



**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)
END OF PROJECT REPORT
COUNTRY: Republic of Yemen
REPORTING PERIOD: August 2014 - November 2015**

Programme Title & Project Number
Programme Title: Peace and Transition Support Project Programme Number <i>(if applicable)</i> MPTF Office Project Reference Number: ¹ 00091373

Recipient UN Organizations
List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

Implementing Partners
List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations: Ministry of Local Administration Local Authorities, All Girls Foundation Yemen Women Union SOUL for Development

Programme/Project Budget (US\$)
PBF contribution (by RUNO) US\$ 2,000,000
Government Contribution <i>(if applicable)</i>
Other Contributions (donors) <i>(if applicable)</i> European Union: EUR 1,150,000 (or 20.06% of total expenses) France: EUR 121,465.22 UNDP: US\$ 300,000 UNFPA: US\$ 30,000

Programme Duration
Overall Duration <i>(months)</i> 30 months
Start Date ² <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 28 July 2014
Original End Date ³ <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 31 October 2016
Final End date ⁴ <i>(dd.mm.yyyy)</i> 31 December 2015

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](#)

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.

TOTAL: \$4,054,644

Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.
Mid-Term Evaluation / Review - if applicable *please attach*
 Yes No Date:
End of project Evaluation- *if applicable please attach*
 Yes No Date:

Report Submitted By
Name: Chikako Kodama
Title: Chief Technical Advisor
Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP
Email address: chikako.kodama@undp.org

PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Assessment of the project implementation status and results

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

<p>Priority Plan Outcome to which the project has contributed. Outcome 1: Strengthened social cohesion at the sub-national and community level increases resilience to conflict</p>
<p>Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project has contributed. Indicator 1: Number of district authorities with peace and development plans with earmarked commitments to sectors identified as conflict triggers. Indicator 2: Percentage of target population with positive perceptions of the roles of governorate- and district-level administrations (disaggregated by target versus non-target districts, gender, age marginalised group) Indicator 3: Percentage of target population that has been consulted in the process of developing district peace and development plans</p>

For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project’s overall achievement of results to date: off 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: District and Governorate Authorities capacitated to deliver peace and development projects

Rate the current status of the outcome: off track

<p>Indicator 1: # of people benefiting from district plans focused on peace and development</p> <p>Indicator 2: % of women as overall number of participants in district planning process</p> <p>Indicator 3:</p>	<p>Baseline: Not available in PTPS project document Target: Not available in PTSP project document Progress: 0. The 2015 district development budget was not approved by the national government and thus districts did not have any financial resources to implement the plan in 2015.</p> <p>Baseline: Not available in PTSP project document Target: Not available in PTSP project document Progress: On average, women represented 39% of total participants in town hall meeting conducted from October to November in 2014. In 2 districts in Taiz Governorate women specific town hall meetings were convened. Khayran Al Muharraq district in Hajjah Governorate recorded 57% of women representation in joint (male and female) town</p>
---	---

	<p>hall meeting while in Daw'an district in Hadramaut Governorate women participation counted only 9% of total attendants.</p> <p>Baseline: Target: Progress:</p>
--	---

Output progress at the end of project

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

Output 1.1: Furniture was provided to all 14 districts while office equipment was provided only 12 districts.

Output 1.2: UNDP established five DFTs in each Governorate (Hadramaut, Hajjah, Taiz, and Socotra. Hadramaut has two DFTs) and 14 Core Teams (CT in all 14 districts. In average, 25 percent of DFTs and 13 percent of the CTs members are female. Through capacity development of all DFTs and CTs for participatory planning, budgeting and project implementation, UNDP has supported all 14 districts to convene town hall meetings, in which local authorities and citizens agreed on the district development project prioritization for 2015.

Output 1.3: Although prioritized district projects were agreed, grants were not provided. UNDP could not transfer grants using the government system which is under unrecognized authority's control and all development projects were civil works, which could not be implemented under airstrikes and violent conflicts.

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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 (3000 character limit)?

While there was progress in capacity development of district and governorate authorities, the project could not support them to deliver peace and development projects. UNDP established national government teams at three levels, i.e. central, governorate and district (on average, 25% of the members at the national and governorate are women and 15% of the district team members were women). Capacity development targeted issues and tools to build confidence between local authorities and citizen as an identified driver of conflict, i.e. participatory planning and budgeting, responsive project implementation, participatory data collection. UNDP in partnership with UNFPA supported both local authorities and civil societies organizations to convene town hall meetings in all target districts and facilitate discussions on district development project prioritization for 2015. During town hall meetings, average 39 % of participants were women and in two districts in Taiz Governorate, women specific town hall meetings were convened to make sure to crate an environment where women could more freely express their views. Upon the completion of the town hall meetings in Khadir district, many of participants expressed that it was the first time for them to see their own district plan and projects and the local authorities asked their opinions. While the proposed development projects were not necessarily what the participants think important, local authority's approach to reach out to citizens and hear their opinions were very well recognized.

12 districts out of 14 target districts had district plans and projects for 2015 approved by local councils while the 2015 development budget was not approved by the national government before the war erupted in March 2015. Therefore, no development budget was transferred from the national government to the district authorities to implement the district development projects. UNDP could

not award grants to the prioritized district development projects either because of the reason mentioned under outcome progress. Therefore, district populations have not benefitted from the district development projects in 2015.

The project could not present of contribution to peacebuilding due to the suspension of the project. However, considering only 15.2% of people responded that they feel their voice has been heard in decision making process (Rapid Integrated Assessment, UNDP, September 2015), and updated Conflict Analysis for Yemen (June 2015) identified that alienation between citizens and the government is still a conflict driver, PTSP approach of involvement of civil society in local authorities decision making i.e. district plans and project and thus building confidence between them could have made a significant difference.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

The project faced challenges as a result of the political and conflict/security situation. The security deteriorated from September 2014 when Ansar Allah ceased control of Sana’a with arms and culminated in February 2015 when it unilaterally announced the establishment of a presidential council, seized government institutions and President Hadi and put cabinet members under house arrest. Ansar Allah entered Aden in March, which triggered the launch of Operation Decisive Storm by Saudi-led coalitions on 26 March 2015. These developments made it difficult to continue the 2015 work plan critical to facilitating development changes. UNDP could not use the existing government structures in providing grants to districts since the unrecognized authority controls the national level. In addition, it was not feasible to implement district projects that are infrastructure/civil works related activities in the midst of airstrikes and violent on-the-ground fighting. The implementation of peace and development projects was an important milestone to make progress against outcome. Therefore, the project could not present evidences of benefitting the populations in the target districts.

Outcome Statement 2: At risk stakeholders participate in equitable and inclusive district-level planning, policies and development (structural/cultural)

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

<p>Indicator 1: # of CSOs conducting focus group discussions to sensitise on project decision making</p>	<p>Baseline: Target: 50% of the selected CSO participate in designing the district plan development process with earmarked commitments to sector specified as conflict triggers</p>
<p>Indicator 2:</p>	<p>Progress:</p>
<p>Indicator 3:</p>	<p>Baseline: Target: Progress:</p>
	<p>Baseline: Target: Progress:</p>

Output progress at the end of project

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

Output 2.1: The public participatory mechanism was established in three (out of four) governorates. At the national level, the Community Coalition (CC) consisting of 14 members was established. A CC representative was selected for each governorate. At the district level, 10 (out of 14) community action committees (CAC) were formed and trained on citizen engagement and participatory democracy issues.

Output 2.2: Training modules on needs assessment, project management, lobbying and communication, democratic principles, participatory decision making, M&E, gender and reporting were developed. The above training courses could not take place due to the unstable political and security situation.

Output 2.3: This output was planned to be implemented at a latter stage of the project after other outputs by UNDP were implemented

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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 (3000 character limit)?

This outcome focuses on stakeholders participating in inclusive planning, and monitoring at district level. The project, despite all difficulties encountered, was able to undertake most of the preparatory steps that lay the basis for the population to participate in the decision making process.

The public participatory mechanism was established in three different levels; national, governorate, and district that included training of the CC, CC representatives and CAC in citizen engagement and participatory democracy. Training modules for the purpose of engaging CAC in local authority district-level planning while advocating for gender-based violence (GBV) prevention and human rights, were also developed.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

The unstable political and security situation caused by lack of agreement amongst political parties on the government structure and legal framework were the main reasons for the slow progress and eventually suspension of the project.

Delays in kick-starting the project were caused by the low capacity of local government and implementing partners in peacebuilding programmes, given the new concept of the project that needed time to get acquainted with the approach and processes.

The security situation was a major risk foreseen in the project document. However, the scale and speed of security deterioration was hard to mitigate, and this led to an immediate suspension of activities and eventually the closure of the project.

Outcome Statement 3: Political and Legislative Framework for local governance extension and reform strengthened through the transition process

Rate the current status of the outcome: off track

Indicator 1: No indicators in the project document	Baseline: Target: Progress:
---	-----------------------------------

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

Output progress at the end of project

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

Three outputs were planned under this outcome. However, delivery of those outputs were delayed mainly because of the longer process for the constitutional development, which were supposed to provide a legal framework for a new local governance system.

In the meantime, for Output 3.1, UNDP provided technical advice to MoLA in different federal system model and potential destinations for a country study based on the context of Yemen. Output 3.2 was planned to be delivered in 2015 after the draft of the Constitution was finalised. However, these activities were suspended due to the political situation evolved from the end of January 2015. UNDP has been supporting MoLA based on the recommendation of the Policy Paper on Options for Future Form of Government and Decentralization and capacity assessment and development was planned in 2015. Again, delivery of the result was halted by the house arrest of the President and other cabinet members including the Minister of MoLA.

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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 (3000 character limit)?

The outcome focuses on the preparation of political and legislative framework on decentralization under the new local governance system, for which the Constitution was supposed to provide the basic framework. The progress of outcome was affected by the delay of the progress of the Constitution drafting process. Without the draft of the Constitution, UNDP could not start the legal framework review nor provide advice to MoLA of its responsibilities and mandate aligned in the framework for decentralization in the Constitution.

However, during the implementation period, UNDP in consultation with MoLA, was preparing a series of debates on local governance models and issues associated with decentralization. The concept note was agreed with MoLA but the implementation was halted due to the evolving political situations from the end of January 2015.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

Progress against Outcome 3 relies on the transition and political process more than Outcome 1. The political background mentioned as challenges for Outcome 1 impacted more on delivery of results

under Outcome 3. While existence of the national counterparts, particularly MoLA was a precondition for Outcome 3, for most of the project duration (September-October 2014 and February 2015 to present), there was no national level counterparts. In addition, in the background of a deepened humanitarian and development crisis, people's interest has shifted from support to policy to provision of tangible and subsistent basic needs (shelter, water, food, cash etc).

Outcome Statement 4: Not applicable

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

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

Output progress at the end of project

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

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made 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 (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

1.2 Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender at the end of the project

Evidence base: What was the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report (1000 character limit)?	MoLA, UNDP and UNFPA convened a project board meeting in which other main stakeholders, i.e. local authorities and CSOs were invited and verified the results of 2014 jointly. Due to the security situation and lack of a recognized national authority, UNDP and UNFPA could not hold additional consultations in 2015.
Funding gaps: Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. (1500 character limit)	Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) was suspended since 9 April 2015 while the funding was received by 27 July 2014. PBF could have worked as catalysis to fill the gap if the project continue and provide evidences of addressing conflict drivers. However it was difficult to fill in the

	funding gap within a limited time.
<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)	The project mobilised additional resources from European Union and France as well as internal resources from UNFPA and UNDP. However, the European Union has terminated the project in mid August, too.
<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)	Together with one of the target districts authority, Khadir, UNFPA and UNDP have submitted a proposal on citizen's engagement in responding to UNDP's regional innovation call for proposal. The proposal was awarded and moved to a stage for prototype development. The idea was to develop an online platform that will be connected with and accessed from various devices such as normal mobiles, smartphones, and computers. The Khadir district authority can use it to share an annual district development plan through the platforms and various devices while citizens can vote projects which ones are critical services for them. While lack of trust between the government and citizens has been a cause of conflict in Yemen, the tool was planned for Kahdir district authority to engage much wider citizens.
<u>Gender marker:</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)	Gender equality was pursued not only by identifying and addressing different needs of men and women, but also by targeting women's empowerment through UNFPA's component. For example, in all town hall meetings, there were special arrangements to choose the proper location, time and the right facilitators to make sure that more women participated in the discussions. On average, women represented 39% of all 14 district town hall meetings. UNFPA has been working on awareness and capacity development to strengthen protection in development planning particularly violence against women.
<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)	

1.3 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 District and Governorate Authorities capacitated to deliver peace and development projects	Indicator 1.1 # of people benefiting from district plans focused on peace and development	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0 for 2015	The 2015 district development budget was not approved by the national government and thus districts did not have any financial resources to implement the plan.	
	Indicator 1.2 % of women as overall number of participants in district planning process	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	39%	On average, women represented 39% of total participants in town hall meetings conducted from October to November in 2014. In 2 districts in Taiz governorate women specific town hall meetings were convened, too.	
	Indicator 1.3					
Output 1.1 Local authorities have basic equipment and resources to fulfill prioritised	Indicator 1.1.1 12 of peace and development plans based upon conflict analysis targeting youth and women developed and under implementation	Not available in project document	12	12	12 district plans out of 14 target districts have district development plans approved by district local councils in 2014.	

roles and responsibilities	Indicator 1.1.2					
Output 1.2 District Facilitation Teams established and supported to provide technical guidance to local authorities	Indicator 1.2.1 Not available in project document					
	Indicator 1.2.2					
Output 1.3 Grants provided to local authorities to respond to local peacebuilding and recovery needs	Indicator 1.3.1 % of district budget allocated to peace and development project in affected communities	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0%	There was no district development budget approval/allocation for 2015 by the central government (a district development budget is supposed to be approved by a presidential decree) and thus no implementation of the projects	
	Indicator 1.3.2 % of satisfactory audit reports submitted on district authorities financial statement	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0%	No audit report is available. COCA did not produce all district financial statements. UNDP has requested COCA to include 14 target districts upon the completion of the 2015 district development project implementation	
Outcome 2 At risk stakeholders participate in equitable and inclusive	Indicator 2.1 # of CSOs conducting focus group discussions to sensitise on project decision making	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0	Delay in kick-starting the project was caused by the low capacity of local government and implementing partners in peacebuilding programmes.	

district-level planning, policies and development (structural/cultural)	Indicator 2.2 50% of the selected CSO participate in designing the district plan, development process, with earmarked commitments to sectors identified as conflict triggers	Not available in project document	50%			
Output 2.1 Civil society and associated network capacity to participate in peace and development planning at national and local levels strengthened	Indicator 2.1.1 Data collection on gender relation in targeted governorates	Not available in project document	Not available in project document		Instable political and security situation caused by reaching no agreement among political parties on the government structure and legal framework were the main reasons for slow progress and eventually suspension of the project.	
	Indicator 2.1.2 # of the LA meetings attended by the CAC	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0	The work plan signed with the partners to implement the activities but due to the conflict and the security issues. the implementation stopped.	
Output 2.2 Civil Society and local authorities supported to initiate dialogues and	Indicator 2.2.1 # of meetings attended by the CAC with LA	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0		
	Indicator 2.2.2 # of districts conducting participatory conflict	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0		

project implementation for peace and development	analysis					
Output 2.3 Civil Society and associated networks monitoring local authority performance in peace and development	Indicator 2.3.1 project addressing women issues under the umbrella of human rights agreed by the LA and implemented by CAC	Not available in project document	Not available in project document			The work plan signed with the partners to implement the activities but due to the conflict and the security issues. the implementation stopped.
	Indicator 2.3.2 # of messages addressed to LA and national level	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0		
Outcome 3 Political and Legislative Framework for local governance extension and reform strengthened through the transition process	Indicator 3.1 Not available in project document					
	Indicator 3.2					
Output 3.1 Provision of technical advice and	Indicator 3.1.1 # of public and political consultation on local government	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0		Activities were planned in 2015 but due to the war and suspension of the project, they were not conducted.

comparative experience in support of design of a system of local governance in support of outcome of national dialogue and/or constitutional review	unitary decentralization/federalism Indicator 3.1.2 Assessment of Local Governance recommendations in National Dialogue	Not available in project document	Not available in project document	0	Activities were planned in 2015 but due to the war and suspension of the project, they were not conducted.	
Output 3.2 Support review of legal framework of local government to reflect outcomes of national dialogue and/or constitutional review process	Indicator 3.2.1 Not available in project document Indicator 3.2.2					
Output 3.3 Support building	Indicator 3.3.1 Not available in project document					

institutional readiness and capacity of MoLA to assume its role following outcome of national dialogue and/or consitutional review	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					

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>Sustainability: A PTSP approach of building on existing national capacity using existing system is critical for sustainability. Both UNDP and UNFPA identified national counterparts i.e. MoLA, governorate and district authorities, and national NGOs at three levels (national, governorate and district). Due to the war and on-the-ground fighting, national counterparts could not continue to implement what were originally expected such as district development plans and development project implementation. However, some of them are still supporting the government humanitarian coordination.</p> <p>In relation to a project formulation problem, the project did not address a chronic issue in local governance, i.e. financial devolution. The local authorities will not have operational costs to continue to provide public services to the populations and reaching out to understand citizens priorities upon the project completion.</p>
<p>Lesson 2 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>Relevance: The conflict driver identified in the PTSP project document is still relevant according to an updated Conflict Assessment for Republic of Yemen in June 2015. In a meeting with Vice Governor of Taiz (acting Governor) in November 2015, he also stressed the importance of PTSP (after UNDP has informed the suspension of the project) and expressed that first and foremost restoring the formal government functions to provide support to citizens is an approach taken by development partners (even during the conflicts).</p> <p>The Minister of Local Administration recommended a PTSP approach (participatory planning and project prioritization) to the President in December 2014 as a model of national resource allocation to district development budget. And there was an expressed interest from the President to allocate bilateral donors' resources to support the same approach in non-PTSP target districts.</p>
<p>Lesson 3 (1000 character limit)</p>	<p>Relevance: The project did not articulate well the importance of economic development and private sector development and its involvement in district planning. It is a missed opportunity since (i) the public sector can facilitate the private sector development, (ii) the private sector development could also contributes to peacebuilding by increasing livelihood opportunities particularly for the youth, and (iii) it could lead to increase local tax revenue through the private sector development.</p>
<p>Lesson 4 (1000 character limit)</p>	
<p>Lesson 5 (1000 character limit)</p>	

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).

PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure

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

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

The project has been suspended since 9 April 2015 and both UNFPA and UNDP could not spend resources in line with the agreed work plan. In the following financial table, the approved budget amount comes from project results framework (including other resources) and the expenses are only from PBF.

Please provide an overview of project expensed 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: District and Governorate Authorities capacitated to deliver peace and development projects					
Output 1.1	Local authorities have basic equipment and resources to fulfill prioritised roles and responsibilities	UNDP	450,000	6,593.46	The expenditure (by the end of November 2015) includes project management costs, DPC and GMS.
Output 1.2	District Facilitation Teams established and supported to provide technical guidance to local authorities	UNDP	610,000	245,655.15	The expenditure (by the end of November 2015) includes project management costs, DPC and GMS.
Output 1.3	Grants provided to local	UNDP	3,750,000	125,568.35	The expenditure (by the end of November 2015)

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

	authorities to respond to local peacebuilding and recovery needs				includes project management costs, DPC and GMS.
Outcome 2: At risk stakeholders participate in equitable and inclusive district-level planning, policies and development					
Output 2.1	Public participatory mechanism established and operational	UNFPA	382,000	163,829	
Output 2.2	CAC supports Local authorities in drawing the year plan and interact with the population (women - youths)	UNFPA	650,000	76,000	
Output 2.3	Participatory mechanism members monitor Local authorities and advocate for Reproductive health/rights and GBV issues	UNFPA	850,000	0	
Outcome 3: Political and Legislative Framework for local governance extension and reform strengthened through the transition process					
Output 3.1	Provisio of technical advice and comparative experience in support of design of a system of local governance in support of outcome of national dialogue and/or constitutional review	UNDP	180,000	0	
Output 3.2	Support review of legal framework of local government	UNDP	280,000	0	

	to reflect outcomes of national dialogue and/or constitutional review process				
Output 3.3	Support building institutional readiness and capacity of MoLA to assume its role following outcome of national dialogue and/or constitutional review	UNDP	80,000	0	
Outcome 4:					
Output 4.1					
Output 4.2					
Output 4.3					
Total			7,232,000	617,645.96	

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) (2000 character maximum):

As a joint project, UNFPA and UNDP have worked closely to implement PTSP. At the project level, UNFPA and UNDP together with national partners convened a project board meeting (participated by a PBF representative in Sana'a) in December 2014 to review/verify progresses in 2014 and endorse a 2015 annual work plan. At the technical level, UNFPA and UNDP held a monthly meeting with the Minister of Local administration and an internal bi-weekly joint project team meeting to coordinate each agency's work plan.

Capacity development of national partners was an integral part of PTSP and both UNDP and UNFPA ensured to include each other's partners in conducting training and awareness work.