
**RUNO ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT TEMPLATE 4.4**

**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)**

**ANNUAL PROJECT progress report**

**COUNTRY:** Liberia

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Title & Project Number |  |
| Programme Title: Strenthening Local/Traditional Mechanism for Peace Project  Programme Number *(if applicable)* PBF/LBR/D-12: (Project ID 00088059)  MPTF Office Project Reference Number:[[1]](#footnote-1) |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recipient UN Organizations | |  | Implementing Partners | |
| List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme:  United Nations Development Program (UNDP) | | List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations:  MIA/PBO (Lead), UNMIL and CSOs | |
| Programme/Project Budget (US$) | |  | Programme Duration | |
| PBF contribution (by RUNO) 693,253 |  |  | Overall Duration *(months)* 24 |  |
|  | Start Date[[2]](#footnote-2) *(dd.mm.yyyy)* 4th November 2013 |  |
| Government Contribution  *(if applicable)* |  |  | Original End Date*[[3]](#footnote-3)* *(dd.mm.yyyy)* | 30th October 2015 |
| Other Contributions (donors)  *(if applicable)* |  |  | Current End date[[4]](#footnote-4)*(dd.mm.yyyy)* 30th June 2016 |  |
| TOTAL: | $1,500,000 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval. |  | Report Submitted By |
| Assessment/Review - if applicable *please attach*  Yes  No Date:  Mid-Term Evaluation Report *– if applicable please attach*  Yes  No Date: | Name: Nathaniel B. Walker  Title: Project Manager  Participating Organization (Lead): Ministry of Internal Affairs/Peacebuilding Office  Email address: natwalker2002@yahoo.com and grayjohnsonw@yahoo.com |

**PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS**

* 1. **Assessment of the current project implementation status and results**

**For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project is contributing:**

|  |
| --- |
| ***Priority Plan Outcome to which the project is contributing.*** County Peace Committees (CPCs) and Early Warning & Early Response (EWER) mechanisms prevent and resolve local disputes in 15 counties. |
| ***Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project is contributing.***  1.Number of County Peace Committees (CPCs) preventing and resolving local conflicts (disaggregated by m/f CPC members, and by m/f of the person bringing the dispute)  2. Number of counties with a functional Early Warning and Early Response (EWER) Working Group (disaggregated by m/f members;  3.Proportion of early warning alerts (by sms) that result in early responses ) |

**For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project’s overall achievement of results to date:**

**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:** : County Peace Committees (CPCs) and Early Warning & Early Response (EWER) mechanisms prevent and resolve local disputes in 15 counties

**Rate the current status of the outcome:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator 1:  Number of County Peace Committees (CPCs) preventing and resolving local conflicts (disagregated by m/f CPC members and by m/f of the person bringing the dispute)  Indicator 2:  Number of counties with a functional Early Warning and Early Response (EWER) Working Group (disagregated by m/f members)  Indicator 3:    Propotion of Early Warning alerts (by SMS) that result in early responses | Baseline: 7 CPCs Funtional (Sept.2013)  Target: 15 CPCs Functional (Sept. 2016)  Progress: Reactivation of CPCs through the harmonization of County Peace Structures has been completed in 12 counties. Peace Committees are now actively involved with the holding of community dialogues, mediation and other conflict transformation initiatives aimed at keeping their environments peaceful and safe ( Currently 30% female participation)  Baseline: 4 Counties (Sept. 2013)  Target: 13 Counties (Sept. 2016)  Progress:6 EWER working group currently functional; Early Warning Focal Persons and leadership identified and contributing to data collection in 12 counties; joint activities including coordination to begin shortly (Currently 25% active female participation).  Baseline: 26% (Sept.2012)  Target: 60% by (Sept. 2016)  Progress:45% at November 2015 |

**Output progress**

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

1.CPCs reactivated and strengthened.

Results

Gender sensitive training manual validated; 130 persons trained

8 peace structures harmonized. Total: 12

Peace messages created for distribution in 250 communities

Needs assessment completed and supplies for 15 CPCs procured

15 motorcycles procured for CPCs

Plans completed for incorporating CPCs into 5 Counties Security Councils

2.EWER Centers functional at 3 Regional Hubs.

Results

EWER Centers setup in Bong, Grand Gedeh and Maryland

3 training workshops conducted for EWER Focal Persons (FP)

Early Warning indicators updated

Violence Prevention training held for EWER Working Group

CSO led EWER Secretariat setup

100 FP received incentives

EWER working group periodic reporting supported

3.CSOs and CBOs capacity strengthened to support CPCs to respond to emerging threats.

Results

10 CSOs awarded small grants

8 additional CSOs being processed

Supplies and equipment provided to the National CSO

Grantees trained in project mgt.

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period 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? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?*

Significant progress was made towards the reactivation of CPCs and harmonization of other Peace Structures. CPCs are actively engaged in dispute resolution in the counties. For instance, the Lofa Peace Committee peacefully resolved a land dispute between immigration officers and the people of Kpassagizia. The resolution of this dispute prevented the outbreak of potential land conflict in the area. Lofa is a county in the north known for land and tribal conflicts. Another achievement was the Grand Gedeh Peace Committee that worked with county authorities in resolving the boundary dispute between River Gee and Grand Gedeh Counties. CPCs have been recognized in some counties and are now being considered for support under the county’s annual budgetary allocation.

EWER Centres are set up at the Gbarnga, Zwedru and Harper Hubs. The Gbarnga EWER Centre is sharing early warning alerts with security officers for rapid response action. The EWER Centre at the Gbarnga Hub is now serving as a link between Local peace structures and the Justice and Security Hub management.

There has been increase in the number of Early Warning Reporters from 45 in 2014 to 120 covering a total of 11 counties as compared to 7 counties in 2014. The quality of reports over time have also improved resulting to a more timely early response initiative increasing from 35% of reports submitted in the previous year to now 45%. CPCs have initiated response actions at community levels to resolve issues of widespread violence. On the average, the total number of incident reports received on the LERN platform (www.lern.ushahidi.com) increased to 900+ in 2015 as compared to 708 in 2014.

The project supported 10 CSOs to engage in activities that complement the work of CPCs. These small grants are empowering communities. For example, the Foundation for Peace and Development and the Women Peacebuilding and Economic Empowerment grant operating in the Firestone Rubber Plantation recently graduated 160 women in various vocational skills trainings. Women are now earning incomes that contribute to the livelihood of their families. Also, the Village Savings and Loan scheme operating in Sinoe County has provided economic empowerment for several communities. Alongside these economic driven initiatives, project participants received various conflict transformation skills which they are now utilizing in their communities.

This project has been very innovative. For example, action was taken in the case of violence at the Golden Veroleum (GVL), a concession company. The project supported a team of CSOs that visited Sinoe. First-hand information on the causes of the violence was gathered while a collaborative network to help support CPC in dealing with such local violence was established. The most significant achievement from this exercise is that PARLEY, a member of the CSO team, is now collaborating with the management of GVL and local communities to help curb potential conflicts.

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

While we note that significant progress were made, we would have achieved a lot more had there not been the usual challenge of beaucratic bottlenecks and unexplained delays. For example, the project 2015 Annual Work Plan did not get approved by relevant authorities until March 2015. This delay, which was beyond our control, resulted to our inability to commence any activity outlined in the 2015 Work Plan until April 2015 following the approval in late March. The result is three months of implementation time wasted leading to an adjustment in Work Plan. Inspite of this, the project engae with the relavant activities and actors and made gains mentioned in this report. There were also the usual challege associated with delays in processing of requests for the project but in all, the project remains on track especially as we have obtained an extension approved by the Joint Steering Committee.

**Outcome Statement 2:**

**Rate the current status of the outcome:**

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

**Output progress**

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

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period 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? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?*

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

**Outcome Statement 3:**

**Rate the current status of the outcome:**

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

**Output progress**

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

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period 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? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?*

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

**Outcome Statement 4:**

**Rate the current status of the outcome:**

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

**Output progress**

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

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period 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? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?*

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

* 1. **Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender in the reporting period**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evidence base: What is the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report *(1000 character limit)?* | Project activities are assessed periodically by project team members and partners. UNMIL which serves as a collaborating partner is in constant touch with Peace Committees and provide feedbacks following verification of some of the information generated. Most significantly in 2015, the PBO/PBF Secretariat conducted a joint monitoring visit to selected PBF projects including this project. Reports are available to validate these information.  In preparing this report and other project documents, consultations were held with Peace Committees, Early Warning Focal Persons, key partners, RUNO among others. Specifically for the preparation of this report, all the above were consulted including some small grant project managers and some beneficiaries. The project team also jointly reviewed the key components and provided necessary inputs based on project team members set of activities completed, individual experience, knowledge of the project and operating environment. |
| Funding gaps: Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. *(1500 character limit)* | The project is filling critical funding gaps when it comes to peacebuilding, National Healing, Conflict prevention and reconciliation. The impact is gradually being felt and once activities are implemented in a timely manner, greater gains will be made to sustain peace and foster peaceful co-existence at the community level. Over the year, a lot of support has been provided for other sectors with little going to community based peacebuilding efforts. This project clearly responds to this critical need. Even though there are bureaucratic challenges which affect the smooth running of the various activities of this project, for the most part, there have been significant progress made and achievements are increasing. Motivation among project beneficiaries is high and could be increased with the timely implementation of outstanding project activities. |
| Catalytic effects: 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)* | As a complimentary activity, the Early Warning Working Group coordinated by the PBO is receivinig support from Humanity United through Trust Africa for some aspects of support to the network which comprised of 34 CSOs, Selected government response actors and UNMIL. Also, in 2015, Humanity United, a private Foundation based in the USA through a PBO support grant to Trust Africa supported the PBO EWER Consultant who is also serving as Project Manager. |
| Risk taking/ innovation: Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? *(1500 character limit)* | Ebola awareness and prevention were mainstreamed throughout the project annual work plan. This innovative approach allowed the project team to effectively implement elements of the project work plan while helping to prevent the spread of the Ebola Virus in Liberia. Earlier, the project staff travelled to communities affected by Ebola and mainstream ebola related violence prevention activities. This work took members to all parts of Liberia including some of the very hard-to-reach locations in Liberia. |
| Gender: 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)* | During the implementation of project activities, the project team ensured that there was equal consideration given to males and females in keeping with the project work plan. While there was noticeable difficulties in securing active female participation at all times, the team worked to ensure an averaged level of 40% women participation in all project activities. To further strengthen gender consideration, the project has mainstreamed women's role in the recently developed training module to be used to deliver training to CPCs throughout the life of the project and beyond. In the awarding of small grants, priority was given to women led and women supported project as a way of ensuring gender balance. This resulted to among other things capacity building of 350 women through the small grant initiatives. |
| Other issues: 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)* | A major achievement is the project's collaboration with other PBF funded projects. For example, the Local Mechanism for Peace Project is collaborating with the Justice and Security Program through the setting up of Early Warning and Early Response Centres at the Regional Hubs. The Joint Justice and Security Program provided office space at the Gbarnga Hub where EWER Staffs are sharing sensitive conflict alerts with security authorities.  The project is also collaborating with UN Women as many of the Palava Hut dispute resolution structures were incorporated into the harmonized peace structure. Likewise, the Independent Commission on Human Rights monitors positioned in the various counties are actively collaborating with County Peace Committee and other Peace Structures in the counties. In short, we are collaborating with most PBF projects and participating in joint activities such as workshops and joint morning visits but worked more closely with INCHR, UN Women, and JSJP. |

**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**  County Peace Committees (CPCs) and Early Warning & Early Response (EWER) mechanisms prevent and resolve local disputes in 15 counties | Indicator 1.1  Number of County Peace Committees (CPCs) preventing and resolving local conflicts (disagregated by m/f CPC members and by m/f of the person bringing the dispute) | 7 CPCs Funtional (Sept.2013) | 13 CPCs Functional (Sept. 201) | 12 county peace committees functional | No delay | None |
| Indicator 1.2  Number of counties with a functional Early Warning and Early Response (EWER) Working Group (disagregated by m/f members) | 4 Counties with representatin of 10% female (Sept. 2013) | 13 Counties with representation of atleast 40% female and 60% male (Sept. 2016) | 5 EWER Working Group functional with representation of 20% female | No delay but we are requesting an adjustment in the target from 13 to 7. The EWER Working Group will now be organized in counties covered by one of the three regional hubs | Adjustment to 7 focus on the Regional Hubs counties |
| Indicator 1.3  Propotion of Early Warning alerts (by SMS) that result in early responses | 26% (Sept.2012) | 60% by (Sept. 2016) | 45% | On track | None |
| Output 1.1  County Peace Committees reactivated and strengthened in 15 counties | Indicator 1.1.1  # of peace structures including County Peace Committees assessed, re-activated and strengthened | 7 counties CPCs partially functional and access limited support (Sept, 2013) | 13 CPCs structures fully functional by 2016 | 14CPC Assessed 12 functional | None. Activities on track | None |
| Indicator 1.1.2  # of CPCs trained in conflict mediation leadership and general peacebuilding including EWER focal person  Indicator 1.1.3  7 CSOs/CPcs benefited from grants to address conflict at local level (Sept. 2013  Indicator 1.1.4  # of CPCs organized | 325 CPC members trained (Sept. 2013  7 CSOs/CPCs benefit from grants to address local conflict  O CPC anchored within County Security Council (September 2013 | 900 CPC members trained, of which at least 30% women (December 2016)  13 CSOs/CPCs benefited from small grants to address local conflict  At least 7 CPCs anchored within the County Security Council (CSC) | 350 CPC members including EWER focal persons (40%) female trained  10 CSOs/CPCs benefited  Strategy document for anchoring CPCs in 5 already organized CSCprepared and awaiting Ministry of Internal Affairs action for next step | Adjust target from 900 to 700 after a review of total membership of CPCs  on track  Delayed and awaiting Ministry of Internal Affairs to move with next step | Adjusted to 700  None |
| Output 1.2  Early Warning and Early Response centers established and functional at 3 Regional Hubs (Bong, Grand Gedeh and Maryland) | Indicator 1.2.1  Number of EWER Centres established and functional at Regional Justice & Security Hubs | 0 (Sept.2013) | Targets: (Dec 2016) 3 centers 3set up and functional | 3 center set up and 2 functional at Gbarnga and Zwedru Regional Hubs | On track | None |
| Indicator 1.2.2  % of support to EWER center | 0 | 50% logistical support including computer, transport, communication, etc. (August 2016)  25 CBO. CSO benefit from small grant | EWER centers currently receiving support. | On track | None |
| Output 1.3  CSOs and CBOs captivity strengthened to support CPCs to respond to emerging threats to peace at the district and communities to prevent and resolve conflict. | Indicator 1.3.1  # of conflicts collectively (CSOs, CBOs including CPCs) resolved, mitigated and alerts provided for timely response | 8 conflicts collectively resolved by CSOs/CBOs/CPCs (Oct. 2013) | 25 conflicts collectively resolved by CSOs/CBOs by September, 2015 | Data collection in process | On track. | None |
| Indicator 1.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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)* | Although CPCs and other Peace Structure have been harmonized, the sustainability of local peace structures requires long term of financial and technical support. Local peacebuilding structures should always be established with sustainability at the core of the strategy. For this project to be sustainable, local ownership and a locally led approach must continue to be central part of the strategies. A participatory approach involving all sectors of the communities must be cardinal. |
| Lesson 2 *(1000 character limit)* | Over the period, collaboration has proven to be the driving force behind the success of this project. CPCs member and other project particiapants enabled us to achieve much because of the collaborative elements incorperated into the project design. |
| Lesson 3 *(1000 character limit)* | Interruption in engagement with community based structure affects overall project outcomes. This was demonstrated clearly when there were delays in the provision of project inputs to the project team. Repeatedly, team members had to re-engage and re-mobolize community dwellers due to the constant breat in engagement. |
| Lesson 4 *(1000 character limit)* |  |
| 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).*

Early Warning Reporters have significantly contributed to the prevention of violent conflict through timely reporting of emerging threats to peace in communities.

An early warning reporter based in Bong Mines, Fuamah District, Bong County reported a planned Workers’ Union demonstration at the China Union. Said alert was quickly communicated with the Gbarnga Hub by the EWER Center Staff. This necessitated the immediate deployment of PSU officers whose presence deterred the would be demonstrators. This action adverted the occurrence of violence which could have taken place had the planned demonstration worked. With this potential threat of violence, plans were made by CPC to work with the leaderships of the Workers’ Union, China Union Management and community in amicably addressing the tensions. A dialogue process was initiated. The EWER Working Group also commissioned a research in Fuamah District to further understand the context and issues which drive constant tensions in that concession area.

**PART 3 *–* FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

* 1. **Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure**

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

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

The financial statement herein stated are preliminary. Final financial report will be submitted at end of project.

Please provide an overview of expensed project budget by outcome and output as per the table below.[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Output number | Output name | RUNOs | Approved budget | Expensed budget | Any remarks on expenditure |
| Outcome 1: | | | | | |
| Output 1.1 | Output 1: County Peace Committees reactivated and strengthened in 15 counties | UNDP | 171,000 | 120,000.00 | Under spent by this amount 51,000.00 |
| Output 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2: | | | | | |
| Output 2.1 | Output 2: Early Warning and Early Response centers established and functional at 3 Regional Hubs (Bong, Grand Gedeh and Maryland) | UNDP | 63,600 | 35,000.00 | Under spent by this amount 28,600.00 |
| Output 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3: | | | | | |
| Output 3.1 | Output 3: CSOs and CBOs captivity strengthened to support CPCs to respond to emerging threats to peace at the district and communities to prevent and resolve conflict. | UNDP | 289,500 | 224,275.10 | Under spent by this amount 65,224.90 |
| Output 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 4: | | | | | |
| Output 4.1 | Output 4: Local Mechanism Project supported to provide technical capacity, coordination and supervision. | UNDP | 169,153.00 | 73,687.90 | Under spent by this amount 95,465.10 |
| Output 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: |  | UNDP | 693,253 | 452,963.00 | 240,290.00 |

* 1. **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); or whether any changes are envisaged in the near future* (2000 character maximum):

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](http://mdtf.undp.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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](http://mdtf.undp.org/) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of annual financial report to the Administrative Agent. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)