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**PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT TEMPLATE**

**PBF PROJECT progress report**

**COUNTRY:** South Sudan

**TYPE OF REPORT: semi-annual, annual OR FINAL** Final report

**date of report:** 26 November 2017 - 26 May 2020

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** Strengthening Dialogue for Peace and Reconciliation in South Sudan  **Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:** 00105733 | |
| **PBF project modality:**  IRF  PRF | **If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:**  Country Trust Fund  Regional Trust Fund  **Name of Recipient Fund:** |
| **List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc):**  UNDP  **List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:**  IOM, UNESCO and UN Women and Civil affairs Department of UNMISS are implementing partners. further, National Dialogue Steering Committee; Secretariat of the National Dialogue; Women in the Leadership of National Dialogue Steering Committee; Eve Organization; Voice for Change; South Sudan National Editors Forum; Association of Media Development in South Sudan (AMDISS); OHCHR; South Sudan Media Authority; South Sudan Media Authority; Community Empowerment for Progress Organization(CEPO); Reconstituted- Joint Monitoring Evaluation Commission(R-JMEC), Eye Radio and Juba Monitor Newspaper. | |
| **Project commencement date[[1]](#footnote-1):** ; 26 November 2017  **Project duration in months:[[2]](#footnote-2)** 30 months | |
| **Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below:**  Gender promotion initiative  Youth promotion initiative  Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions  Cross-border or regional project | |
| **Total PBF approved project budget\* (by recipient organization):**  UNDP:$ 3,000,000        : $        : $        : $  Total: 3,000,000  *\*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO’s approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account*  **How many tranches have been received so far:** 2 | |
| **Report preparation:**  Project report prepared by: Technical Working Group (UNDP, UNWOMEN, IOM, UNESCO, RCO)  Project report approved by: UNDP  Did PBF Secretariat clear the report: Yes. Benjamin Moore, O/DSRSG/RC/HC  Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report:  Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach: evaluation to be undertaken | |

***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. **Overall project progress to date**

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit):

The Project implementing partners have completed most of the activities save for two key activities which were not implemented due to COVID-19 restrictions. These are: Activity 2.3.1: Facilitate forums between CSOs, community leaders and members of youth and community radio listeners’ clubs to provide opportunities for inter-communal and inter-cultural dialogues on reconciliation and peaceful co-existence and activity 2.3.2: Conduct assessment to examine the local population understanding of hate speech and its proliferation in South Sudan and training of journalists and CSOs on media information literacy. The total budget for both activities is $200,000 which will be returned to PBF. Furthermore, a repurposing of less than 15% ($40,161) of Activity 2.4.3: Advocate and facilitate the establishment of the grassroots women dialogue platform in collaboration with the National Dialogue Initiative on Peace and Reconciliation was undertaken towards building women's capacity to respond to COVID 19. The funds were repurposed and used to engage the same targeted groups as planned in the initial activity. Project closure activities including an evaluation is ongoing. Preliminary activities such as development of draft Peacebuilding plan, conflict assessment, mapping of community peacebuilding mechanisms, engagement of women, IDPs and media in grassroots dialogue and displacement tracking matrix (DTM) data generation laid foundation for 2nd phase.

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

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).

Evidence based programming: The project has combined delivery of key services with production of baseline and other data to inform peacebuilding interventions. For example, the SCORE is a unique index that is helping the country assess perception on social cohesion and reconciliation that is very specific to location. The DTM information produced by IOM is also unique data kept on informing the project intervention e.g. Site Flow Monitoring Reports. Conflict assessment ensured the real issues were at the core of project implementation.

Direct involvement with beneficiaries: For the first time in South Sudan, through this project's support to the National Dialogue, citizen voices, aspiration and desires have been heard. Citizens themselves expressed appreciation during the grassroots consultations supported by the project as they said it was the first-time leaders asked for their opinion on issues of peace, leadership and governance.

The use of multiple strategies and actors: Ensured no one is left behind in the collective effort to search for durable peace in the country. Using dialogue platforms, communities who had not been engaged before, were reached. For example, cattle camp youth (nomadic youth who move from place to place with cattle in search of pasture and water) shared their views on peace and reconciliation, during community consultations. Often, they are involved in the communal conflicts and pervasive practices of cattle rustling.

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):

A UN wide peacebuilding plan was developed under the project and is a reference document for all UNAFPs and UNMISS. The Greater Jonglei conflict assessment is being implemented by the Government in response to ongoing inter-communal conflict in Greater Jonglei and Pibor Administrative area (GPA). The Project contributed to improved inclusivity, transparency and credibility of the national dialogue process because of the extensive engagement with refugees and IDPs, opposition political parties and civil society, youth and women. Over 25000 people were engaged directly in the grassroot consultations and 47000 through social media. Six opposition political parties were actively engaged in the ND process. A peace resource centre with internet services was established and 250 journalists trained on conflict and gender sensitive reporting- a training toolkit was produced and shared with journalist and media houses for reference. A first ever South Sudan network for fact checkers was established. Furthermore, a first ever Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index (SCORE) for South Sudan was developed and results for three states are used as baseline. Women leaders in target areas have capacities to participate in peacebuilding and decision-making structures in their communities- 45/132 local leaders are women in Yambio. The voices of cattle camp youth, who have been traditionally excluded from the mainstream discourse were amplified during peace dialogues.

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):

Women in Yambio and Wau are now freely creating their safe spaces to discuss women rights and political participation issues. Ms. Margret Nako (49 years old, Yambio) said “I have been serving the community of Akorogbodi as a Headwoman for 5 years now, but no young woman has ever approached me for guidance on how women can assume local leadership positions. Since the awareness raising of the 35%, women and young girls’ have been coming to my office to ask how to be politically active. I am now mentoring three girls. ”

in Rubkona, Young cattle camp youth appreciate their roles in a peace dialogues in Pakur Cattle Camp in Rubkona said that "as youth with cattle, we understand our problems better, and therefore any decisions that affect us need our participation for it to succeed".

After a peace dialogue organised by UNDP and UNMISS in Chorokol in Eastern Equatoria in 2018, during a recent project monitoring visit a peace committee member noted "there is a decrease in intercommunal conflict and violence as a result of the Chorokol Peace dialogue as follows: community member, business people, NGOs have started moving freely, reduced revenge killing, the community in all sides are respecting the resolution and rule of law, Youth participation in peace process is improved and the use of water and pasture in the valley is undertaken as per the agreed resolution”.

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).

Delay in formation of the Revitalised Transitional Government of National Unity (R-TGoNU affected the organisation of the National Dialogue Conference as the Steering Committee wanted to organise the conference when the Government is in place to allow for even wider inclusivity. When the first tier of the Government (Presidency and Council of Ministers) was finally formed, the country went into a lockdown because of the COVID 19. The delay period was utilised to do more in-depth analysis and studies into some of the issues raised by the National dialogue local consultations and regional dialogues. For example, the issue of access and use of land, type of Government (Federalism/presidential) and also inclusivity and diversity issues were subject to studies and analysis. Reports by experts will inform the National Dialogue Conference. COVID-19 restrictions also led to non-completion of two main activities of the project which were under implemented by UNESCO one of the implementing partners. It was difficult to access field locations and directly interact with beneficiaries. During the rainy season, impassable roads hampered accessibility and movement to sites. IOM’s construction of the of Milk Bar and also access to some project locations in Unity State were significantly delayed. Readjustments were undertaken to prioritize accessible areas.

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

N/A

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

Annex : Draft Peacebuilding Plan

Annex 2: Greater Jonglei Need Assesment

Annex 3: community level peacebuilding mechanisms

* 1. **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:**  Peace and Reconciliation Strengthened

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

**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)?*

Output 1.1: Strengthened dialogue platforms that gather national and international actors:

The UN supported the National Dialogue, the first bottom up and country wide platform for citizen voice and engagement, is bringing tangible change in peacebuilding process. Six political parties are participating, the local consultative process that engaged more than 20000 delegates (33%F) were concluded and regional consultation was also convened with 800 delegates. Over 47000 people have also engaged with the national dialogue through social media after the information strategy was developed and rolled out by the national dialogue secretariat with the support of the UN.

Media coverage and reporting on the ND has improved and, in the process, protected the integrity of the process as the sharing of real time information has reduced the probability of reports being censored and edited. Journalists were trained in gender and conflict sensitive training. An online hate speech platform is in place with over 1000 journalists contributing in fact checking. UN advocacy and support has contributed the release of 31 political prisoners.

Output 1.2: Strengthened participation of better-informed women and women’s groups in dialogue platforms:

As a result of advocacy by the UN, women representation in the leadership of the national dialogue is 33% (there were no women before). The capacity strengthening support provided to women leaders contributed significantly to enhancing the participation of grassroots women in the ongoing National Dialogue process. The reports of the grassroots consultations by the NDSC indicate that female participation exceeded 35 % in most of the regions, similar to provision of R-ARCSS. The reports further noted that women articulated their needs and contributed substantively to the discussions and proposed recommendations, distinct from those of men.

The UN further supported women leaders to establish a Coordination Forum that has helped promote collaboration and cooperation among various women civil society organizations and women leaders and enabled them to unify the women's voice in the peace process. The Coalition of Women of South Sudan and the Women Block were both signatories to the revitalise peace agreement.

Output 1.3: Shared goals and strategies for peace articulated in a UN peacebuilding plan, as well as a national strategy:

To strategically support South Sudan peace process and reinforce UN agencies peace building effort, the project also supported the design of UN-wide Peacebuilding Plan (2018-2021) that guides UN agencies in identification, formulation and coordination between and among UN agencies engaged in peacebuilding processes. A first even South Sudan network for fact checkers was established. Furthermore, a Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index (SCORE) was developed and results for three states are used as baselines for reconciliation

**Outcome 2:**Local and traditional peacebuilding institutions and actors undertake actions to reduce violence at the community and local level in targeted areas

Output 1: Mapping and Assessment of existing support for local dialogue and reconciliation initiatives

The greater Jonglei conflict and need assessment which was completed in 2018 is now is being implemented by the Government in response to ongoing going communal conflict in Greater Jonglei and Pibor Administrative area (GPA).

The UN supported collection of data on flows of IDPs in and out of the PoC and intentions of displaced communities. The Flow Monitoring tracks movement flows of groups and individuals through key points of origin, transit locations, and destination. The flow monitoring exercise indicated a decline in the total volume of flows of people in and out of Bentiu PoC. Results of these surveys will inform the conflict analysis which will be completed during the

Output 2.2.: Community level dialogue mechanism strengthened

The project supported establishment and operationalised 80 county-level gender and diversity inclusive peace committees and trained 1,078 members (39% female). The peace committees resolved 271 disputes/conflict incidences of cattle rustling, child abductions, sexual and gender-based violence and resource utilisation. As a result, 66.4 percent of the communities living in the areas where UNDP operates indicated that the intercommunal conflict and violence decreased in 2018/9 as compared to any other year before (baseline 22.7 percent in 2017).

The UN also supported implementation of 18 local level agreements to mitigate conflict around seasonal cattle migration. The agreements emerged from pre and post cattle migration dialogue conferences supported by the project. The conferences also strengthened relationships between communities that share borders.

The UN further enhanced youth participation in peacebuilding by engaging 77,494 youth in income-generating activities, sports, (volleyball and football for both boys and girls) theatre and arts, cultural activities (traditional wrestling), peace messaging and promotion of social cohesion intergeneration dialogues.

The capacities of thirteen youth led local peace structures to play an active and vital role in prevention and transformation of communal conflicts. In Unity State, 400 youth (43.8% female) from four cattle camp youth associations and 641 youth (32% female) from Bentiu POC were mobilized through peace dialogues and directly capacitated through project interventions.

Three Council of Traditional Authority Leaders (COTALs) in Bor, Aweil and Yambio were supported to have a reflection meeting issues of legal provision for COTAL in the Local Government Act’s and the formation a national COTAL to coordinate councils at the state level. Participants identified enhanced participation and representation of youth and women in COTAL as a participatory condition for proper implementation of customary law. An exchange visit between the COTAL of Western Equatoria State and those of Jonglei and Northern Bhar EL Ghazal was conducted in Yambio for two days.

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

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

**Outcome 3:**

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

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

**Outcome 4:**

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

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

* 1. **Cross-cutting issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **National ownership:** How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit) | The National Dialogue process is nationally owned and driven. The ND was called for by the President in A presidential decree in December 2016. The ND Steering Committee invited the UN system to support the process, but it remained nationally owned. A taskforce, consisting of UNCT Members, UN Mission, IGAD and other partners has been advising the Steering Committee on the ND process. All the support provided by the UN has been in response to request from the ND Steering Committee.  The Greater Jonglei need assessment was undertaken in response to the request by the then Vice President Taban Gai to find solution to ongoing inter-communal violence in Greater Jonglei. The report is not a reference document by a High-Level Committee Set up by the President and Chair by the Vice President Wani Igga, to investigate inter communal violence in Greater Jonglei and Pibor Administrative Areas.  At the subnational level, establishment of local infrastructure for peace and conduct of communal dialogues and conferences has been spearheaded by the South Sudan Peace and Reconciliation Commission (SSPRC) at the National Level, as well as the State peace Commission and Local leaders including COTAL. This not only ensure national and local ownership, but also sustainability.  The development of the Draft Peacebuilding plan was a consultative process that involved the Government Institutions such as the SSPRC, Bureau for Community Security and Small Arms Control and Ministry of Gender |
| **Monitoring:** Is the project M&E plan on track? What monitoring methods and sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. *(1500 character limit)?* | The Project M&E Plan is on track. M&E involved the following  Joint field visits to project site ( UN Women and UNDP to Yambio in 2019 January; UNDP and UNESCO joint field visit to Jonglei in March 2020) and UNDP and IOM field visit to Bentiu in June 2020.  - Monitoring reports from the project’s teams in the field especially in Bor, Yambio Aweil, Rumbek and Juba;  - Indicator monitoring survey was conducted which included some of the project indicators by UNDP.  - Field monitoring visit led by the RCO- to some of the project locations |
| **Evaluation:** Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. *(1500 character limit)* | The project final evaluation is in progress: TOR have been drafted and the process of selecting the Company to conduct the evaluation is ongoing. The evaluation will be completed within six months after project operational closure, COVID 19 restriction withstanding. |
| **Catalytic effects (financial):** Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from whom and how much? If not, have any specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? *(1500 character limit)* | IOM is using the approach of this project to promote peaceful coexistence programming in South Sudan. IOM has received USD 800,000 from Government of Japan to undertake a similar project in Wau, Western Bahr el Gazal.  The project support has catalysed commitments from the Government of Canada which has provided about $600,000 in 2019 to UN Women to support women leadership and participation in the peacebuilding processes.  UNDP has also received additional funding from Sweden for peace building and social cohesion intervention to the tune of USD 12 Million. |
| **Catalytic effects (non-financial):** Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. *(1500 character limit)* | The success of the National Dialogue consultation has created a good environment for the implementation  The local peace structures of the project contributed to the overall success of the Revitalised Peace Agreement by promoting peaceful co-existence and reducing communal conflict.  The increase in trust and community cohesion is creating an enabling environment for the steady increase of returnees in Wau and Bentiu. This coincide with the recent government and other actors National Plan for return and reintegration of IDPs.  The Government showed commitment and led in the implementation of one of the recommendations of the National Dialogue: return of raided cattle’s from Equatoria to Upper Nile, in collaboration with traditional leaders. |
| **Exit strategy/ sustainability:** What steps have been taken to prepare for end of project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? *(1500 character limit)* | The sustainability of project result is anchored in national ownership. Some of the activities are linked with implementation of the Peace Agreement. e.g. issue of the national dialogue will be taken up by the constitution building process.  Direct support of beneficiaries through technical capacity support, capacity building and empowerment with skills such as management, leadership, reconciliation, and equipment of beneficiaries with the relevant knowledge and skills on writing, basic journalism, data collection and packaging peace related content and trained on used of equipment was a strategy adopted to ensure sustainability even after end of the project  It is also expected that local peace architecture will be taken up by government as part of the national peace architecture.  Women and Youth initiatives, like association and groups, of the project are part of the peace structures and linked with the government and other actor’s peace building processes.  Capacity building support is provided for institution such as government offices, Medias and other community structures that will enable them to provide continuous peace building and social cohesion support to the community    The project had been implemented in collaboration with other actors and they will continue reinforcing the project initiatives and results  Economic independencies arising from project interventions are expected to reinforce cooperation among local conflict affected communities in the long- |
| **Risk taking:** Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. *(1500 character limit)* | Slow implementation of the Peace Agreement was posing risk that created mistrust and the community loose interest to participate in peace building interventions. At the strategic level, the SRSG were engaged in continuous dialogue with the parties to implement the peace agreement. At community level, the project used community volunteers and leaders as change agents, and they mobilized the community in peace building and social cohesion interventions. |
| **Gender equality:** In the reporting period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women’s empowerment? *(1500 character limit)* | Involving Youth and Women in peace process is one of the key pillars of the project and two indicators are dedicated for this result. UN Women is one of the recipients of this fund and worked to increase the participation and decision-making power of women in all project location. In this respect women represent 30% of the national dialogue leadership and as of February 2020, 5 out of the 10 villages surpass 35% of women’s leadership position whereas there was no woman in those positions in January 2019. Women, men, boys and girls were actively involved in all activities of the project including in peace building committees, trainings, advocacy efforts and social cohesion activities. |
| **Other:** Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? *(1500 character limit)* | The spread of Corona Virus (COVID-19) and associated restriction in slowed down the last quarter activities. The project continued the implementation of activities by following the precautionary advices of WHO and the Government COVID-19 taskforce. The project also used remote management technique to get real- time information and provide support for community volunteers. |

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

|  | **Performance Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Current indicator progress** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** | **Adjustment of target (if any)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1**  Peace  and reconciliation  strengthened | Indicator 1.1  Participants in dialogue platforms with confidence in peace and security disaggragated by sex | 28% | 55% | 66.8% | This figure is from the indicator monitoring report of UNDP Peace and Community Cohesion Project conducted in July 2019. It will be replaced by the percentage measured in the final evaluation of this report |  |
| Indicator 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.1  Strengthened dialogue platform that gather national and international actors | Indicator 1.1.1  Number of active national participants engaged in interactive public debate / awareness programs- disaggregated by sex and age | 2640 | 4200 | 4500 |  |  |
| Indicator 1.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.2  Strengthened participation of better informed women and women groups in dialogue platforms. | Indicator 1.2.1  Percentage of women actively engaged in dialogue platforms disaggregated by age. | - | 50% | 40%  this is from UNDP Peace and community cohesion project dialogues participants | This figure will be updated from the percentage obtained from the project final evaluation. |  |
| Indicator 1.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.3  Shared goals and strategies for peace articulated in UN peacebuilding plan as well as national strategy. | Indicator 1.3.1  UN peacebuilding plan document | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3.2  Number of actions undertaken to support a common forum for dialogue across conflicting communities. | 36 | 55 | 54 |  |  |
| Output 1.4 | Indicator 1.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2**  Violence reduced at the community level and local levels in targeted areas | Indicator 2.1  No. of violent incidents in target areas. |  | 30% decrease | 368 incidents of conflict have been diffused | The percentage progress will be measured during the final evaluation. |  |
| Indicator 2.2  % of participants in dialogue mechanisms who report increase personal security and safety | 32% | 50% | 58.2% | The percentage is from UNDP peace and community cohesion project final evaluation conclude in January 2020 and will be updated by the final evaluation of this project. |  |
| Indicator 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.1  Preparing scaling up of community and local level dialogue through a mapping and an action plan. | Indicator 2.1.1  Mapping and action plan | 0 | 1 UN mapping and action plan | 1 |  |  |
| Indicator 2.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.2  Community level dialogue mechanism strengthened based on opportunities for long term transformational change. | Indicator 2.2.1  Increase in the no. of communities with dialogue mechanism for conflict based on opportunities for long term conflict and transformation change |  | 50 communities | 62 | 49 peace committees and 13 youth peace groups |  |
| Indicator 2.2.2  Increase in the no of people from different communities benefitting from shared assets and resources in targeted areas. | 520 | 3500 | 3700 |  |  |
| Output 2.3  increase participation and empowerment of women in local dialogue mechanisms | Indicator 2.3.1  No of supported mechanisms that have secured a minimum of 25% women participation |  | 50% | 35 % | This figure is from UN Women report. The contribution of the project for this indicator will be captured by the final evaluation |  |
| Indicator 2.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.4 | Indicator 2.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3** | Indicator 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.1 | Indicator 3.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.2 | Indicator 3.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.3 | Indicator 3.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.4 | Indicator 3.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 4** | Indicator 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.1 | Indicator 4.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.2 | Indicator 4.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.3 | Indicator 4.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.4 | Indicator 4.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |

**PART 2: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS**

* 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:

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and when do you expect to request the next tranche if applicable: 2

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.

1. Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)