



PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

COUNTRY: Myanmar

TYPE OF REPORT: SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL ANNUAL

DATE OF REPORT: JANUARY TO NOVEMBER 2018 (most data to 30 September)

Project Title: Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee - Support Platform Project (JMC-SPP)	
Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:	
PBF project modality: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRF <input type="checkbox"/> PRF	If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund: <input type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund Name of Recipient Fund:
List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc): UN/DP: UNDP is the project administrator of the Project Initiation Plan (PIP), and the project is co-led with UNRCO, utilising DPA/MSU's ceasefire expertise	
List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental: The Responsible Party is the Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee - Technical Secretariat Center (JMC-TSC) receiving the funds on behalf of the tri-partite JMC. The JMC is comprised of signatories of the Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) with representatives of the Government, including the Tatmadaw / Myanmar Armed Forces and Ethnic Armed Organisations (EAOs). The JMC is also in the process of identifying Local Ceasefire Monitors (LCMs) who will monitor the ceasefire at local levels and be trained by Civil Society and Community Based Organisations (CSO, CBOs)	
Project commencement date ¹ : The PBF-IRF funding was received 14 December 2016, the IRF began 1 January 2017, and the JMC-SPP PIP began formally on 1 April 2017	
Project duration in months ² : The IRF duration is now 24 months (14-Dec-16 to 13-Dec-18), with two six-month no-cost extensions in 2018; the PIP is also 24 months, initially 1-Apr-17 to 31-Mar-18, then extended 1 more year to 31-Mar-19	
Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below: <input type="checkbox"/> Gender promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Youth promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-border or regional project	
Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization): PBF: \$ 2,363,641 JPF : \$ 2,996,607 NORWAY : \$ 946,803 UNDP : \$ 300,000 Total: \$ 6,607,051 <i>*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO's approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account</i>	
How many tranches have been received so far: 2/2 tranches.	

¹ Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.

² Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

Report preparation:

Project report prepared by: Sophie Butcher, Lessons Learned and Reporting Specialist, UN/DP, PMU; and Adrian Morrice, Chief Technical Adviser / Project Manager; Cleared by Aung Naing Oo, Executive Director, JMC-TSC; Aung Mrat Lurn, Donor Relations and Capacity Building Manager, JMC-TSC; Joerg Stahlhut, Chief of Governance and Sustainable Peace Unit, UNDP; Peter Barwick, Peace and Development Advisor, UNRCO

Project report approved by: Peter Batchelor, Country Director, UNDP

Did PBF Secretariat clear the report:

Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report:

Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach: The UN has supported several assessment exercises for the JMC, including two Technical Needs Assessments (TNA) of the JMC's core ceasefire mandate areas, TNA1 in 2017, and has almost completed the 2018 TNA2 report at the time of writing. Two micro-capacity (HACT) assessments were also conducted, reviewing JMC institutional capacity - HACT1 in 2017, and HACT2 in 2018. A Project Management Lessons Review (PMR) was completed in July 2018, to be used to guide the transition from the Phase 1 JMC-SPP to Phase 2 JMC's Multi-Support Platform (JMC-MSP). A Functional Needs Assessment (FNA) was completed in July 2018, to review the JMC's needs and options to transition to Phase 2 JMC-MSP. It identified new posts, new policies and other capacities and processes the TSC might need to perform all programme finance, donor fund management and programme governance, much of which is currently carried out by or jointly with UN/DP. An independent audit of the JMC, managed by and using UNDP criteria, on 1 April 2017 - 31 December 2017 was completed in July 2018. The final PBF independent project evaluation process has been initiated, to review the full PIP project outputs.

NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

- *Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general / common language.*
- *Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*
- *Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

PART 1: RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Overall project progress to date

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit): The project – a UNDP administered Project Initiation Plan (PIP) mechanism – began on 1 April 2017. Designed to be a 1-year initial project before a 2-year subsequent phase, in its 13th meeting in November 2017 the JMC decided to begin steps to transition to a JMC-managed funding mechanism instead. Subsequent details on its plans were then outlined in its 14th and 15th meetings in January and March. At the same time, implementation on both the JMC and UN/DP sides has been slower than planned in the results, activities, budget and indicators, the reasons for which have been outlined in previous PBF reports, and in project board quarterly progress reports. Following the JMC-U decisions, on 3 April 2018 the project board then endorsed several new elements of the project timeline and implementation cycle: 1) in response to a 7 February 2018 request to the UN from the three JMC-U joint Chairs, the PIP project overall was extended 12 months with an annual work plan to March 2018, approved by UNDP HQ; 2) two donors – the Joint Peace Fund (JPF) and Norway – decided on 19 February to proceed with a 6-month no-cost extension, concluding on 30 September, and; 3) JMC requested a 6-month funding extension to 30 September. On 28 September, the JMC was further extended as Responsible Party to 13 December 2018. Phase 2 should then commence when the JMC-managed Multi-Support Platform (JMC-MSP) begins.

Given the recent/current political/peacebuilding/ transition situation/ needs in the country, has the project been/ does it continue to be **relevant** and well placed to address potential conflict factors/ sources of tensions/ risks to country's sustaining peace progress? Please illustrate. If project is still ongoing, are any adjustments required? (1500 character limit)

The JMC and project continue to be relevant and well placed to address state / region and local level mitigation, prevention and resolution of armed conflict. The JMC is largely institutionally established at the JMC-U and S levels, carrying out its core functions. After a long history of conflict in Myanmar, the JMC represents the first 'joint and subnational' institution and lessons continue to be learnt and shared with other peace and government bodies. Aside from regular joint meetings, the JMC plays an active role in monitoring, reporting on and negotiating a resolution to conflict between signatories. Significant in Myanmar is its move towards more decentralisation on some issues to aid implementation in a manner customised to each state and local level situation.

In a context of a lack of significant and inclusive progress in the peace process, the JMC represents an example of a functioning institution working meaningfully towards peace. Since January the JMC-U met 5 times, according to schedule, and the 5 JMC-S committees met monthly, to jointly problem solve and create trust. Notably, only 2/10 planned JMC-L committees are established, only one of them is meeting, and no armed group disengagement has been jointly agreed. Both issues are negotiated confidentially and are impacted by the broader political environment. Local civilian ceasefire monitors are closer to being formed in one JMC-L, and each JMC-S committee conducted regular community public consultations.

In a few sentences, summarize **what is unique/ innovative/ interesting** about what this project is trying/ has tried to achieve or its approach (rather than listing activity progress) (1500 character limit).

The JMC is a ceasefire monitoring arrangement that is exception in that it does not rely on an external 3rd party to act as the principal monitoring party, but rather utilizes a hi-bred formulation of the parties themselves, together with civilians and civil society actors, carrying out many of the main functions. Typically, ceasefire support is led by 3rd parties (such as in UN mission settings), yet this project uses a development mechanism, with challenges and opportunities in this approach.

The JMC represents the first time in Myanmar's history that ceasefires are expected to be fully and jointly implemented and monitored to international standards. Overall, armed clashes have reduced in NCA signatory areas, but necessary conditions to implement troop redeployment and disengagement - such as interim arrangements - are lacking. Committee members state that some trust and confidence is beginning to be built, though evidence of this awaits a community level perception survey and the outcome of pilot research in Kayin State.

Inside the joint structures, three key elements are emerging: 1) growing responsibility, cohesion and effectiveness of the civilian members, whom although nominated by either side, aim to work neutrally and in the interest of the NCA, 2) development of the local civilian monitoring concept, and; 3) the institutional development that is being felt in both the U/S/L JMC and technical secretariat centre, which practically backstops the whole operation.

Considering the project's implementation cycle, please **rate this project's overall progress towards results to date:**
on track

In a few sentences summarize **major project peacebuilding progress/results** (with evidence), which PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit): Although broader political challenges remain unresolved, and armed conflict between some signatories continues, the elements of Myanmar's only and first joint subnational peace architecture are forming, and armed conflict in signatory areas has reduced since the signing of the NCA.

JMC-State committees are now conducting regular public consultations at the village level, commanders and former combatants wearing the same blue JMC vest, briefing on their joint responsibilities to implement provisions of the military code of conduct, including its protection of civilian provisions. The JMC has demonstrated by its actions that joint decision making among former combatants is possible, contributing to a path to end some of the world's longest lasting civil wars. It has shown the importance of joint peace institutions to implementing peace agreements.

The JMC is significant in the Myanmar context as it represents a new institutional and governance structure; joint in nature, provides a central role for citizens, prioritises community engagement and is working towards decentralisation and operation in government, non-government and areas of mixed control. Such aspirations are also shared for a Union/ State/ Local governance structure in the future and in other peace architecture.

It should be noted, however, that EAOs have raised questions and concerns about the power balance between actors in JMC structures and imbalances effecting decision making and functioning.

In a few sentences, explain how the project has made **real human impact**, that is, how did it affect the lives of any people in the country – where possible, use direct quotes that PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

The JMC, particularly at the JMC-S and JMC-L, has provided ongoing opportunities for trust building and decision making across and between stakeholders and communities, noticeable differences in people's day to day lives as a result of peace and stability and opportunities for community involvement; for example as Local Civilian Monitors and in sport events as confidence building measures. A real human impact is best described by Naw Mei Lar Htoo below.

An excerpt from an interview with Naw Mei Lar Htoo, a civilian representative of the JMC-L (Hpapun), on the ceasefire monitoring situation and the successes, challenges and difficulties of the JMC, published in the JMC's June 2018 newsletter. It should be noted this was prior to recent clashes in the area.

"Daw Khine Thiri Lin - Please tell what has changed since the NCA was signed, as compared to before it.

Naw Mei Lar Htoo - I don't even know how to begin. In the past, we were afraid to travel and communication was bad. We had no phone connection. Now you can make a return trip to Hpa-An on the same day, while in the past it was an overnight journey to even get to Kama Mung. There is no more forced labor or porters. People are now free to engage in their livelihoods and so-called taxes are no longer collected. However, a few cases still remain on the Kawthulei side. People can even travel at night time now. Even women can go alone without fear. These are the benefits of the NCA."

If the project progress assessment is **on-track**, please explain what the key **challenges** (if any) have been and which measures were taken to address them (1500 character limit).

Challenges and measure taken to address them:

- i) The continued roll out of the JMC-L and LCMs while slow, is getting attention from the JMC joint leaders, including curriculum development and SOPs;
- ii) Project management has been challenging across and between national and international stakeholders, consequently the Project Management Review was undertaken and efforts have been made to implement the recommendations;
- iii) Practical progress has not been made on disengagement, however joint trainings and discussions continues on how to overcome this challenge. Consequently, armed group disengagement trainings and dialogue plans continue;
- iv) The transition to phase 2, the JMC Multi Stakeholder Platform, has resulted in specific work tasks and amendments to the project. There is now a proposal and detailed plans being finalised for donor consideration, for funding agreements and fund transfer. Institutional support to the JMC has not been sufficient to best prepare it in the limited time available.
- v) A lack of progress in the broader peace process has provided numerous challenges for the JMC and is something the JMC can not substantively change. However, efforts have been to support the peace process whenever possible, to ensure the work of the JMC continues and to respond to conflict issues as soon as possible to defuse and de-escalate tense situations.

If the assessment is **off-track**, please list main reasons/ **challenges** and explain what impact this has had/will have on project duration or strategy and what **measures** have been taken/ will be taken to address the challenges/ rectify project progress (1500 character limit):

N/A

Please attach as a separate document(s) any materials highlighting or providing more evidence for project progress (for example: publications, photos, videos, monitoring reports, evaluation reports etc.). List below what has been attached to the report, including purpose and audience.

The annual progress report, project board terms of reference, QPR4 and QPR5 have been shared. QPR 6 (July - September) and an 18 month progress report are being completed now and will be shared shortly.

1.2 Result progress by project outcome

The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes. If your project has more approved outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.

Outcome 1: JMC is set up and carries out its core functions

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: *Describe main progress under this Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration), including major output progress (not all individual activities). If the project is starting to make/ has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context. Where possible, provide specific examples of change the project has supported/ contributed to as well as, where available and relevant, quotes from partners or beneficiaries about the project and their experience. (3000 character limit)?*

Outcome 1 contains the central purpose for this project and PBF expenditure: all of the funding required for the effective functioning of the JMC and its 4 core functions, namely the key instrument to implement provisions of the NCA, monitor adherence (of the parties) to the Military Code of Conduct, investigate alleged violations and undertake problem-solving functions. As mentioned above, at JMC-U and S levels, the outcome has largely been achieved. The JMC-U is fully established and 2018 has been its third year of operations.

While only quantitative measures (see attached LogFrame), the regular meetings and ability of the union and state level committees to continue collaboratively coming to decisions reflects the progressive local-level creation of trust and cooperation among the tripartite membership. The 19th JMC-U meeting in November 2018 has been postponed due to concerns over the structure and functioning of the JMC and a lack of progress in the peace process. There are also perceptions of limited progress on the political front, some continuing armed conflict and allegations of violations, and numerous complaint letters received, being verified and resolution sought. The JMC's Complaint Management System, operational since July 2017, allows the JMC to better understand the pattern of complaints. 165 of the 273 (60%) official complaints received between January and September 2018 were resolved and closed. Important unresolved issues frequently relate to the absence of agreement over troop deployment and related ceasefire areas. At the JMC-L level, while 2 committees were established during the first year of the project, 10 was an original target, but political issues tied to the peace process are seen to have slowed progress.

Overall, TSC- U and TSC-S offices are now operating at interim operational capability and the operational tempo of the TSC at all levels gained during the eleven months with the increasing number and regularity of meetings, workshops and public outreach events. Progress of TSC local level office functioning has been slower; offices were arranged and equipped quickly, but staff recruitment has been challenging and the offices have required backstopping from TSC state level staff. Key administrative systems and policies were put in place in January to November, with support from the UN/DP-PMU and significant recruitment efforts undertaken. The procurement and installation of most TSC equipment and capital assets at the U and S levels have largely been accomplished or are in process. The

TSC-U continues to put in measures to support TSC-S offices to become more operationally independent.

The JMC continued training and development activities in 2018 to develop knowledge and skills of committee members and TSC staff, guided by the September 2017 UN TNA (see below). Other partners such as the Siem Reap based Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies continue to provide technical expertise and support exposure visits.

Outcome 2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

Between January to September 2018, ceasefire technical assistance and capacity development activities of the UN/DP Project Management Unit (PMU) focused on five key areas, including cross-cutting of IHL and IHRL:

- i) Capacity assessment: the PMU coordinated the second UN TNA to support the JMC in identifying its technical and capacity needs, including to be in line with international laws and standards. A year since the last assessment, the first of two field missions deployed in June, with the two same DPA/MSU ceasefire experts and a third Maj. Gen. (Retd.) expert joining. ToRs were concluded in May, with a similar methodology as TNA1, to ensure as comprehensive as possible an assessment of the tripartite JMC-U/S/L committees and TSC. During TNA2 the JMC continued to credit the TNA1 assessment as having substantially contributed to the JMC's capacity building and technical assistance provision plans. The second mission took place in September. Their preliminary report was presented to the 17th JMC-U meeting 3 July and their final report is expected in November;
- ii) Comparative international mine action experience: coordinating with UNICEF and PMU on the invitation, during February 2018 the JMC sent a 3-person delegation for the first time to the UN mine action conference in Geneva, Switzerland, to learn of demining experiences from other countries and international laws on mines;
- iii) Communications and media capacity development: the PMU supported the coordination, training development and conduct of the first media training for JMC-U/S/L Secretaries who are mandated to speak to the media, with UN/DP, Joint Peace Fund (JPF) and other media experts;
- iv) Facilitation, dialogue, mediation and negotiation skills: the PMU supported the Netherlands Clingendael Academy, under its global partnership with UNDP, to hold the 2nd and 3rd Insider Mediation trainings with JMC members and staff in April and June, and two TSC staff attended their global Train the Trainer course in September; and,
- v) Troop redeployment techniques and related topics and international norms, laws and standards: a 4th workshop on disengagement was held in Yangon from 24-26 September 2018. The workshop was attended by representatives of the Tatmadaw / Government and EAO signatories, civilian members and TSC staff, and was the first time JMC members and TSC staff ran through and practiced specific disengagement scenarios. One of three exercises was the main hypothetical exercise run at the annual UN Ceasefire Mediation Course, hosted by Norway, that the JMC has sent participants to the last two years.

The PMU has also continued Myanmar / English document translation for JMC and the project (JMC does its own translations as well, including into other ethnic languages). The PMU has also developed a glossary of technical ceasefire and other terms. The effort includes: 68 documents and 205,000 words translated since January; and 121 documents and 312,000 words since April.

Outcome 3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: off track

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

Throughout 2018 the PMU continued to act as a “one-stop window” for UN support to the JMC, harnessing and integrating inputs from across the UN system. It also succeeded in maintaining positive relationships with the JMC and TSC.

UN/DP-JMC project management and institutional capacity development activities focused on:

- i) Conducted the second Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT2) micro-capacity assessment of the TSC: The assessment resulted in another moderate rating of the TSC, a good outcome for a new institution, while identifying gaps in the TSC's administrative policies and practices, primarily for financial management but also for programme management, staffing and procurement;
- ii) Management of the cash-advance cash transfer system: the UN/DP-PMU supported the TSC's implementation of the cash advance system based on quarterly advances transferred only when reaching 80% or more expenditure, seeking to address over-budgeting and cash management;
- iii) Institutional capacity development through UNDP ‘SURGE’ support: a second international expert was deployed in January from the UNDP global SURGE roster to provide advice and inputs into the development of TSC administrative and operational policies and systems, in particular on finance and anti-fraud measures and policies;
- iv) Programme management and preparation for the transition to Phase 2 JMC-managed multi-channel support platform (JMC-MSP): the Project Management Review assessed issues for not only the current platform, but provided recommendations for the JMC and donors to consider to improve capacity and more efficient processes to manage and support this complex and unique ceasefire mechanism and platform for international engagement.
- v) The Functional Needs Assessment (FNA): The FNA was conceived as an assessment to support the JMC to make evidence-based decisions on the design and set-up of the Phase 2 JMC-MSP. Based on its ToRs, jointly signed by the TSC and UN, it reviewed JMC-TSC options, and needs (policies, systems, staff capacities) to transition to Phase 2, across four areas - programme finance, donor fund management, programme governance, and core administrative functions. The UN submitted the final FNA report in July, with three key areas of observation, 12 principal recommendations, and annexes with detailed options on new structures, staff and policies for the JMC-TSC.

The steps needed to build institutional capacity for Phase 2, for JMC to manage its own multi-donor trust fund, are yet to be completed. Programme finance and management policies, processes, structures and staff are yet to be put in place, hence this key aspect of this outcome is not yet on track.

Outcome 4:

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: Please select one

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

1.3 Cross-cutting issues

<p><u>National ownership:</u> How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>As above, the JMC tripartite committee members and all TSC staff are 100% Myanmar, and the government has representatives at all three U/S/L levels. The project is grounded in legitimate joint requests and approval: the JMC-U co-Chairs first requested UN support in February 2016; in March 2016 the State Counsellor also requested UN support; in November 2016 the JMC-U co-chairs requested PBF funds, and; the State Counsellor-led Joint Coordinating Body for peace process funding (JCB) approved the PIP in February 2017. The TSC contribute to and clear all reports, including this one.</p> <p>A role the parties requested the UN to perform was to facilitate coordinated international support, so that at inception the JMC-TSC could stay focused on implementing the NCA across its members. While the peak body is the JMC-U, the Project Board is key for fiduciary oversight and programme monitoring. The Project Board is not only unique in Myanmar, also possibly globally for ceasefire bodies. The PMU facilitated negotiation on board ToRs which led to the UN co-lead the body with the Tatmadaw JMC-U Chair, who requested he be joined on the board by his co-chairs - the senior EAO General and the senior civilian member (Vice Chairs 1 and 2). Other JMC-U members routinely join the meetings to monitor and learn how it operates.</p>
<p><u>Monitoring:</u> Is the project M&E plan on track? What monitoring methods and sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. (1500 character limit)?</p>	<p>The JMC continues to focus on its role as a monitoring body, one of the four core NCA functions. Ambition in this regard is substantial: it requires joint consensus-based civil-military processes. In 2018 the M&E for the JMC continued to be the further development of its “MVR” efforts described above. The U bi-monthly and S monthly meetings remained primary mechanisms for reporting, evaluating and resolving complaints. These allow the parties to respond to local and regional armed conflict dynamics, and peace process progress.</p> <p>The set-up and impact of M&E project / donor systems have been more mixed. After the HACT1 baseline, HACT2 was completed in May. After the TNA1 baseline, the TNA2 field missions were completed in June and September, the report is expected in November. The project is monitored financially and on outputs, but no LogFrame indicator criteria, community perception surveys, capacity development baselines etc have been set. The indicators have not been broadly accepted by the JMC as adding value to the achievement of the JMC's core mandate. The PMR reported that Phase 1 indicator ambition has been too high. There remains no full-time M&E capacity in the TSC, PMU, and the planned international M&E expert from the JPF has not materialised. Attention has now been diverted to the Phase</p>

	<p>2 transition and its new proposal, budget and LogFrame. The PMR provided analysis and recommended actions to address some of these issues to be learnt for Phase 2.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The conduct of a final external and independent evaluation is clearly an important and sensitive exercise for the JMC. It was agreed by the JMC in late 2016 and provided for in the PBF project document, allowing one more comprehensive evaluation of Phase 1, instead of subjecting the JMC to multiple donor-specific assessments. From August 2018 the PMU coordinated UN and JMC planning and received guidance from PBSO. The PMU drafted a note to file that was submitted to JMC-U leadership for consideration on the methodology for conducting and providing oversight on the evaluation. That concept was accepted, an Expert Reference Group was formed with UN and JMC co-chairs, and the procurement will shortly be advertised by UNDP. The evaluation is expected to occur in January and February, with a report submitted by mid March 2019.</p>
<p>Catalytic effects (financial): Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from whom and how much? If not, have any specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Yes, additional funding was received from the Norwegian Government in 2016 and from the Joint Peace Fund in September 2017. PBF funding was also critical in February to April 2018 by providing stability through a period of uncertainty when the no-cost extension was being negotiated and re-drafted, as were all plans and agreements.</p> <p>The JMC-U's decision to move to the JMC-managed mechanism in phase 2 from 13 December presents challenges and opportunities for the programme and donor finance and management, leaving less time for TSC capacity building initiatives, and to identify (see Functional Needs Assessment Report) and recruit new staff and approve new policies and systems to manage it.</p> <p>The PBF funds have been critical and catalytic in allowing the JMC to develop as an institution to a point that they will independently receive funding from November 2018 through the JMC- Multi Stakeholder Platform (MSP).</p> <p>The PBF funds have also provided stability for UN support to the TSC, while two other donors ended their support to the JMC-SPP from 30 September to fund the TSC directly under the JMC-MSP.</p>
<p>Catalytic effects (non-financial): Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>During a difficult period of Myanmar's peace process the JMC has largely been able to remain operational and support peace efforts because of its level of functionality and institutionalisation, possible through donor funding and UN support, including PBF support.</p> <p>Catalytic effects are often discussed but hard to measure or</p>

	<p>verify. The institutionalised nature of the JMC is providing an instructional example to its sister organisation, UPDJC (mandated to support and facilitate political dialogue) and to other government institutions interested in undertaking reforms and key assessments. Further, relationships across the JMC parties and the jointness of the structure continues to be discussed as surprising and more than anticipated.</p> <p>Most strategic risks are beyond the JMC committees' mandate, and ceasefires between the Tatmadaw and now 10 EAOs have largely held. A multi-actor joint peace institution has been established and conflict resolution ToRs/SOPs have been agreed and many elements of the NCA and ToRs/SOPs are being implemented.</p>
<p><u>Exit strategy/ sustainability:</u> What steps have been taken to prepare for end of project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Funding to the JMC, through the JMC-MSP funding mechanism will commence in November/ December 2018. The TSC and PMU have been working together on the transition, with a notable transfer of greater leadership and direction to and by the TSC and its JMC-U policy-making body.</p> <p>The JPF have indicated they plan to fund the JMC directly from 14 December and the JMC have already received a donation from the Chinese Embassy in November 2018. The JMC is thus close to financial stability.</p> <p>With the closure of the JMC-SPP project on December 13, 2018 the provision of ceasefire and institutional development technical assistance to the JMC remains more uncertain.</p> <p>In August the UN received a new request for continuous support to the JMC from the NCA signatories and is considering future activities and an approach. The final evaluation will also consider the possibility of future actions.</p>
<p><u>Risk taking:</u> Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The JMC is a high risk yet necessary project, given the legacy of over 60 years of armed conflict, the interplay of political, security and economic (legal and illegal) activities that are at stake, and the current lack of progress on interim arrangements and in the peace process more broadly. Armed clashes have reduced in NCA signatory areas since the signing of the NCA, and members state that some trust and confidence is beginning to be built, though evidence of this is - to date - is indirect. When interviewed, community members articulate significant improvements in the conduct of their day to day lives, particularly in regards to reduced levels of taxation, freedom of movement, access to services and a reduction in forced recruitment and labour.</p>
<p><u>Gender equality:</u> In the reporting</p>	<p>The JMC continued to take concerted efforts to strengthen</p>

<p>period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women's empowerment? <i>(1500 character limit)</i></p>	<p>the gender and inclusion provisions of its work (see attached LogFrame statistics). The civilian women members are significant because Myanmar Army and EAOs have few and seldomly nominated women commanders as committee members, as well that civilian members are essential for the conflict resolution in the JMC setting in general, and are specifically receiving SGBV cases.</p>
<p>Other: Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? <i>(1500 character limit)</i></p>	<p>A second no-cost-extension of six months to 13 December was approved, taking the project to the maximum timeframe permitted under the IRF.</p>

1.3 INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT: *Using the **Project Results Framework** as per the approved project document or any amendments- provide an update on the achievement of **key indicators** at both the outcome and output level in the table below (if your project has more indicators than provided in the table, select the most relevant ones with most relevant progress to highlight). Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation. Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (300 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	Indicator 1.1					
	Indicator 1.2					
	Indicator 1.3					
Output 1.1	Indicator 1.1.1					
	Indicator 1.1.2					
Output 1.2	Indicator 1.2.1					
	Indicator 1.2.2					
Output 1.3	Indicator 1.3.1					
	Indicator 1.3.2					
Outcome 2	Indicator 2.1					
	Indicator 2.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	Indicator 2.3					
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					
	Indicator 3.3					
Output 3.1	Indicator 3.1.1					
	Indicator 3.1.2					
Output 3.2	Indicator 3.2.1					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	Indicator 3.2.2					
Output 3.3	Indicator 3.3.1					
	Indicator 3.3.2					
Outcome 4	Indicator 4.1					
	Indicator 4.2					
	Indicator 4.3					
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: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS

2.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditures

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, delayed, or off track, vis-à-vis project plans and by recipient organization: *on track*

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and what is the overall level of expenditure against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far (500 characters limit): Two tranches of funds have been received. As of 30 September 2018, the overall level of expenditure was 61%.

When do you expect to seek the next tranche, if any tranches are outstanding: N/A

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters limit): Although only 61% of PBF funds were utilised by 30 September 2018, it is anticipated that all funding will be exhausted by the end of the project. The JPF and Government of Norway only extended their funding to the project for six months, ending on 30 September 2018. Therefore all project expenditure will be from the PBF until the operational close on 13 December 2018, and January to March for transition and handover, administrative closure, and final evaluation activities.

Please state what \$ amount was planned (in the project document) to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women's empowerment and how much has been actually allocated to date: As a start-up ceasefire project, M&E and financial systems were not designed to perform this tracking, however, gender equality is in-part embedded in the JMC's ToRs, and in their increasing success in attracting senior women managers in the TSC, and JMC-S and JMC-L women civilian committee members.

Please fill out and attach Annex A on project financial progress **with detail on expenditures/ commitments to date using the original project budget table in Excel**, even though the \$ amounts are indicative only.

LogFrame Progress Table for PBF-IRF, 11-months January to November 2018 (most data is 9 months to September)

<i>Results and activities / Indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Targets (Yr 1)</i>	<i>Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹</i>
Objective:			
JMC effectively undertakes ceasefire monitoring in accordance with NCA and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law			
Indicator 1. # and % of NCA violations addressed effectively against established criteria (criteria to be developed, with the TSC, including on civilian protection)	0# (0%)	100# from Apr 2017	In Jan-Sep 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 165/273 or 60% NCA ceasefire violation cases were resolved/closed • Q4 had 74/85 cases • Q5 had 68/95 cases • Q6 had 23/93 cases Total 18 months Apr 2017 – Sep 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 383/537 or 71% complaints received resolved/closed
Indicator 2. Perceptions of confidence of NCA signatories in the JMC against established criteria (criteria to be developed, with the TSC, including on jointness)	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending the establishment of criteria and baseline survey of JMC members and signatories
Indicator 3. % of public who express understanding of the JMC's mandate and functions in respective areas	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending community perception survey baseline
Result #1: JMC is set up and carries out its core functions			
Indicator 1.1: # and % of sampled ceasefire violations under the mandate of the JMC, where JMC members report being satisfied with the MVR process	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Indicator 1.2: % increase or decreases in reported incidents with analysis for increase/decrease	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending baseline

¹ Note that this data is provisional: this report precedes the reporting timeline of the JMC-TSC to the JMC-U, the JMC-TSC to the UN/DP, as well as the JMC-SPP to the project board. Final Jan-Dec 13 2018 data will be available in Q8 (Jan – March 2019). Data is up to date until end of Q6, September 30 2018, and when possible is provided until November 2018.

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
Indicator 1.3: % of civilians who state that they (or someone they know) have reported violations into the ceasefire complaints mechanisms have been satisfied with the manner in which complaints were handled (Ranking to be developed for the satisfaction)	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending the establishment of ranking and baseline
Activity 1.1 The JMC tripartite mechanism established at central level in target states and in priority township locations			
Indicator 1.1.1: # of JMC committee bodies constituted and fully operational (against established criteria) at Union, State and Local levels (criteria to be developed)	n/a	1 JMC-U, 6 JMC-S and 10 JMC-L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending the establishment of criteria <p>Total in Nov 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1x JMC-U 5x JMC-S 2x JMC-L (Hpa'pun not fully operational)
Indicator 1.1.2: # and % of women civilian members in JMC committee bodies at union, state and local levels (disaggregated by membership, i.e. Government/Tatmadaw, EOA, civilian)	tbc	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending baseline and membership disaggregation At end Sep 2018: 12% <p>Disaggregated by JMC Level at end Sep:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JMC-U: 0% JMC-S: 19% JMC-L: 11% <p>Disaggregated by membership across all JMC levels at end Sep:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government/ Tatmadaw: 0% EOAs: 5% Civilians: 48%
Indicator 1.1.3: # and % of meetings held jointly (against established criteria including joint agenda-setting, meetings in mutually-agreed locations)	n/a	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending the establishment of criteria <p>In Jan-Sep 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 in Q4 + 1 in Q5 + 2 in Q6 = 5 JMC-U mgts 12 in Q4 + 10 in Q5 + 7 in Q6 = 29 JMC-S mgts 2 in Q4 + 1 in Q5 + 2 in Q6 = 5 JMC-L mgts <p>Total at end Sep 2018 (18 months Apr 17 – Sep 18):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 x JMC-U mtgs;

<i>Results and activities / Indicators</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Targets (Yr 1)</i>	<i>Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12x JMC-S Shan mtgs; 11x JMC-S Tannitharyi mtgs; 12x JMC-S Kayin mtgs; 13x JMC-S Mon mtgs; 13x JMC-S Bago mtgs; 10x JMC-L Langkho mtgs; 1x JMC-L Hpapun mtgs
Activity 1.2 JMC-TSC offices are functioning and staffed, at central level, in target states and in priority local areas			
Indicator 1.2.1: # of JMC TSC offices functional against established criteria (criteria to be developed)	n/a	1 TSC-U, 6 TSC-S and 10 TSC-L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending the establishment of criteria Total at Nov 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1x TSC-U 5x TSC-S 2x TSC-L
Indicator 1.2.2: # and % of women employed at TSC at all levels (disaggregated by role: management, programme, operations, and support services level (union, state, local) and location)	n/a	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending disaggregation by role Across JMC-TSC U/S/L in Jan – Sep 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q4: 36 females out of 93 TSC staff Q5; 36 females out of 94 TSC staff Q6; 38 females out of 93 TSC staff At end Sep 2018: 41% TSC staff are female Disaggregated by level at end Sep 2018: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSC – U: 16 females out of 41 TSC-U staff (39%) TSC-S: 22 females out of 50 TSC-S staff (44%) TSC-: 0 females out of 2 TSC-L staff (0%)
Activity 1.3 The JMC undertakes MVR activities in response to ceasefire violations and complaints based on pilot SOPs for MVR complaint handling, verification and joint mobile monitoring			
Indicator 1.3.1: # of new SOPs drafted and applied that are informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law	n/a	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan-Sep 2018: 1x Q4 + 0x Q5 + 3x Q6 (3 adopted, of which one was an amendment) = 4x ToR/SOPs adopted Total SOPs/ TORS at end Sep 2018 (not including amendments): 20 TORs/ SOPs Adopted As of November 2018: 3 TORs/ SOPs have been submitted to the JMC-U and are being considered and 1 TOR/SOP will be submitted to the next JMC-U meeting.

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
Indicator 1.3.2: % and # of ceasefire issues/violations/complaints received by the JMC that are in the mandate of the JMC (disaggregated by source and type)	tbc	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending source and type disaggregation • This data is confidential between the parties
Indicator 1.3.3: # and % of ceasefire issues/violations/complaints verified by the JMC (disaggregated by source and type)	tbc	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending source and type disaggregation • See Indicator #1 above
Indicator 1.3.4: % and # of ceasefire issues/violations/complaints resolved by the JMC (disaggregated by source and type)	tbc	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending source and type disaggregation • See Indicator #1 above
Activity 1.4 JMC members and staff have knowledge and skills to implement core functions			
Indicator 1.4.1: Training curricula on MVR and related undertaking (interview case management case referrals etc.) developed and adopted by the JMC	n/a	tbc	<p>Over 9 months Jan-Sep 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q4: 1) Photography training for JMC-TSC Staffs; 2) media training for JMC-U/S/L trainings; 3) JMC orientation workshop; 4) Insider Mediation Training; 5) JMC EAO workshops; 6) JMC workshops; 7) Nepal trip; 8) Switzerland trip. • Q5: 1-2) 2nd & 3rd Insider Mediation Training; 3-6) 4 JMC orientations; 7) JMC orientations for JMC members; 8) JMC orientations for both side commanders and administrators; 9) JMC orientation for NMSP ; 10) MVR internal capacity building training • Q6: 1) The JMC-U committee conducted its first Leadership Study Tour, sending a delegation to Norway to study peace processes, 2) 4th Disengagement Workshop, 3) two TSC attended Clingendael Academy Insider Mediation Train the Trainer in the Netherlands, 4) Technical Roundtable Talks held on confidence building during the Ceasefire Process, 5) Course Directive for JMC Training, 6) ToT on the Course for JMC Training, 7) JMC-S Kayin held a JMC training for military members from both sides, 8) Verification workshop, 9) training on Procurement and Asset Control, 10) IT Training in Bago • Events involved JMC members & TSC staffs at all levels

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
Indicator 1.4.2: # of JMC members and TSC and LCM staff completing function specific training courses on agreed curricula (disaggregated by topic/course, level and gender)	n/a	120	<p>Over 9 months Jan-Sep 2018: Q4 928 + Q5 264 + Q6 196 = 1,388</p> <p>Q6 Trainings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JMC-U delegation Leadership Study Tour to Norway to study peace processes – 18 (17 males, 1 female) • ToT Course Directive – 36 (25 males, 11 females) • Expert Talk (Civilian meeting in Taungoo) – 36 (24 males and 12 females) • 4th Disengagement Workshop – 23 (20 males, 3 females) • Verification Workshop – 36 (32 males, 4 females) • JMC-S Kayin held a JMC training for military members from both sides – 31 (31 males, 0 females) • Training on Procurement and Asset Control – 10 (4 males, 6 females) • IT Training in Bago – 6 (2 male, 4 female) • Total female participation rate in Q6: 21%
Indicator 1.4.3: % of training participants who report increased levels of understanding of training topics following training (disaggregated by topic/course and gender)	n/a	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Indicator 1.4.4: # and % of JMC members and TSC and LCM staff who are satisfied with the training and capacity development initiatives (by type, by gender, by topic/workshop type)	n/a	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Activity 1.5 Communities in ceasefire areas understand the JMC core functions			
Indicator 1.5.1: # of regular joint public consultation by JMC (by location and type)	tbc	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location and type of consultation shown in progress report tables <p>Over 9 months Jan-Sep 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18x Q4 + 17x Q5 + 7x Q6 = 42 Public consultations <p>Over 18 months Apr 2017 – Sep 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 86 Public consultations

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
Indicator 1.5.2: # of civilians attending briefing meetings with JMC (disaggregated by sex, by location)	tbc	1 per month x 200 x 7 (S/L) locations per SOP (4000)	<p>Over 9 months Jan-Sep 2018: 9,909 females attended briefing meetings out of 27,377 participants (36%)</p> <p>Disaggregated by quarter in 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q4: 4,868 females attended briefing meetings out of 12,102 participants (40%) Q5 3,594 females attended briefing meetings out of 8,668 participants (41%) Q6 1,447 females attended briefing meetings out of 3,353 participants (43%) <p>Over 18 months Apr 2017 – Sep 2018:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13,584 females attended briefing meetings out of 33,822 participants (40% women)
Result #2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law			
Indicator 2.1: # and descriptions of instances in which training concepts were applied as reported by JMC members	n/a	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Indicator 2.2: Reflections of JMC members on the quality of technical assistance provided by the Platform (quality includes: usefulness, relevance, timeliness etc.)	n/a	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline TNA1 and TNA2 assessments interview members on past training, which informs their recommendations on training needs (but don't assess the training providers) TSC conducts its own training evaluations after each event, but these are not yet being collated across all trainings
Activity 2.1 The JMC is supported to draw a validated technical assistance provision plan			
Indicator 2.1.1: Multi annual technical assistance plan developed	n/a	Aug-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TNA1 report finalized and presented to JMC-U Sep-17; Report included a table of Recommendations on Technical Assistance (TA) and Capacity Development Plan (TA Matrix) Through Jan-Nov 2018 the JMC continues to be guided in part by TNA1 report TA plans have been approved in JMC-U bi-monthly

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
			meetings, including the development of the JMC-U Course Directive by a JMC-U member. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TNA2 mission funding was confirmed by the project board on 3 April 2018, new ToRs drafted, and the first of two missions deployed in June and the second in September 2018. The report is expected in November, 2018.
Indicator 2.1.2: # and % and descriptions of recommendations from the TNA that are planned to be applied to the programme (by type of support)	n/a	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline % was not finalised, nor how disaggregation by type of support would be counted JMC-U does not track its decisions in relation to the TNA recommendations, but indirect indications are that the TNA process substantially contributes to the JMC committees' work, negotiations and joint decision-making
Activity 2.2 The JMC benefits from access to technical assistance, capacity-development and exposure to international comparative experience including on key cross-cutting areas			
Indicator 2.2.1: # of JMC TSC staff, JMC members and LCMs receive capacity development and support on cross-cutting issues (disaggregated by course, gender, function)	n/a	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pending baseline, target setting and disaggregation by course, gender, function JMC-U bi-monthly and JMC-S monthly meetings agree frequency and participation of military code of conduct training, including on protection of civilians and other cross-cutting topics See Annual Progress Report for "Participants across JMC capacity building activities during Year 1" and Q5 and Q6 quarterly progress reports. Insider Mediation Training (IM2), Clingendael Academy with UN/DP support, Yangon, April UN Ceasefire Mediation Course, with Norway support, 4 JMC participants (3 men, 1 women), Oslo, April
Indicator 2.2.2: # of JMC members and TSC staff participating in international training courses and in-country and foreign exchange visits (disaggregated by gender and type)	n/a	tbc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Annual Progress Report "Participants by group across JMC capacity building activities during Year 1" See above (IM2, Oslo course) Two TSC staff attended Clingendael Academy Insider Mediation Train the Trainer in the Netherlands JMC-U committee delegation conducted its first

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
			<p>Leadership Study Tour to Norway to study peace processes; coordination and substance support was provided by the UN, and attendance by DPA/MSU expert and PMU/ CTA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fourth disengagement training (DW4) was held in September, with the same two expert Generals (Retd.), one on UNDP contract and the second with HDC; PMU provided conceptual input to the design of a new format, scenario-based exercises with DW1-3 participants, to practice disengagement techniques.
Result #3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development			
Indicator 3.1: Project meets its bi-annual and annual financial delivery targets	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial delivery targets were redeveloped in the context of the JMC request for the 6-month no-cost extension (NCE), with the AWP endorsed in the 4th project board meeting 3 April; two further changed financial delivery targets were in their requests for a 2 month NCE Oct-Nov 2018, endorsed in the 5th project board meeting 28 September, and a request for a 13 day NCE to 13 December 2018, being prepared at the time of writing Delivery remains lower than planned, budgeting and planning challenges remain
Indicator 3.2: # and descriptions of Project Board recommendations that are applied to the Project	n/a	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jan – Nov 2018: 3 April board meeting had 4 endorsements, and the 25 June meeting had 1 action and 2 endorsements and the 28 September meeting had 2 action point and 1 endorsement. Board members have not yet endorsed draft minutes of the 28 September meeting. A board meeting is scheduled in December 2018. Since April 2017: 5 project board meetings, with 6 action points and 13 endorsements were applied by the project
Activity 3.1 Core delivery and governance structures for the JMC support platform set up and maintained			
Indicator 3.1.1: Project is audited in line with UNDP corporate standards	n/a	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UNDP contracted independent audit of result 1 JMC-TSC for 9 months, April-December 2017 final report was received 13 July, and also in Q6 an action plan on the audit

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
			<p>recommendations was concluded between UNDP and JMC-TSC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The JMC-TSC arranged its own audit to cover 12 months April 2017 – March 2018, the audit took place in July 2018 and the final report was received in 5 September 2018. The JMC-SPP project will be audited per UNDP CO schedule, and an audit is currently scheduled to begin in Q1 2019.
Activity 3.2 The administrative capacities of the TSC are strengthened			
Indicator 3.2.1: # of short-term consultants providing on-site support to TSC on institutional topics (by type)	n/a	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 part-time in-kind UNDP SURGE staff: The first SURGE staff deployed Dec 17 – Jan 18 focusing on TSC procurement and assets management policies; The second SURGE staff deployed Jan – Apr 18, focused on finance and anti-fraud policies, and advised on the design of the Project Management Review (PMR), and Functional Needs Assessment (FNA) 1 international consultant conducted PMR in May, final report in June 1 international and 1 national consultant formed FNA team in late June, report in July Four short-term and part-time UNDP experts supporting TSC from PMU: Mar-Apr; Apr-May; Apr-Jun; Jun-Jul Two UNDP consultants supporting TSC from PMU in Oct-Dec 2018: one supporting project management and institutional development, the other on MEL. Other in-kind UNDP Country Office support
Indicator 3.2.2: # of training events on institutional topics (by type, # of participants and sex)	n/a	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second SURGE staff conducted training on anti-fraud on 26 March 2018
Activity 3.3 Phase 2 JMC managed multi-channel funding systems and capacities are in place and tested			
Indicator 3.3.1: # and % and descriptions of key lessons learned through meetings with JMC, workshops and consultations	n/a	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When JMC articulated their emerging plans in Sep 2017 that Phase 2 would be a JMC-managed funding mechanism, this activity focused on preparing for the transition; In Oct-Nov 2017 the JMC invited UN/DP to provide lessons and options on the

- Not for circulation -

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Nov 2018)¹
			transition and potential roles of the UN <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jan to Mar 2018 meetings and consultations with JMC and donors on options to extend PIP project, and transition to Phase 2; Drafted Overview of Capacity Development Approach, 23 March 2018, submitted to the 3rd Project Board meeting• Design of two independent assessments to support evidence-based decision-making for JMC's Phase 2 transition: i) PMR, and ii) FNA

- Not for circulation -

Annex A to JMC-SPP PBF Annual Report 2018: Table 1: PBF Project Expenses By Activity, as of 20Nov2018		
For the year of 2017		
Activity	Activity Description	Sum of USD Amount
Objective: JMC engages effectively in ceasefire monitoring in accordance with NCA and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
Output / Result #1: JMC has capacity to carry out its core functions		
ACTIVITY1.1	The JMC tripartite mechanism established at central level in target states/regions and in priority township locations	171,191.44
ACTIVITY1.2	JMC-TSC offices are functioning and staffed, at central level, in target states/ regions and in priority local areas	205,731.04
ACTIVITY1.3	The JMC undertakes MVR activities in response to ceasefire violations and complaints based on pilot SOPs for MVR, dispute resolution, conflict de-escalation and civilian monitoring	179,856.50
ACTIVITY1.4	JMC members and staff have knowledge and skills to implement core functions	174,611.19
ACTIVITY1.5	Communities in ceasefire areas understand the JMC core functions	87,439.12
Output / Result #2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
ACTIVITY2.1	The JMC is supported to draw a validated technical assistance provision plan	34,172.01
ACTIVITY2.2	The JMC benefits from access to technical assistance, capacity-development and exposure to international comparative experience including on key cross-cutting areas	39,708.57
ACTIVITY2.3	* See below	(1,680.11)
Output / Result #3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development		
ACTIVITY3.1	Core delivery and governance structures for the JMC support platform set up and maintained	(51,643.23)
ACTIVITY3.2	The administrative capacities of the TSC are strengthened	5,098.73
Grand Total for Year 2017		844,485.26
For the year of 2018		
Activity	Activity Description	Sum of USD Amount
Objective: JMC engages effectively in ceasefire monitoring in accordance with NCA and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
Output / Result #1: JMC has capacity to carry out its core functions		
ACTIVITY1.1	The JMC tripartite mechanism established at central level in target states/regions and in priority township locations	471,778.07
ACTIVITY1.2	JMC-TSC offices are functioning and staffed, at central level, in target states/ regions and in priority local areas	53,397.66
ACTIVITY1.3	The JMC undertakes MVR activities in response to ceasefire violations and complaints based on pilot SOPs for MVR, dispute resolution, conflict de-escalation and civilian monitoring	23,432.40
ACTIVITY1.4	JMC members and staff have knowledge and skills to implement core functions	123,872.41
ACTIVITY1.5	Communities in ceasefire areas understand the JMC core functions	5,613.04
Output / Result #2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
ACTIVITY2.1	The JMC is supported to draw a validated technical assistance provision plan	4,830.07
ACTIVITY2.2	The JMC benefits from access to technical assistance, capacity-development and exposure to international comparative experience including on key cross-cutting areas	117,613.71
ACTIVITY2.3	* See below	1,680.11
Output / Result #3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development		
ACTIVITY3.1	Core delivery and governance structures for the JMC support platform set up and maintained	146,378.91
ACTIVITY3.2	The administrative capacities of the TSC are strengthened	62,299.90
ACTIVITY3.3	The upcoming financial strategies for JMC support platform are designed and set up	7,264.77
Grand Total of Year 2018		1,018,161.05
Contribution Received		2,363,641.00
Tranche 1 utilization rate		78.8%
* This sub activity was in the PIP document, but was removed in the September 2017 JPF UN2UN agreement, reflected in the first quarterly progress report and subsequently agreed in the first project board		

**Annex A to JMC-SPP PBF 2018 Annual Report:
Table 2: PBF Project Expenses By Cost Category, as of 20Nov2018**

CATEGORIES	Amount Recipient Agency UNDP			Total Expenditure As per 20Nov2018	Project Balance As of 20Nov2018
	Tranche 1 (70%)	Tranche 2 (30%)	Total (100%)		
1. Staff and other personnel	300,671	34648	335,319	450,090	(114,771)
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	35,685		35,685	8,513	27,172
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture (including Depreciation)	47,658		47,658	47,501	157
4. Contractual services	106,088	80000	186,088	16,602	169,486
5. Travel, Workshops & Conferences	250,000	30000	280,000	217,744	62,256
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	721,143	445612	1,166,755	1,022,479	144,276
7. General Operating and other Costs	85,062	72443	157,505	2,010	155,495
Sub-Total Project Costs	1,546,307	662,703	2,209,010	1,764,939	444,071
8. Indirect Support Costs (7%)	108,241	46,389	154,631	97,708	56,923
TOTAL	1,654,548	709,092	2,363,641	1,862,646	500,994