 

**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)**

**ANNUAL programme[[1]](#footnote-1) NARRATIVE progress report**

**REPORTING PERIOD: 1 january – 31 December 2012**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Programme Title & Project Number |  | Country, Locality(s), Priority Area(s) / Strategic Results[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| * Programme Title: Guinea-Bissau National PBF Secretariat Support 2012 - 2013 * Programme Number *(if applicable)* * MPTF Office Project Reference Number:[[3]](#footnote-3)00072056 | *(if applicable)*  *Country/Region*  Guinea-Bissau |
| *Priority area/ strategic results*  Public Administration |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Participating Organization(s) |  | Implementing Partners |
| * Organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme   NA | * National counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme/Project Cost (US$) | |  | Programme Duration | |
| MPTF/JP Contribution: 531,347 US$   * *by Agency (if applicable)* |  |  | Overall Duration *(months)*  2 years |  |
| Agency Contribution   * *by Agency (if applicable)* |  |  | Start Date[[4]](#footnote-4) *(dd.mm.yyyy)* | 09/12/2011 |
| Government Contribution  *(if applicable)* |  |  | Original End Date*[[5]](#footnote-5)* *(dd.mm.yyyy)* | 09/12/2013 |
| Other Contributions (donors)  *(if applicable)* |  |  | Current End date[[6]](#footnote-6)*(dd.mm.yyyy)* | 09/12/2013 |
| TOTAL: 531,347 US$ |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval. |  | Report Submitted By |
| Assessment/Review - if applicable *please attach*  Yes No Date: *dd.mm.yyyy*  Mid-Term Evaluation Report *– if applicable please attach*  Yes No Date: *dd.mm.yyyy* | * Name: Raluca Eddon * Title: Peacebuilding Officer * Participating Organization (Lead): UNIOGBIS * Email address: eddon@un.org |

# NARRATIVE REPORT FORMAT

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The political developments of 2012 have posed an unprecedented set of challenges for the PBF, the PBF Secretariat, as well as for implementing partners on the ground. Following the coup of 12 April 2012, the PBF, along with other international partners, suspended funding for Guinea Bissau, with the exception of the Secretariat. On 26 April, ASG Cheng-Hopkins informed the SRSG as co-Chair of the JSC that PBF programmes in support of the government were to be ceased immediately, while activities in support of civil society could continue alongside minimal project expenditures; this decision was reaffirmed on 6 August, which additionally requested the PBF Secretariat to provide bi-weekly political analyses that would help inform the work of the PBC and affect PBF programmatic decisions.

As a result, the Secretariat saw its role and function fundamentally transformed and therefore its activity for much of 2012 focused mainly on three objectives:

* Providing bi-weekly political analyses of the situation in GB, as requested by PBSO;
* Exercising an oversight role (on behalf of the suspended JSC) and facilitating the reallocation of funding in select cases (see FAO emergency distribution of seeds to vulnerable families);
* Leading an ongoing in-house review process of the PBF portfolio reflecting the rapidly evolving political situation, with the objective of preparing the rapid and effective repositioning of the PBF and the PBC if/when the freeze is lifted.

It is expected that these activities will culminate in the development of a new Priority Plan, following, on the part of the government, the establishment of an inclusive government and the adoption of a roadmap for the re-establishment of constitutional order, and, on the UN side, the recommendations of the Technical Assistance Mission (TAM) currently on the ground (March 15-25) and a new Security Council Mandate for the UN presence in Guinea Bissau.

# Purpose

The main expected outcome for the PBF Secretariat as stated in the Priority Plan has been:

*PBF funds managed transparently, strategically, cost-effectively and catalytically maximizing PB opportunities.*

In the aftermath of the 12 April coup, the PBF along with other national partners suspended funding on the basis that the ‘de facto’ authorities lacked a demonstrable commitment to peacebuilding. A key objective of the Secretariat throughout 2012 has been to ensure transparency and continuous oversight of existing programs during the suspension (in particular, to avoid the temptation of ‘nibbling away’ at the PBF in absence of, and dire need for, alternative sources of funding for implementing partners).

# Results

The political developments of 2012 have forced the PBF Secretariat to rethink its role from supporting the JSC to ensuring the transparent and accountable management of suspended PBF programs, the timely provision of information to PBSO (and other UN bodies, notably the Security Council and the PBC), and the development of proposals for the strategic repositioning of the PBF in GB if/when the freeze is lifted.

**A key (unanticipated) result has been a PBF portfolio functional and strategically repositioned for re-engagement.**

1. **Narrative reporting on results:**

*OUTCOME: PBF funds managed transparently, strategically, cost-effectively and catalytically maximizing PB opportunities.*

*Measurable indicators/Targets:*

* *At the Peacebuilding impact’ level: Perception of stakeholders and partners (multi/bilateral) on a) programme effectiveness (funding relevance within transitional setting, innovation, risk taking, catalytic effect, operational speed, national ownership); b) level of expertise of PBSO on GB; c) contribution to increased UN coherency and synergy and d) Synergy between PBF and PBC.*
* *At the Outcome level: Number of NSC decisions in line with Peacebuilding Strategic Framework and PBF Terms of Reference.*

1. Perception of stakeholders:

* During the suspension period, the PBF conducted a survey among the international members of the JSC. Three out of seven members responded, highlighting among other issues:
  + the continued relevance and importance of PBF engagement in GB
  + the need to restructure the in-country management structure, notably the JSC, in order to allow for greater efficiency, coherence and impact
  + the need for a better management of the technical processes leading up to JSC decision-making in order to avoid the JSC involvement into project management issues

1. level of expertise of PBSO on GB

* During the suspension period, the Secretariat provided regular political analyses to PBSO, welcomed by PBSO senior management. The Secretariat liaised regularly with PBSO desk officers on Guinea Bissau, providing updates and exchanging relevant information with colleagues in HQ

1. contribution to increased UN coherence and synergy

* During the suspension period, the Secretariat worked closely with the integrated Strategic Planning Unit on the in-house review of the PBF portfolio. During the Q1 2012 (prior to the coup), the Secretariat provided technical guidance to the Joint Progammes Coordination Units, which brought together UNIOGBIS, UNCT and national counterparts.

1. Synergy between PBF and PBC

* The SRSG addressed the CSC of the PBC twice in the aftermath of the coup, both times with support from the Secretariat, emphasizing the importance of a mutually reinforcing dynamic and complementarity in GB.
* **Outputs:**

1. National Steering Committee and Technical Review Group effectively oversee the implementation of the 2nd PBF allocation.

Not possible to assess: During Q1, the TRG and the JSC met to review in detail and approve the work plans for three out of the four proposed Joint Programmes under the PBF. Unfortunately, the coup occurred in the very early stages of implementation, followed by the suspension of the PBF in GB.

1. PBF National Secretariat established as a local repository of knowledge, lessons learned and institutional memory regarding PBC/PBF engagement in Guinea-Bissau.

Partially achieved: The coup and subsequent suspension in fact reinforced the role of the Secretariat as a local repository of knowledge and institutional memory. It is expected that this knowledge will greatly facilitate the review, restructuring and jump-starting of the portfolio in 2013.

1. Capacity of national government counterpart (Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Integration) to oversee the implementation of the 2nd PBF allocation strengthened.

Not achieved: The suspension of funds has meant that the capacity development efforts involving the Ministry had to be put on hold. However, the Secretariat has maintained regular contact with technical counterparts informing them of decisions on the UN side and discussing possible next steps.

* **Explain, if any delays in implementation, challenges, lessons learned & best practices:**

The risk of political instability identified during the project design materialized and was followed by an unprecedented reaction on the part of the international community, which, with the exception of ECOWAS, suspended virtually all non-humanitarian assistance to Guinea Bissau. No formal programmatic revision has been undertaken due to the absence of a functioning JSC, but plans have been developed and will be tabled for discussion if/when engagement resumes. If the international community does not respond to the recent progress towards greater political inclusiveness and a consensus roadmap for the transition, there is a risk of Guinea Bissau slipping into a serious humanitarian and political crisis.

**Qualitative assessment:**

Not applicable to Secretariat, as the Secretariat plays a supporting role only.

**ii) Indicator Based Performance Assessment:**

Using the **Programme Results Framework from the Priority Plan, or Logframe of the Project Document** - provide an update on the achievement of indicators at both the output and outcome level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, clear explanation should be given explaining why, as well as plans on how and when this data will be collected.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Achieved Indicator Targets** | **Reasons for Variance with Planned Target (if any)** | **Source of Verification** |
| **Outcome 1[[7]](#footnote-7)** PBF funds managed transparently, strategically, cost-effectively and catalytically maximizing PB opportunities  **Indicator:** Perception of stakeholders and partners (multi/bilateral) on a) programme effectiveness (funding relevance within transitional setting, innovation, risk taking, catalytic effect, operational speed, national ownership); b) level of expertise of PBSO in PB; c) contribution to increased UN coherency and synergy and d) Synergy between PBF and PBC  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:** | **N/A –** | **Funds suspended following coup of 12 April 2012.** |  |
| **Output 1** NSC meetings minutes, TRG meetings minutes, Mid-year and annual PPP review reports, PBF Secretariat reports shared with NSC and TRG.  **Indicator 1.1** Number of meetings of the NSC held  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 1.2** Quality and relevance of National Steering Committee decisions on the 2nd PBF allocation programmes  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 1.3**  Quality and relevance of the TRG technical recommendations made to the NSC  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 1.4**  Number of meetings of the TRG  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 1.5**  Frequency of attendance of the members of the TRG to meetings  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 1.6**  2nd PBF allocation programmes delivery rates  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 1.7**  % of 2nd PBF joint programmes workplan activities achieved (out of total of activities foreseen for each year)  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 1.8**  Degree to which the Secretariat plays an increased role in supporting the NSC  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Output 2** PBF Secretariat database, Mid-year and annual reports  **Indicator 2.1** Existence of file records related to PBF/PBC activities  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 2.2** % of stakeholders with increased knowledge of PBC/PBF issues in Guinea-Bissau  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:** |  |  |  |
| **Output 3** NSC meetings minutes, TRG meetings minutes, Mid-year and annual PPP review reports, PBF Secretariat reports shared with NSC and TRG.  **Indicator 3.1** PBF Secretariat has an allocated space in the MEPIR  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 3.2** Number of NSC organized with active participation of the ministries  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:**  **Indicator 3.3** Number of TRG meetings convened by the MEPIR  **Baseline:**  **Planned Target:** |  |  |  |

**iii) Success Story**

|  |
| --- |
| **Conflict dynamics being addressed:**  Impending food crisis in the context of instability following the 12 April coup. |
| **Project Interventions:**  Following approval from PBSO on 31 May, US$ 390,000 was re-allocated to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) for the distribution of seeds to 8,000 mostly female-headed households in rural areas. Some 223 metric tonnes of seeds (rice, corn, beans, groundnut, sorghum and millet) were distributed countrywide, covering around 13,000 households, with the logistical support from WFP and the collaboration from nine national non-governmental organizations. |
| **Result:**  Beneficiaries have created cereals banks in prevision of the next season, to reduce dependency on external support. Creation of cereal banks in the communities increase also the cohesion of the group of beneficiaries. 576 women around Bissau also benefited from distributions of vegetable seeds for the dry season. Thanks in part to this intervention; a food crisis was avoided in 2012, which could have driven Guinea Bissau further down the path of instability. |

1. The term “programme” is used for programmes, joint programmes and projects. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Strategic Results, as formulated in the Performance Management Plan (PMP) for the PBF, Priority Plan or project document; [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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](http://mdtf.undp.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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](http://mdtf.undp.org/) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. As per the MOU, agencies are to notify the MPTF Office when a programme completes its operational activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Note: Outcomes, outputs, indicators and targets should be **as outlined in the Project Document/Priority Plan or PMP specific** so that you report on your **actual achievements against planned targets**. Add rows as required for Outcome 2, 3 etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)