

# PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT COUNTRY: SOMALIA TYPE OF REPORT: SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL FINAL DATE OF REPORT: 31 AUGUST 2019

| Project Title: Midnimo (Unity     | () - Support for the Attainment of Durable Solutions in Areas Impacted by Displacement and Returns in                                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Jubaland, South West and Hirshabe | Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway: 00103708  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PBF project modality:             | If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ IRF                     | Country Trust Fund  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\square$ PRF                     | Regional Trust Fund   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | Name of Recipient Fund:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | Name of Recipient Fund.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 0                               | cipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| organization (UN, CSO             |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Organization        |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | ettlement Programme (UN Habitat)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| List additional implement         | nting partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project commencement              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project duration in mon           | ths: <sup>2</sup> 31/08/2019  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does the project fall und         | ler one of the specific PBF priority windows below:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gender promotion init             | tiative   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth promotion initia            | ative   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | r regional peacekeeping or special political missions   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-border or regior            | nal project   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| _ 0                               |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total PBF approved pro            | oject budget* (by recipient organization):  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IOM: \$ 2,650,000                 |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UN habitat :\$ 1,850,000          |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : \$                              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : \$                              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total:                            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | get and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO's ailability of funds in the PBF account |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How many tranches hav             | ve been received so far: 2  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Report preparation:               |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project report prepared by: ]     |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | Peter Nordstrom, PBF Coordinator  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did PBF Secretariat clear th      |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any comments from PBF S           | ecretariat on the report: Yes, incorporated   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach: Yes

## 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): All activities under Midnimo 1 were successfully implemented and targets reached within the time frame of the project in the seven districts of Jubaland, South West and Hirshabelle States. Midnimo 1 contributed to building government capacity to facilitate participatory visioning, planning and prioritization to identify basic needs in areas impacted by displacement through 1) Development of seven community action plans and implementation of community priority projects to improve access to basic services and spatial integration; 2) Identification and training of 7 Community Action Groups (CAG) and seven Community-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (CBM&E) groups to mobilize local resources and assess project progress; 3) Training of two community-based local dispute resolution committees, and art, sports, communication and visibility initiatives to enhance general public's awareness and understanding on social cohesion and peaceful coexistence; 4) Training and equipment provided to district and state authorities to improve information management, data collection and to enter into town planning consultations, 4 urban profiles developed; 5) Draft of a land law for South West state through intensive consultations; 6) Support for two municipalities to develop toolkits to facilitate the management of existing IDP settlements, site selection for creation of new settlements and settlement upgrading.

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

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 project utilized a people-centred, community-driven, government-led, context-specific, area-based, and resilience-oriented approaches. This entrenched ownership, sustainability and engagement of multiple stakeholders. This was complemented by supporting government for inclusive dialogues centred on comprehensive, locally led analyses of root causes for conflict, risk management and capacity building. Conducting in-depth analysis of root causes for displacement and conflict thus, enabling communities to take the lead in seeking prevention-oriented solutions, played a significant role throughout the entire project. Local leadership ensured broad participation of socio-economic groups in dialogue sessions, facilitating a more comprehensive approach to solutions, for example the inter-agency and inter-ministerial taskforce. In addition, this was the first project in the Somalia humanitarian development nexus to link rapid urbanisation and peacebuilding initiatives in a rapidly changing environment. Peacebuilding is intertwined with urbanisation because protracted displacements of nearly 2.6 million people has contributed to accelerated urbanisation. Integration of the city extension plan with IDP settlement planning has been acknowledged by government counterparts to unlock additional resources from development partners (See catalytic effects).

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): Community-based planning was applied as the principal approach and entry point for building social cohesion among returnees, IDPs and host communities. It has brought together various groups to jointly negotiate and prioritize projects to improve access to basic services, security and recreation. The process facilitated acceptance of IDPs/returnees by host communities thus promoting sustainable integration. Art, culture and sports events contributed to peaceful coexistence. Implementation of inclusive community dialogue such as Community Action Plan (CAP) reviews were part of a continued dialogue process with decision makers. The implementation of community-prioritized infrastructure projects has improved services for both IDPs and host communities hence, reducing potential tensions over resources. Strengthened government capacity to reduce forced evictions through management of IDP settlements and planning of new ones with sufficient services, contributed to peaceful coexistence. Midnimo 1 advanced reconciliation across clan divides and between communities and local authorities by addressing root causes of fragility and establishing community dispute resolution committees. Joint planning and collaborative events improved perception of IDPs/returnees in the eyes of local community creating a peace dividend, and further spurring investment in development. Identification of community advisors created intermediaries between communities, local leaders and authorities.

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): 842,225 people (54% female; 49% male) drawn from IDPs, returnees and host communities directly benefitted from improved access to education, health, water, safety and security, markets, livelihoods, recreation and transport in the seven project districts. This was achieved through upgrading/rehabilitation/construction of community prioritized schools, hospitals, water sources, markets, police stations, prisons, airport and stadiums. This advanced the basic rights of IDPs and returnees and concurrently improved "absorption capacity" of host communities. Short-term employment opportunities were provided to 300 vulnerable youth, women and men selected to work on the community-identified projects for example cleanup campaigns. Improved accessibility and connectivity of IDPs settlements has been identified a poverty reduction tool; see roads rehabilitation and construction in Hudur, Baidoa and Kismayo. More than 3,000 people were engaged in art, sports and culture events leading to improved acceptance, tolerance and integration. The inclusive CAP process allowed the voices of different groups in the community to be heard and considered: "I was a team leader representing the women's group. I was involved in community-based planning of the CAP and I contributed more to development; as women's group we participated in many consultations and the implementation of the projects in Afmadow district" (Afmadow 8-2019).

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).

Challenge 1: Delays in implementation due to slow decision-making processes with the government authorities. This was mainly due to the rapid changing political situation in the context of state elections, and the lack of clarity on who holds the responsibility or leads on durable solutions between the federal government and several state ministries.

Mitigation 1: The formation and engagement of the inter-ministerial taskforce facilitated joint planning and decisions making in Baidoa district. During the second year of project implementation, IOM and UN Habitat intensified dialogue and

coordination with the federal Ministry of Interior, reconciliation and federal affairs embedded in line with other PBF projects.

Challenge 2: Limited accessibility to remote project sites due to fluctuating security situation but also due to different security rules for Habitat and IOM staff. Mitigation 2: IOM and UN Habitat coordinated the work planning on a regular basis, and organised joint mission planning, supervision and monitoring of project activities. Challenge 3: Delay on implementation of community-based public works due to limited staff capacity.

Mitigation 3: UN Habitat and IOM each hired an additional engineer. IOM contracted an engineering company to clear the backlog of architectural designs and BOQs.

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): Continuation of section above.

Challenge 4: Activities related to land legislation in Jubaland could not be implemented because there was no consensus between the project and the government. However, there was a draft law led by the government, followed by the establishment of a land commission and commissioning of urban planning activities.

Mitigation 4: The project conducted intensive dialogue sessions with the Ministry of public works and the Ministry of interior resulting in a joint understanding that UN Habitat focuses on area-based planning and upgrading strategies in a newly built IDP settlement (Midnimo village) aligned with the government master plan and policy framework. The implementation of planned activities will commence under the trust fund (TFHS) component of Midnimo 1. Challenge 5: Delays and time lost due to the lengthy UN procurement policies and procedures for medium and large-scale projects under UN Habitat. Mitigation 5: The project originally planned for large scale upgrading projects, but the team learnt that projects would not be implemented in time therefore the approach was revised to smaller scale projects. This required additional capacity to respond to the more tailored local solutions and intensive dialogues with government partners.

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.

Annex 1. Urban profiles published

Annex 2. Videoclip produced for the participation of South West State Officials in the World Urban Forum in Kuala Lumpur, 2018

Annex 3. Urban land law for South West state

Annex 4. Baidoa City extension strategy combined with city extension planning

Annex 5. Final Impact of UN-Habitat Midnimo I projects

Annex 6. Short video on Midnimo 1 projects in Kismayo: this video is both a communication and remote monitoring tool which seeks to gain feedback from the beneficiaries and the government, capture the different infrastructures and how they are being used by the community, and its impact and showcase the projects. The intended audience are primarily the displaced affected communities, government, UN Peacebuilding Fund and other Durable Solutions donor partners, Somali diaspora, international community.

Annex 7. Short video on Midimo 1 projects in Baidoa: Same purpose and intended audience as the short video in Kismayo N.B. this will be provided in September 2019 as editing is still ongoing.

Annex 8. Joint Monitoring (IOM and Government) Report: The objective of the monitoring mission was to assess the impact, relevance and sustainability of the various projects one year after construction as well as the quality of the construction work. The last joint monitoring mission took place in Feb 2018. The intended audience are the government, UN Peacebuilding Fund, IOM and UNHABITAT (for learning).

Annex 9. Three Human-interest stories : the human-interest stories from Baidoa have the same purpose as the videos but with a focus on the indivdual and their perceptions on three projects: construction of Kerowfogi bridge, construction of ISHA police station, and rehabilitation of gravel road at livestock market road. The intended audience is the same as the video.

Annex 10. Midnimo 1 photo catalogues (Core Facilitation Team training in Mogadishu, Joint monitoring in Kismayo): The photos catalogues showcases the different

Annex 11: Midnimo 1 projects on social media links (by both IOM and government counterparts of progress of projects): The tweets and social media products showcase the different stages of projects captured by both IOM and the government. The intended audience are the same as the videos.

Annex 12: Axiom M&E Midnimo Mid Term Final Report.

Annex 13: Community Based Planning Guidelines

Annex 14: Afmadow Community Action Plan

Annex 15: Midnimo 1 IOM Projects list

# 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:** Government structures and institutions at federal, regional, district and community level are strengthened, more accountable and transparent and better able to respond to the various needs of the population in Southern and Central Somalia.

# 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)?

The application of community based planning principles centred around drafting, monitoring and implementing community action plans proved successful to change the way local and state authorities work to address the needs of their constituents. The community action planning process has been adopted by the local and state authorities beyond the 7 project locations as a tool for transparency and accountability under the current environment. The project enhanced the coordination and implementation capacity of local government and community representatives to promote dialogue, inclusive planning and peaceful co-existence amongst different community groups and define community driven solutions to displacement. Furthermore, IOM provided local authorities in target districts with the tools and capacity to lead the coordination and information management of durable solutions interventions in identified areas impacted by displacement and returns. This was achieved through training on data collection and analysis derived from the planning, mapping processes and progression of IDPs, returnees and host communities towards achieving durable solutions. Due to increased media activities to the communities, a wider range of population and IDP communities were informed of their rights and issues especially through the SMS public information campaigns. The drafting of land legislation has streamlined the responsibilities amongst stakeholders in district, and state levels to address land conflicts and land management. The project supported the participatory development of toolkits to facilitate management of existing IDP settlements and site selection in South West and Jubaland States. Kismayo, Baidoa and Xudur urban profiles have been developed to present solutions for long term urban development and the current displacement crisis taking into consideration the changing landscape of towns and the overall socio-economic and political trends of Somalia. Terms of references for 2 local land dispute resolution committees were developed.

**Outcome 2:** Targeted communities in Southern and Central Somalia are able to define and drive their own recovery, durable solutions and community security

### Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

#### **Progress summary:** (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

Local solutions were paramount to the success of the intervention in all the seven districts by formation of various socio-economic groups, pursuing of an area-based planning approach, deployment of community advisors and community wide art, culture and recreational facilities. Context and tailor-made approaches were applied in the implementation of activities focusing on vulnerabilities. These groups are currently the drivers of the local projects in liaison with government authorities including those not implemented as per the CAP review. The CAPs summarise the intensive dialogue from the five-day community consultations and identify the drivers of conflict and instability as well as the entry points to identify local solutions. Through the project, seven CAPs have been developed and are being implemented, officially launched by the government. IOM and UN Habitat mobilised additional resources for implementation. The Community Action Groups (CAGs) were trained to enhance their skills in project planning and implementation, ensure equitable distribution of benefits among diverse socio-economic groups, promote local resource mobilization, and ensure project sustainability. In the end, the project supported the implementation of 29 community infrastructural projects (19 by IOM and 9 by UN Habitat). The community advisors played a significant role as mediators between the local groups, local authorities and project partners. Similarly, the CBM&Es were established and trained aimed at strengthening monitoring and evaluation. The CAGs and CBM&Es participated in quarterly review meetings for their respective CAPs. They assessed progress; reviewed priorities for relevance and realignment as needed; and shared lessons learnt with stakeholders. Community wide art, culture and recreational activities were facilitated in seven districts. The shared art, cultural and recreational activities facilitated a common identity, leading to improved community social bonds.

## Outcome 3:

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

**Progress summary:** (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

# 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

|   | 1   |
|---|---|
| <b>National ownership:</b> How has the    | The Federal Government of Somalia was very receptive to       |
| national government demonstrated          | the project at inception stage by supporting Federal          |
| ownership/ commitment to the project      | Member States in defining implementation parameters and       |
| results and activities? Give specific     | selecting pilot and additional districts for scaling up. They |
| examples. (1500 character limit)          | co-facilitated the Project Steering Committee meetings and    |
|   | actively contributed to the Technical Working Group           |
|   | meetings. The Federal Member States and the respective        |
|   | Municipalities in target districts assigned dedicated         |
|   | officials to District Core Facilitation Teams who             |
|   | spearheaded community mobilization, joint planning,           |
|   | prioritization and implementation of identified community     |
|   | peace building projects that enhanced access to basic social  |
|   | services and social cohesion. Local Authorities in seven      |
|   | target districts designated land for construction of priority |
|   | infrastructural projects as well as officially launched the   |
|   | dialogue with communities. In Baidoa and Kismayo local        |
|   | authorities in collaboration with state institutions (refugee |
|   | commission) allocated land with tenure security for           |
|   | resettlement of IDPs and returnees.                           |
| Monitoring: Is the project M&E plan on    | The M&E activities consisted of i) monitoring through a       |
| track? What monitoring methods and        | bi-weekly updated database which tracks the progress of       |
| sources of evidence are being/ have been  | infrastructure projects (annex 7); ii) on site monitoring by  |
| used? Please attach any monitoring-       | in-house engineers resulting in an inspection report; iii)    |
| related reports for the reporting period. | Human-interest stories by third party monitoring that         |
| (1500 character limit)?                   | interview beneficiaries from different groups to gain         |
|   | feedback on participation and inclusivity of CAPs, and        |
|   | impact of priorities implemented (annex 4); iv) Videos by     |
|   | media firm with guidance from IOM M&E team to gain            |
|   | feedback from community and government officials, and         |
|   | capture infrastructure projects visually on film (annex 7);   |
|   | v) Mid-term evaluation report which looked at the             |
|   | effectiveness, efficiency, outcomes and prospects for         |
|   | sustainability of activities. Due to the linkages of the      |
|   | project with various initiatives related to governance,       |
|   | employment, peace building, stabilization and rule of law,    |
|   | the evaluation also collected information from stakeholders   |
|   | beyond IOM and UN Habitat to better understand                |
|   | synergies between programmes and the level of                 |

| <b>Evaluation:</b> 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)   | collaboration and complementarities with other projects,<br>including those funded by the PBF, to assess the catalytic<br>effect of Midnimo (annex 6). M&E activities enabled<br>compilation of the lessons learned to benefit Midnimo 2.<br>The only challenge encountered was the lack of training<br>and fortification of the CBM&Es that should have been<br>provided by M&E team of IOM but which is carried on as<br>a lessons learnt for Midnimo 2.<br>UNPBF will contract third party monitoring agency to<br>conduct external evaluation. IOM will support with<br>mobilization of government and community stakeholders<br>to facilitate M&E activities (e.g. KII, FGDs), and on site<br>visits.  |
|---|---|
| Catalytic effects (financial): Did the<br>project lead to any specific non-PBF<br>funding commitments? If yes, from<br>whom and how much? If not, have any<br>specific attempts been made to attract<br>additional financial contributions to the<br>project and beyond? (1500 character limit) | The United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security<br>(UNTFHS) project co-funded the Midnimo Project. The<br>additional funding was allocated for implementation of the<br>priority community-based projects identified in the<br>community action plans. Additional funding has been<br>secured to scale up the Midnimo Project within existing<br>and new geographical locations. The Peacebuilding<br>Support Office allocated an additional USD 500,000 for<br>the Midnimo project to expand into Balcad district,<br>Hirshabelle State. Funding from the EU-IOM Joint<br>Initiative and the Japan Supplementary Budget provided<br>additional resources to support community prioritized<br>public works that are outside the funding scope of the<br>Midnimo.<br>The integrated city planning approach which links the IDP<br>site plan and city plan as part of the services extension is<br>intended to unlock additional resources and investments<br>from development partners. Example the World Bank has<br>declared readiness to support one of the main roads which<br>connects the city and the IDP settlements in Baidoa. |
| Catalytic effects (non-financial): Did<br>the project create favourable conditions<br>for additional peacebuilding activities by<br>Government/ other donors? If yes, please<br>specify. (1500 character limit)   | The IOM Somalia Stabilization Initiative supported<br>expansion of radio coverage in Jubaland. These efforts<br>were integrated with the Midnimo Project's work with<br>Media INK on airing local radio and TV programmes to<br>enhance the general public's awareness and understanding<br>of the benefits of working together to achieve a common<br>vision as well as messages that promote public<br>understanding about different population groups in mixed<br>settlements. The Jubaland local authorities also facilitated<br>consultations with communities on the IDP policy and is<br>planning to conduct a multiple stakeholder consultative<br>and validation workshop before presenting the policy draft<br>to the cabinet for approval. The creation of an enabling<br>environment, e.g. durable solutions units by the Federal<br>and state governments, has catalyzed a broader   |

| Exit strategy/ sustainability:<br>have been taken to prepare for end of<br>project and help ensure sustainability of<br>the project results beyond PBF support<br>for this project? (1500 character limit)To entrench sustainability of<br>Habitat provided technical and capacity building support to<br>municipal authorities and community leadership. Both<br>have strengthened the capacity of local authorities to<br>facilitate community based planning and participatory<br>community action plan review processes but also drafting<br>of land legislation and town planning concepts.<br>Sustainability and continuity of these initiatives will be<br>strengthened through community structures that have been<br>established and trained to lead on project implementation<br>including Community Action Groups Community Based |  | understanding to tackle protracted displacement.Support<br>for educational facilities kept the young people empowered<br>reducing their vulnerability to social crime/militia groups.<br>Additionally, the project had major engagement with the<br>inter-ministerial and inter-agency task force in Baidoa for<br>voluntary resettling project for creating ownership and<br>sustainability.Deployed community advisors worked as<br>advocates. Their continued work is linked to other project<br>initiatives like Joint Programme on Local<br>Governace(JPLG) and Dhulka Nabaada(Land of peace) for<br>sustainability.The urban profiles are published online for<br>wider dissemination for example www.reliefweb.com.   |
|--|--|--|
| M&E Committees, Community Dispute ResolutionCommittees. Community Action Plans with be consideredas the current District Development Plans to engage a widerange of stakeholders including Diaspora and Businesscommunity. In Baidoa and Kismayo World Bank fundedurban roads projects are following the CAP as part of thecommunity engagement. Most of the current initiatives aresupported by various development organisations. Midnimoproject ensured that community infrastructure projectswere properly handed over to local authorities and relevantline ministries. Soft components of the project, e.g Landlegislation, town planning will continue under successorproject such as JPLG, Dhulka Nabaada and other whilefunding for the follow up initiatives is secured.   | have been taken to prepare for end of<br>project and help ensure sustainability of<br>the project results beyond PBF support<br>for this project? (1500 character limit) | Habitat provided technical and capacity building support to<br>municipal authorities and community leadership. Both<br>have strengthened the capacity of local authorities to<br>facilitate community based planning and participatory<br>community action plan review processes but also drafting<br>of land legislation and town planning concepts.<br>Sustainability and continuity of these initiatives will be<br>strengthened through community structures that have been<br>established and trained to lead on project implementation<br>including Community Action Groups, Community Based<br>M&E Committees, Community Dispute Resolution<br>Committees. Community Action Plans with be considered<br>as the current District Development Plans to engage a wide<br>range of stakeholders including Diaspora and Business<br>community. In Baidoa and Kismayo World Bank funded<br>urban roads projects are following the CAP as part of the<br>community engagement. Most of the current initiatives are<br>supported by various development organisations. Midnimo<br>project ensured that community infrastructure projects<br>were properly handed over to local authorities and relevant<br>line ministries. Soft components of the project, e.g Land<br>legislation, town planning will continue under successor<br>project such as JPLG, Dhulka Nabaada and other while<br>funding for the follow up initiatives is secured. |
| <b>Risk taking:</b> Describe how the project<br>has responded to risks that threatened the<br>achievement of results. Identify any new<br>risks that have emerged since the last<br>report. (1500 character limit)Political risks: Changes in the leadership of ministries and<br>district administrations due to elections and cabinet<br>reshuffles generated risks of delayed implementation of<br>activities. In some cases there was a delay of upto 2<br>months when the presidential campaigns were ongoing. To<br>mitigate the impact, the project teams worked with several<br>focal people at different levels within government<br>ministries and departments to ensure institutional memory<br>and continuation of work.In this regard, the core<br>facilitation teams were helpful.   | has responded to risks that threatened the<br>achievement of results. Identify any new<br>risks that have emerged since the last<br>report. (1500 character limit)       | district administrations due to elections and cabinet<br>reshuffles generated risks of delayed implementation of<br>activities. In some cases there was a delay of upto 2<br>months when the presidential campaigns were ongoing. To<br>mitigate the impact, the project teams worked with several<br>focal people at different levels within government<br>ministries and departments to ensure institutional memory<br>and continuation of work. In this regard, the core<br>facilitation teams were helpful.  |
| Gender equality:In the reportingThe Midnimo project mainstreamed gender through theperiod, which activities have taken placefollowing principles: it ensured representation and  |  |  |

| with a specific focus on addressing issues | participation of women, men, boys and girls in the            |
|--|---|
| of gender equality or women's              | community based planning process and review of                |
| empowerment? (1500 character limit)        | community action plans as well as arts, culture and           |
|  | recreational activities/events. The project collected gender- |
|  | disaggregated data for review and analysis (51% women         |
|  | and 49% men reached through 19 implemented                    |
|  | infrastructure projects). Men and women participated in the   |
|  | community action groups and community-based M&E               |
|  | committees. The agreed modality for public work projects      |
|  | through cash-for-work considered the vulnerabilities, needs   |
|  | and opportunities for both men and women. Location and        |
|  | timing of community-based activities as well as drafting      |
|  | •   |
|  | land legislation, considered gender to facilitate equitable   |
|  | participation and access. Inclusive planning and              |
|  | implementation of community based projects advanced           |
|  | women and girls' equal access to education, healthcare,       |
|  | decent work and representation in political and economic      |
|  | decision-making processes. A female representative from       |
|  | Garbaharey says: "I was working as the community              |
|  | representative and I was among the women who were             |
|  | consulted by the project; based on my experience I            |
|  | provided a number of ideas that have been implemented in      |
|  | the district. Among the recommendations I made include:       |
|  | construction of a meat market in Garbahaaray, construction    |
|  | of MCH center in Garbaharay and construction of a             |
|  | women's hall in Garbaharay." (August 2019)                    |
| <b>Other:</b> Are there any other issues   |   |
| concerning project implementation that     |   |
| you want to share, including any capacity  |   |
| needs of the recipient organizations?      |   |
| (1500 character limit)                     |   |
|  |   |
|  |   |
|  |   |

**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<br>Indicators | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any) | Adjustment of<br>target (if any) |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Outcome 1           | Indicator 1.1             |                       | 0  |                               |   |                                  |
| Government          |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| structures          | Indicator 1.2             |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| and                 |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| institutions at     | Indicator 1.3             |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| federal,            |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| regional,           |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| district and        |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| community           |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| level are           |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| strengthened,       |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| more<br>accountable |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| and                 |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| transparent         |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| and better          |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| able to             |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| respond to          |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| the various         |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| needs of the        |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| population in       |                           |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators  | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)  | Adjustment of<br>target (if any) |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Southern and<br>Central<br>Somalia.  |  |                       |  |                               |  |                                  |
| Output 1.1<br>District<br>and/or<br>community<br>level<br>government<br>representativ<br>es are trained<br>and<br>capacitated<br>to facilitate | Indicator 1.1.1<br>Number of district<br>and/or community<br>level government<br>representatives<br>trained and<br>included in the<br>core facilitation<br>group for<br>community<br>consultations | 0                     | 24                                       | 30                            | Initially the project targeted to train 4<br>core facilitation team members in 6<br>districts. The project expanded to 7<br>districts (including Balcad in Hirshabelle<br>State) and also had 5 people (instead of<br>4) trained in Baidoa and Kismayo to<br>cater for State level project focal points. |                                  |
| durable<br>solutions<br>through<br>participatory<br>inclusive<br>planning,<br>mapping and<br>community<br>driven<br>recovery.                  | Indicator 1.1.2<br>Frequency of<br>follow-up<br>meetings held  | 0                     | Quartely                                 | 27                            |  |                                  |

|               | Performance<br>Indicators | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of                         | Current indicator | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)   | Adjustment of target (if any) |
|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------------------|
|               | mulcators                 | Dasenne               | project<br>Indicator<br>Target | progress          | (II any)                                  | target (II ally)              |
| Output 1.2    | Indicator 1.2.1           | 0                     | 24                             | 35                | Number of target districts increased from |                               |
| Local         | Number of district        |                       |                                |                   | 6 to 7 and government authorities         |                               |
| governments   | level government          |                       |                                |                   | organized quarterly and half yearly       |                               |
| have tools    | authorities               |                       |                                |                   | reviews were they interacted/coordinated  |                               |
| and capacity  | coordinating              |                       |                                |                   | with community leadership.                |                               |
| to lead the   | through regular           |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| coordination  | meetings with the         |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| and           | community                 |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| information   | leadership, leading       |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| management    | the implementation        |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| of durable    | schedule and              |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| solutions     | interacting with the      |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| interventions | community                 |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| in identified | leadership to             |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| areas         | facilitate planning       |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| impacted by   | and recovery              |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| displacement  | processes.                |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| and returns   | Indicator 1.2.2           | 0                     | 24                             | 24                |   |                               |
| (particularly | Number of                 |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| in support of | government staff          |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| data and      | trained on relevant       |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| analysis      | subjects including        |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| derived from  | data management,          |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
| the planning  | data analysis, and        |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |
|               | use of data               |                       |                                |                   |   |                               |

|               | Performance          | Indicator | End of               | Current indicator | <b>Reasons for Variance/ Delay</b> | Adjustment of   |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
|               | Indicators           | Baseline  | project<br>Indicator | progress          | (if any)                           | target (if any) |
|               |                      |           | Target               |                   |                                    |                 |
| and mapping   |                      |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| processes).   |                      |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| Output 1.3    | Indicator 1.3.1      | 0         | 6 radio, 4 TV,       | 6 radio, 4 TV, 4  |                                    |                 |
| State level / | Number of radio      |           | 4 SMS                | SMS messages      |                                    |                 |
| local radio   | and TV programs      |           | messages             |                   |                                    |                 |
| and TV        | broadcasted, SMS     |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| programs are  | messages             |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| aired and     | disseminated on      |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| SMS           | social cohesion,     |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| messages      | peaceful             |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| disseminated  | coexistence, and     |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| to enhance    | the benefits of      |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| general       | working together     |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| public's      | to achieve a         |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| awareness     | common vision        |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| and           | Indicator 1.3.2      | 0         | 65%                  | 85%               |                                    |                 |
| understandin  | % of audience who    |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| g of the      | participated in the  |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| benefits of   | feedback survey      |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| working       | expressing their     |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| together to   | improved             |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| achieve a     | understanding of     |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| common        | the benefit of joint |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| vision as     | planning and a       |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |
| well as those | common vision.       |           |                      |                   |                                    |                 |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators   | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)   | Adjustment of<br>target (if any)   |
|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| that promote<br>public<br>understandin<br>g about<br>different<br>population<br>groups in<br>mixed settl<br>Output 1.4<br>Regional and<br>municipal<br>legislative<br>and<br>executive<br>bodies are<br>supported in<br>legislative<br>processes for | Indicator 1.4.1<br>Number of bylaws,<br>directives and<br>regulations drafted<br>and ready for<br>approval by<br>competent<br>authorities | 0                     | Target<br>3                    | 2                             | In Jubaland, the government comissioned<br>a private company for land legislation<br>related activities. In addition, delays in<br>the district council formation process in<br>Kismayo and Baidoa hampered by-law<br>drafting; however, in South West State,<br>the Land Law has been endorsed by<br>cabinet decision. | In various<br>consultations with<br>Jubaland<br>government<br>officials, a joint<br>understanding was<br>achieved to focus<br>upon area based<br>planning apporach<br>that fits into |
| the approval<br>of land<br>legislation in  | Indicator 1.4.2   | 0                     | 1                              | 3                             |   | drafted land law<br>(see 1.4.2).<br>Area plans were  |
| relation to<br>the<br>formulation  | Number of Spatial<br>Strategic Plans<br>developed,<br>validated by  |                       |                                |                               |   | supported for<br>Baidoa-North (city<br>extension), Hudur<br>(Pilot to test state   |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators   | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)  | Adjustment of<br>target (if any)  |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---|
| of area/town<br>plans  | stakeholders and<br>ready for approval<br>by authorities  |                       |  |                               |  | land legislation<br>procedures), and<br>for wider Midnimo<br>Village Area in<br>Kismayo.  |
| Outcome 2<br>Output 1.5:<br>Regional and<br>municipal<br>legislative<br>and<br>executive<br>bodies are<br>supported in<br>the<br>development<br>of toolkits to<br>facilitate<br>management<br>of existing<br>IDP<br>settlements,<br>site selection<br>for creation | Indicator 2.1<br>Indicator 1.5.1:<br>number of toolkits<br>developed for:<br>Land use planning<br>in IDP settlement,<br>Spatial<br>development plans,<br>Land dispute<br>resolution | 0                     | 3  | 3                             | 4 Urban Profiles plus manual; 3 socio-<br>economic surveys in Baidoa, Kismayo<br>and Hudur; 1 toolkit for demographic<br>estimates | Toolkits were<br>developed for<br>urban profiling, for<br>using Kobo<br>Toolbox as open<br>data collection,<br>and for<br>undertaking<br>population survey<br>estimates with sat.<br>imagery. Four<br>urban profiles<br>were validated<br>through core<br>facilitation teams<br>with local and state<br>authorities and<br>translated partially<br>into Somali. |
| of new   | Indicator 2.2   |                       |  |                               |  |   |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators  | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any) | Adjustment of<br>target (if any)   |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| settlements<br>and<br>settlement<br>upgrading  | Indicator 2.3  |                       |  |                               |   |  |
| Output 2.1<br>Output 1.6:<br>A strategic<br>framework to<br>devise spatial<br>responses<br>dealing with<br>conflict<br>prevention in<br>relation to<br>HLP issues,<br>land use,<br>settlement<br>locations and<br>selection,<br>settlement<br>upgrading, | Indicator 2.1.1<br>Indicator 1.6.1:<br>Framework<br>document agreed<br>upon with the<br>relevant authorities<br>and stakeholders | 0                     | 1  | 1                             |   | A communities of<br>practice -approach<br>was pursued to<br>assist and facilitate<br>re-settling<br>activitites in<br>Baidoa with IDP<br>settlement<br>planning and<br>planned city<br>extension through<br>an inter-agency,<br>municipal and<br>inter-ministerial<br>taskforce with ToR<br>and workplan led<br>by IOM-CCCM. |
| prevention of<br>hazards that<br>may impact  | Indicator 2.1.2  |                       |  |                               |   |  |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators   | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)  | Adjustment of<br>target (if any)   |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| on<br>livelihoods is<br>in place and<br>used by<br>relevant duty<br>bearers  |   |                       |  |                               |  |  |
| Output 2.2<br>Output 1.7:<br>Terms of<br>reference for<br>land dispute<br>resolution<br>commissions<br>at regional | Indicator 2.2.1<br>Indicator 1.7.1:<br>Number of final<br>draft terms of<br>reference aligned<br>with the Regional<br>Constitution ready<br>for approval<br>Indicator 2.2.2 | 0                     | 1  | 0                             | As stated above Jubaland government<br>installed a Land Commission without<br>direct engagement of the programme. In<br>SWS, the formation of the commisson is<br>linked to the approval of the drafted land<br>legislation (see 1.4.1). However at local<br>level 2 land commissions were installed<br>(Baidoa/Kismayo) | Follow-up<br>activities will<br>continue under<br>PBF supported<br>Dhulka Nabaada<br>and JPLG. |
| level are<br>developed   |   |                       |  |                               |  |  |
| Output 2.3   | Indicator 2.3.1<br>Indicator 2.3.2  |                       |  |                               |  |  |
| Output 2.4   | Indicator 2.4.1<br>Indicator 2.4.2  |                       |  |                               |  |  |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators  | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress  | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)  | Adjustment of<br>target (if any) |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Outcome 3<br>Output 2.1:<br>Community<br>defined<br>socio-<br>economic<br>groups are<br>formed,<br>inclusive of<br>all members<br>of the<br>community<br>and | Indicator 3.1<br>Indicator 2.1.1:<br>Number of<br>individuals<br>participating in<br>community based<br>planning process<br>disaggregated by<br>gender and socio-<br>economic status | 0                     | 1200                                     | 1277 (712 male<br>and 565 female)<br>comprising youths,<br>orphans, widows,<br>disabled, livestock<br>farmers, crop<br>farmers,<br>entrepreneurs,<br>religious leaders,<br>IDPs, returnees<br>and vulnerable<br>host community<br>members. |  |                                  |
| participating<br>fully in the<br>community<br>driven<br>planning<br>processes.   | Indicator 3.2<br>Indicator 2.1.2:<br>Number of core<br>facilitation teams<br>formed and trained<br>Indicator 3.3   | 0                     | 6  | 7  | The project initially targeted 6 districts<br>but it expanded into 7 districts as part of<br>the cost extension. |                                  |
| P. 0000000   | Indicator 5.5<br>Indicator 2.1.3:<br>Number of<br>community driven<br>planning exercises<br>completed  |                       | 12                                       |  |  |                                  |
| Output 3.1   | Indicator 3.1.1  | 0                     | 12                                       | 12   |  |                                  |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators  | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project   | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any) | Adjustment of<br>target (if any) |
|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
|  |  |                       | Indicator<br>Target |                               |   |                                  |
| Output 2.2:<br>Drivers of<br>instability &<br>tensions as<br>well as<br>priority<br>projects for<br>conflict<br>resolution<br>and peaceful<br>coexistence<br>as well as<br>durable<br>solutions and<br>recovery<br>(e.g., basic<br>needs and<br>means to<br>sustain a<br>living) are | Indicator 2.2.1:<br>Number of<br>analysis, visioning,<br>planning and<br>prioritization<br>processes taken<br>place<br>Indicator 3.1.2<br>Indicator 2.2.2:<br>Number of<br>Community Action<br>Plans developed | 0                     | Target<br>12        | 7                             |   |                                  |
| identified<br>through<br>consultative<br>+ particip.<br>visioning,   |  |                       |                     |                               |   |                                  |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators  | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress     | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)  | Adjustment of<br>target (if any) |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| plan. /<br>prioritization  |  |                       |  |                                   |  |                                  |
| Output 3.2<br>Output 2.3:<br>Community<br>action groups<br>(CAGs) and<br>community<br>based<br>monitoring<br>and                                   | Indicator 3.2.1<br>Indicator 2.3.1:<br>Number of CAGs<br>and CBM&Es<br>formed and the<br>number of<br>participants<br>disaggregated by<br>gender | 0                     | 12                                       | 14                                | Additional CAG and CBM&E were<br>formed in the additional district that the<br>project expanded into (Balcad district).      |                                  |
| evaluation<br>committees<br>(CBM&Es)<br>are formed<br>and<br>functioning<br>to ensure<br>participatory<br>planning,<br>implementati<br>on and M&E. | Indicator 3.2.2<br>Indicator 2.3.2:<br>Number of<br>community based<br>monitoring plans<br>developed   | 0                     | 6  | 7                                 | The project initially targeted 6 districts<br>but it expanded into 7 districts as part of<br>the cost extension.             |                                  |
| Output 3.3<br>Output 2.4:<br>Target  | Indicator 3.3.1<br>Indicator 2.4.1:<br>Number of   | 0                     | 2,880                                    | 842,225 (54%<br>female, 49% male) | There is a significant overachievement<br>against targets which can be attributed to<br>the fact that beneficiaries reported |                                  |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators   | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project   | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)  | Adjustment of target (if any) |
|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
|  |   |                       | Indicator<br>Target |                               |  |                               |
| population<br>and<br>communities<br>have<br>improved   | beneficiaries with<br>improved access to<br>basic services and<br>means to sustain<br>their living  |                       |                     |                               | include both direct and indirect<br>beneficiaries drawn from IDPs, returnees,<br>and host communities in the seven<br>districts. |                               |
| access to<br>basic<br>services and<br>means to<br>sustain their<br>living as well<br>as to conflict<br>resolution<br>and<br>community<br>security,<br>through the<br>community<br>driven and<br>defined<br>priority<br>projects for<br>peaceful co-<br>existence,<br>durable | Indicator 3.3.2<br>Indicator 2.4.2:<br>Percentage of<br>returnees, IDPs<br>and host<br>community<br>members who<br>express<br>improvement in<br>their perceptions of<br>their physical<br>safety and security | 0%                    | 50%                 | 97%                           | This is based on external evaluation<br>conducted for the project.   |                               |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators   | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)   | Adjustment of<br>target (if any) |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| solutions and recovery   |   |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| Output 3.4<br>Output 2.5:<br>Selected<br>communities<br>in target<br>locations are   | Indicator 3.4.1<br>Indicator 2.5.1:<br>Number of<br>community<br>advisors hired per<br>pilot project site                   | 0                     | 1  | 1                             |   |                                  |
| supported by<br>technical<br>(community)<br>advisors in<br>the<br>monitoring<br>and selection<br>of<br>community<br>contracts for<br>public works<br>and<br>implementati<br>on of cash<br>for work<br>activities | Indicator 3.4.2<br>Indicator 2.5.2:<br>Number of projects<br>selected by<br>communities are<br>submitted to the<br>advisors | 0                     | 24                                       | 28                            | Additional 4 projects were identified in<br>the new district which the project<br>expanded to |                                  |

|   | Performance<br>Indicators  | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)   | Adjustment of<br>target (if any)   |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Outcome 4<br>Output 2.6:<br>Community-<br>based local<br>dispute<br>resolution<br>committees<br>are trained<br>on land<br>dispute<br>mediation,<br>upgrading<br>and | Indicator 4.1<br>Indicator 2.6.1:<br>Number of<br>committees trained     | 0                     | 7  | 3                             | Due to change in government policy<br>directions in Jubaland towards the state<br>Land commission, no further local<br>committees were formed outside of<br>Kismayo | In South West<br>State decision was<br>made by project<br>supported task<br>force for land law<br>drafting to<br>concentrate first<br>upon the approval<br>of the legislation<br>and policy<br>direction before<br>formation of new<br>committees. |
| resilience to<br>disasters and<br>local<br>building<br>culture<br>(LBC)   | Indicator 4.2<br>Indicator 2.6.2:<br>Number of training<br>sessions held | 0                     | 12                                       | 7 (3 in Baidoa, 4<br>Kismayo) | See 2.6.1   | In Kismayo<br>Midnimo Village<br>trainings at area<br>level were<br>conducted as part<br>of formation of<br>local women<br>committee<br>(activitiy<br>continued under<br>TFHS part of<br>Midnimo).   |

|  | Performance<br>Indicators   | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress      | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any)   | Adjustment of<br>target (if any)   |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
|  | Indicator 4.3   |                       |  |                                    |   |  |
| Output 4.1<br>Output 2.7:<br>Communities<br>reinforce<br>social<br>cohesion and  | Indicator 4.1.1<br>Indicator 2.7.1:<br>Number of<br>community<br>meetings held per<br>target site   | 0                     | 19                                       | 19                                 |   |  |
| reintegration<br>of displaced<br>and refugee<br>returnees<br>through pilot<br>projects<br>focused on<br>neighbourho<br>od-led<br>settlement<br>upgrading,<br>creation of<br>new<br>settlements<br>(mixed use),<br>improved<br>connectivity<br>and services | Indicator 4.1.2<br>Indicator 2.7.2:<br>Number of<br>community<br>selected projects<br>are supported by<br>technical advisors<br>and finalized | 0                     | 4  | 9 (see Appendix<br>list in detail) | High demand for community<br>infrastructure in the project locations as<br>identified in the Community Action<br>Plans: lenghty procedures for large scale<br>projects which would have requested<br>UNON procurement led to a changed<br>approach to implement more smaller<br>projects under delegated authority to UN-<br>Habitat. | Another change of<br>UN-Habitat<br>procurement rules<br>delayed the Balcad<br>Hospital support<br>structure project<br>and will be<br>implemented under<br>Midnimo II. |

|   | Performance<br>Indicators   | Indicator<br>Baseline | End of<br>project<br>Indicator<br>Target | Current indicator<br>progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay<br>(if any) | Adjustment of<br>target (if any) |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| in target<br>clusters of<br>IDP<br>settlements. |   |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| Output 4.2                                      | Indicator 4.2.1<br>Indicator 2.7.3:<br>Number of mixed<br>use settlement<br>areas identified by<br>communities and<br>authorities for<br>small scale<br>resettlement<br>Indicator 4.2.2 | 0                     | 2  | 2                             |   |                                  |
| Output 4.3                                      | Indicator 4.3.1<br>Indicator 4.3.2  |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |
| Output 4.4                                      | Indicator 4.4.1<br>Indicator 4.4.2  |                       |  |                               |   |                                  |

## 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 when do you expect to request the next tranche if applicable:

What is the overall level of expenditure/ commitment against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far:

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

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:

Please fill out and attach the project document Excel budget Annex showing current project financial progress (expenditures/ commitments to date), using the original project budget table in Excel, even though the \$ amounts are indicative only.