (IDPs, women, youth and ethnic minorities) living in ceasefire areas. | Government with relevant services such as education, health, civil registration. | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.2 | | | | | |
| Output 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. | Indicator 2.1.1 Conflict-affected communities interviewed feel that the Government is paying attention to their social needs. | Using the ranking method, a survey will be conducted in selected communities and with NSAs and CSOs to gauge their perceptions of the Government's performance and delivery of social services. | A similar survey by the end of the project period will be done showing marked increase in the respondents' level of satisfaction. | A rapid assessment is currently being undertaken to assess the perceptions of conflict-affected communities on whether the government is paying increased attention to their social needs. | Not Applicable. | Not Applicable. |
| | Indicator 2.1.2 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| Output 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 | Indicator 2.2.1 NSAs, CSOs and representatives from ethnic minorities expressed satisfaction over improved participation and collaboration with the government. | Using the ranking method, a survey will be conducted in selected communities and with NSAs and CSOs to gauge their perceptions of the Government's performance and delivery of social services. | A similar survey by the end of the project period will be done showing marked increase in the respondents' level of satisfaction. | A rapid assessment is currently being undertaken to assess contributions towards improving participation and collaboration of communities and NSAs with the Government in planning and delivery of social services. | Not Applicable. | Not Applicable. |
| | Indicator 2.2.2 | | | | | |
| Output 2.3 Basic social services (education, health and | Indicator 2.3.1 By the end of the project period those communities identified through the baseline survey | Rapid needs assessment conducted with local government, CSOs, | Endline survey of basic service needs in specific project | A rapid assessment is currently being undertaken to collect information on whether basic service needs have | Not Applicable. | Not Applicable. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------|--|--|
| WASH) in selected ethnic minority ceasefire areas in Mon and Kayin and established and improved. [Template does not allow for inclusion of Outputs 2.4-2.6. Information available on request.] | for education/health/WASH inputs have received them. | community members and NSAs in selected townships to select specific project locations. | locations reveal basic service needs have been addressed. | been addressed. | | |
| | Indicator 2.3.2 | | | | | |
| Outcome 3 | Indicator 3.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 3.2 | | | | | |
| Output 3.1 | Indicator 3.1.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 3.1.2 | | | | | |
| Output 3.2 | Indicator 3.2.1 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Indicator 3.2.2 | | | | | |
| Output 3.3 | Indicator 3.3.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 3.3.2 | | | | | |
| Outcome 4 | Indicator 4.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 4.2 | | | | | |
| Output 4.1 | Indicator 4.1.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 4.1.2 | | | | | |
| Output 4.2 | Indicator 4.2.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 4.2.2 | | | | | |
| Output 4.3 | Indicator 4.3.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 4.3.2 | | | | | |