



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

| Programme Title & Project Number |
|---|
| <p>Programme Title: Livelihood and economic recovery: strengthening social cohesion and community resilience.</p> <p>Programme Number (<i>if applicable</i>)</p> <p>MPTF Office Project Reference Number:¹ 0009651</p> |

| Recipient UN Organizations |
|--|
| <p>List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: UNDP, UNHCR, WFP, IOM, ILO, FAO</p> |

| Implementing Partners |
|--|
| <p>List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations:</p> <p>Social Fund for Development Ministries of Planning and International Cooperation Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Ministry of Fisheries Ministry of Technical and Vocational Training Ministry of Social Welfare and Labour Governorate Based National NGOs District Councils CSOs.</p> |

| Programme/Project Budget (US\$) |
|--|
| <p>PBF contribution (by RUNO) US\$ 4,800,000</p> |
| <p>Government Contribution (<i>if applicable</i>)</p> |
| <p>Other Contributions (donors) (<i>if applicable</i>)</p> |

| Programme Duration | |
|--|-------------------|
| Overall Duration (<i>months</i>) | 24 months |
| Start Date ² (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>) | 21 August 2014 |
| Original End Date ³ (<i>dd.mm.yyyy</i>) | 30 September 2015 |
| 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

| | |
|---------------|-------------|
| TOTAL: | \$4,800,000 |
|---------------|-------------|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

| |
|---|
| Report Submitted By |
| Name: Yassir Khairi |
| Title: Early Recovery Field Advisor |
| Participating Organization (Lead): UNDP |
| Email address: yassir.khairi@undp.org |

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 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:

- (i) Youth, women, IDPs and other marginalized populations of conflict affected communities drive peace consolidations and economic recovery.
- (ii) Local community structures manage livelihood stabilization through conflict sensitive socio-economic development planning contributing to peaceful transition

Rate the current status of the outcome: off track

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Indicator 1: # of district authorities with peace and development plans elaborated through a participatory consultative process involving community development committees and governorates NGOs.</p> | <p>Baseline: N/A Target: 12 districts authorities have peace development plans earmarked with commitments to sectors identified as conflict triggers. Progress:</p> |
| <p>Indicator 2: # of Women led civil society organizations, monitoring peace building activities</p> | <p>Baseline: N/A Target: 30% Progress:</p> |
| <p>Indicator 3:</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.

As output 1, 10 CDCs was established in Sa'ada (50% of achievement of the particular target) and together with local authorities and CSOs, they were trained in conflict sensitive development. For output 2, stabilization support to conflict affected populations, rehabilitation of 40 houses was completed for reintegration of returnees in Sa'ada. In Hajjah, 523 (200 of them are women) directly benefited from cash for works, impacting 61,600 individuals indirectly. The vocational training was conducted to 135 beneficiaries. Two tailored curriculums to start up business targeting at semi- and illiterate people was drafted. In addition, in-depth study on a value chain for the dairy sector has been finalized, which was planned to be the basis of livelihood stabilization. Output 3 ensured women's participation in more than 30% of main deliverable mention above. In CDCs, average 30% of women represented and almost 40% of participants were women in cash and vocational training.

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)?

There are some initial achievements at output level as briefed above while it is difficult to demonstrate evidences for changes at outcome level. Twelve district authorities were targeted to have peace and development plans through a participatory consultative process involving community development committees and governorates NGOs. In contributing to the target, Community Development Committees (CDCs) in two districts in Sa'ada were established as a participatory consultative platform but could not link to the district development plan formulations due to the commencement of the conflict (district development planning cycles ends in June every year). Also, women-led civil society organizations monitoring peacebuilding activities was an outcome indicator as well as output 3. Criteria of women led civil society organizations selection in Hadramaut has been developed and agreed with local authority. However, the project could not reach to the stage of monitoring peacebuilding activities since the project was suspended.

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)?

There are mainly three reasons why outcome delivery status was off track. First of all, the actual project duration before the suspension of the project on 9 April was almost seven months since the fund was disbursed at the end of August 2014 while the original project duration 24 months. Secondly, a delay was caused by the interventions from local authorities. The project should have had intensive consultation processes with all stakeholders from the community to the local authorities in order to ensure conflict sensitivities. While the project implementation, influence and control by Ansar Allah increased in target governorates like Hajjah. Even in Sa'ada where originally Ansar Allah was controlling, interventions into the project activities such as identifying the beneficiaries and partners increased for inclusion of politically affiliated people and counterparts. Therefore, the project faced sometimes to suspend the activities or restart planning processes ensuring inclusiveness as well as maintaining consensus and support from local authorities. Lastly deterioration of security situation affected the implementation, too. In Hadramaut, from the mid-2014, it was very difficult for UN staff to even go on mission while IOM managed to complete preparation works such as identification of target districts with local authorities.

Outcome Statement 2: Not applicable

Rate the current status of the outcome:

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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)?

Outcome Statement 3: Not applicable

Rate the current status of the outcome:

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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)?

Outcome Statement 4: Not applicable

Rate the current status of the outcome:

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Evidence base</u>: 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)?</p> | <p>The Results Framework of the project document was not clear so participating UN organizations spent a lot of time to clarify and agree what evident we were going to collect and what available information was. For this report, evidence was collected from consultation with the counterpart ministries, back to office reports, implementing partner reports, field visits and media coverage.</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>The project could fill the funding gap if Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) was not suspended. The project aimed at contributing Peacebuilding Priority "Strengthened social cohesion at the sub-national and community level increases resilience to conflict." And if the project continued, the project could have made changes at outcome levels because the project outputs directly targeting social cohesion, stabilization, capacity development of both individual and community for resilience.</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>The project started to conflict analysis at the community levels and identification of conflict drivers upon the establishment of CDCs. Also the dairy value chain directly targeted to reduce tensions between the already suffering host community and the IDPs community. However, both interventions were suspended due to the full-blown conflict from March and suspension of the funding. Some of the components such as cash for works in Hajjah governorate had a catalytic effects of additional funding from Netherlands, Silatech and UNDP internal resources.</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>N.A.</p> |
| <p><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)</p> | <p>The project has specific target of women's empowerment (output 3) and gender were mainstreamed in all the interventions with women's participation as one of targets. On average, women's participation was more than 30% in main deliverables mentioned in section 1.1 (output deliverables). In CDCs, average 30% of women represented and almost 40% of participants were women in cash for works and vocational training.</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>Ansar Allah, de facto authority in Sa'ada, intervened and suspended activities by not allowing one of the national implementing partners working in the governorate. A hidden agenda was that the de facto local authority wanted UN agencies to work with a NGO affiliated with them. As indicated, the project needed to manage the implementation well in order to ensure inclusiveness and neutrality as well as ensuring the local authority's support for implementation.</p> |

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 1.1 Youth, women, IDP and other marginalized populations of conflict affected communities drive peace consolidations and economic recovery. | Indicator 1.1 # of district authorities with peace and development plans elaborated through a participatory consultative process involving community development committees and governorates NGOs. | N.A. | 12 districts authorities have peace development plans earmarked with commitments to sectors identified as conflict triggers | 0 | Due to the full-blown conflict, local authorities did not make any development plan for 2016. | |
| 1.2 Local community structures manage livelihood stabilization through conflict sensitive | Indicator 1.2 # of Women led civil society organizations, monitoring peace building activities | TBC | 30% | 0 | All activities were suspended due to the PBF suspension. | |
| | Indicator 1.3 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----|--|---|--|
| socio-economic development planning contributing to peaceful transition | | | | | | |
| Output 1.1 inclusive Community Development Committees (CDCs) including female, youth, IDP, marginalized and vulnerable group representation, linked to local authorities and trained in conflict sensitive development are implementing conflict sensitive projects. | Indicator 1.1.1 # new CDC formed and trained in conflict sensitive development alongside governorate and district council officials. | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 CDCs were established in Sa'ada in Q1 2015. PBF suspended the projects on 10 April and thus all activities have ceased since then. By August 2015, most of the CDC members and community members in Sa'ada became IDPs and moved to Amran and Sana'a. | |
| | Indicator 1.1.2 # of CDC led participatory projects undertaken to rehabilitate/restore socio-economic infrastructure | 0 | 70 | 0 | Due to the irruption of war in the end of March 2015, UNDP could not provide grants to CDCs in implemeting socio-economic infrastructure project. | |
| | Indicator 1.1.3 % community population perceive that they can influence decision making about | TBC | 75% | 15.2% (on average in 6 governorates: Hajjah 20.2% and Sa'ada 7.1%) as of September 2015. | A survey was conducted after the conflicts escalated and the project was suspended. | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|---|--------|---|--|
| | development in their community. | | | | | |
| | Indicator 1.1.4 % of CDC with priority list of conflict sensitive socio economic restoration/ rehabilitation. | N.A. | 80% | 0% | Even CDCs established in Sa'ada could not reach to the stage of developoing priority list of socio-economic restoration/rehabilitation due to the commencement of conflict in March 2015. | |
| | Indicator 1.1.5 # of men and women who directly benefitted from improved access to socio-economic strucure | N.A. | TBC | 0 | No implementation of community projects targeting socio-economic restoration/ rehabilitation. Thus no populations in the communities benefited from it. | |
| Output 1.2 Contribute to livelihoods stablization of populations affected by conflict, at risk of return to violence through creation of short-term employment creation to rehabilitate | Indicator 1.2.1 # of work days created | N.A. | 80,828 | 16,368 | Suspension of funds from PBF and Saudi Arabia which caused stopping all activities in Sa'ada and Hadramout while down scaling the activities in Hajjah due to fund shortage | |
| | Indicator 1.2.2 # of individuals who directly benefited from cash for work | N.A. | 1,837 have been included in cash for work programme lasting for 44 days | 523 | The local authorities and MOPIC initially stopped the activities until more coordination was done with them. Later, the suspension of funds added a reason for not achieving the target. | |
| | Indicator 1.2.3 % of women who directly benefits from cash for work | N.A. | 10% of women benefit from Cash for Work | 38% | Reaching much more than the target which is a success for the project | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|---|------|--|--|
| and restore social and economic infrastructure | Indicator 1.2.4 % of projects assessed against the impact on the environment (either through reduction of negative environmental impact or contribute positively) | N.A. | 100% of projects assessed contribute positively to the environment | 100% | The environment was positively impacted as the activities were all WASH related and to the benefit of the community | |
| | Indicator 1.2.5 # of men and women who moved on from temporary to more sustainable employment (value chain development/small business development) | N.A. | 742 people have benefited from more sustainable employment (value chain development/small business development) | 103 | Due to the suspension of the project, the project could not achieve the target. PBF suspended the projects on 10 April and thus all activities have ceased since then. FAO did manage to carry out an in-depth study on the potential for developing a sustainable value chain scheme for the dairy sector in Hodeidah but it did not reach to the stage for people move from temporary to more sustainable employment. | |
| | Indicator 1.2.6 % of benefits from productive livelihoods options received by women and girls | N.A. | N.A. | 42% | | |
| | Indicator 1.2.7 % of individuals engaged in sustainable SMEs by the end of the project | 742 | 90% of individuals operate sustainable SMEs | 20% | The number went down due to the suspension and the higher per capita cost due to the fuel shortage. | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|------|--|--|
| | Indicator 1.2.8 % of community population who perceive that the local authorities are aware of and committed to improve the level of basic services in the community | N.A. | 75% community population perceive that the local authorities are aware of and committed to improve the level of basic services in the community | N.A. | There is no data. | |
| Output 1.3 Women led civil organizations monitoring and implementing peacebuilding activities | Indicator 1.3.1 % of women members of CDCs trained and active in CDC decision making process | Not identified | 30% | 30% | Women represented 30% of total CDCs members established in Sa'ada. | |
| | Indicator 1.3.2 # of small enterprise startups created by women | N.A. | 600 women created, owned and managed SMEs | 0 | | |
| | Indicator 1.3.3 % of women who perceive that they have more control over their family finances | N.A. | Not identified | | Data is not available | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---|------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| | Indicator 1.3.4 % of women who perceive that they have more control over their life decision | N.A. | Not identified. | | Data is not available | |
| Outcome 2 | Indicator 2.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.2 | | | | | |
| Output 2.1 | Indicator 2.1.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.1.2 | | | | | |
| Output 2.2 | Indicator 2.2.1 | | | | | |
| | Indicator 2.2.2 | | | | | |
| Output 2.3 | Indicator 2.3.1 | | | | | |
| | 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 | | | | | |

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.

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Lesson 1 (1000 character limit) | <p>Coordination with stakeholders: As is mentioned in Section 1.1, the project faced challenges in coordination and communication with local authorities. In Hajjah, it took time to agree with local authorities on target districts since local authorities felt that they were not consulted in advance. Advance consultation with all stakeholders including local authorities would have helped implementation.</p> |
| Lesson 2 (1000 character limit) | <p>Relevance: Project would have been still relevant to the Yemeni context even after the full-fledged conflict from March 2015. For example, through rapid employment, youth could still gain income, which would help them not to participate in the armed groups. In addition, with the conflicts, numbers of IDPs in Yemen drastically increased and social cohesion became more important. Some of the results could have been delivered at localized areas.</p> |
| Lesson 3 (1000 character limit) | <p>Impact of the project's suspension: The project faced difficulties when it was suspended in April 2015. The UN has lost trust of the communities and implementing partners by the decision of PBF's suspension. Particularly the decision came when needs for stabilization and social cohesion were mounting with IDPs, and interventions were still relevant as mentioned in the above. In making a decision for suspension of the project, more consultation on the ground would have been required since the decision could do harm.</p> |
| Lesson 4 (1000 character limit) | <p>Manage political interventions: In implementing a peacebuilding project in a political context, project management needs carefully handle politically driven interventions so that the project can still include all members of societies. At the same time, local authorities' support is a precondition to operate in the field. In two target governorates (Sa'ada and Hajjah), the project needed deliberate efforts to manage political influences and principles of peacebuilding projects</p> |
| Lesson 5 (1000 character limit) | |

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).

Not applicable

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):

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: | | | | | |
| 1.1 Youth, women, IDP and other marginalized populations of conflict affected communities drive peace consolidations and economic recovery. | | | | | |
| 1.2 Local community structures manage livelihood stabilization through conflict sensitive socio-economic development planning contributing to peaceful transition | | | | | |
| Output 1.1 | Inclusive Community Development Committees (CDCs) including female, youth, IDP, marginalized and vulnerable group representation, linked to local authorities and trained in conflict sensitive development are implementing conflict sensitive projects | UNDP | 324,000 | 117,829.88 | The expenses including GMS and DPC covers by the end of November 2015 |
| Output 1.2 | Contribute to livelihoods stabilization of populations affected by conflict, at risk of return to | ILO | 244,079.99 | 77,894.77 | |
| | | UNDP | 941,178 | 690,521.01 | Expenses include GMS and DPC. Advance payment to IOM is included as expenses. |
| | | FAO | 1,075,659 | 52,239 | N.A. |

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

| | | | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|------------|-----------|--|
| | violence through creation of short-term employment creation to rehabilitate and restore social and economic infrastructure. | UNHCR | 499,626.17 | 70,528.23 | This activity has been closed due to the conflict which broke out in 2015 and transitional shelter has been changed to emergency shelter. |
| Output 1.3 | Women led civil organizations monitoring and implementing peacebuilding activities | UNDP and IOM | 350,000 | 350,000 | UNDP & IOM were unable to support women NGOs to deliver livelihood assets to female headed households due to the escalation of the conflict in March 2015. |
| Outcome 2: | | | | | |
| Output 2.1 | | | | | |
| Output 2.2 | | | | | |
| Output 2.3 | | | | | |
| 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) (2000 character maximum):

The cooperation and collaboration among UN agencies was its best through regular and ad hoc meetings, both at project staff level and Head of Agencies (HoAs) as well. In order to delivery as one, participating UN agencies share UN resources including UN field offices.

The HoAs paid quarterly field visits to Hajjah governorate to meet with Hajjah's Governor and his cabinet and promote the project activities and agree on targeting areas and implementation modality, as well the role of the local authority in facilitating the project activities.

The RUNOs receive support from the PBF secretariat in Sana'a, through regular updates, ad hoc meetings, esp. after the eruption of war and step by step guidance on project suspension and project closure process.