

DARFUR COMMUNITY PEACE AND STABILITY FUND (DCPSF)  
Phase 2  
**Revised Terms of Reference**

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Programme title       | DARFUR COMMUNITY PEACE AND STABILITY FUND   |
| Programme Period      | Phase 1: 2008-2011<br>Phase 2: 2011-2017  |
| Budget                | Phase 1: USD 33 million<br>Phase 2: USD 40 million  |
| Goal                  | To achieve local-level peace and stability, and support inclusive and sustainable Darfur-wide peace negotiations.   |
| Expected purpose      | Communities are stabilized, and trust and confidence between communities is restored, paving the way towards early recovery.  |
| Expected Output(s)    | Specific outputs resulting from this project, and contributing to the above, are:<br>Output 1: Effective community-level conflict resolution and prevention platforms in Darfur are in place<br>Output 2: Cooperation between communities enhanced through shared livelihood assets and income generating opportunities.<br>Output 3: Cooperation between competing communities over management of natural resources and access to basic social services increased.<br>Output 4: A network of effective collaborative peacebuilding initiatives created and feeding into wider peace fora and Darfur agendas. |
| Governance Modalities | Multi Partner Trust Fund with the following main bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Steering Committee supported by a Technical Secretariat</li> <li>• Technical Secretariat</li> <li>• UNDP, as Managing Agent</li> <li>• UNDP MPTF Office as Administrative Agent on behalf of Participating UN organizations</li> <li>• Participating UN Organizations and IOM accountable for the funds disbursed to them by the Administrative Agent</li> </ul>  |
| Responsible parties   | NGOs, Participating Agencies, IOM, CSOs   |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>LIST OF ACRONYMS .....</b>                                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>A. PROJECT CONTEXT.....</b>                                | <b>6</b>  |
| Background .....  | 6         |
| DCPSF Rationale.....  | 7         |
| Layers of conflict and their root causes.....                 | 9         |
| <b>B. PROJECT STRATEGY- CONCRETE PEACEBUILDING STEPS.....</b> | <b>12</b> |
| Overview .....  | 12        |
| Lessons Learned .....   | 13        |
| <b>Outputs</b> .....  | <b>17</b> |
| Engagement with other actors .....                            | 19        |
| DCPSF Principles for Funding .....                            | 20        |
| <b>C. RESULTS FRAMEWORK.....</b>                              | <b>22</b> |
| <b>D. RISK ANALYSIS.....</b>                                  | <b>45</b> |
| <b>E. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE .....</b>                          | <b>51</b> |
| Steering committee (SC) .....                                 | 51        |
| Technical Secretariat (TS).....                               | 51        |
| Administrative Agent (AA).....                                | 52        |
| Managing Agent (MA) .....                                     | 52        |
| <b>F. FUNDING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.....</b>            | <b>53</b> |
| Contributions to the DCPSF.....                               | 53        |
| Eligibility.....  | 54        |
| Participating Organisations .....                             | 54        |
| Proposal Submission and funding windows.....                  | 54        |
| Value for Money .....   | 55        |
| Funding approval and Disbursement Process .....               | 57        |
| <b>G. PROJECT SELECTION AND APPROVAL CYCLE .....</b>          | <b>58</b> |
| Principles of Project Selection and Award .....               | 58        |
| Composition and Responsibilities of Appraisal Committees..... | 58        |
| Onward Handling.....  | 59        |
| <b>H. MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....</b>                     | <b>59</b> |
| Desk Monitoring and Reporting.....                            | 60        |
| Field Monitoring .....  | 60        |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Spot Checks.....                                 | 61        |
| Community Perception Surveys .....               | 61        |
| Thematic and Regional Studies .....              | 61        |
| DCPSF Partner Meetings .....                     | 61        |
| Commissioned Impact Evaluations .....            | 62        |
| <b>I. REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY .....</b>     | <b>62</b> |
| <b>ANNEX 1: DCPSF STRUCTURE.....</b>             | <b>65</b> |
| <b>ANNEX 2: DCPSF WINDOW 2 GUIDELINES.....</b>   | <b>66</b> |
| <b>ANNEX 3: BIENNIAL REPORTING TEMPLATE.....</b> | <b>68</b> |
| <b>ANNEX 4. PROGRESS MATRIX .....</b>            | <b>74</b> |

**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| AA         | Administrative Agent  |
| AHCT       | Area Humanitarian Country Team  |
| AUPD/AUHIP | African Union High Level Panel on Darfur  |
| CfP        | Call for Proposals  |
| CHF        | Common Humanitarian Fund  |
| CSO/NGO    | Civil Society Organization/Non-Governmental Organization                        |
| DCPSF SC   | Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund Steering Committee                    |
| DCPSF TS   | Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund Technical Secretariat                 |
| DDDC       | Darfur Darfur Dialogue and Consultation   |
| DFID       | UK Department for International Development                                     |
| D-JAM      | Darfur Joint Assessment Mission   |
| DPA        | Darfur Peace Agreement  |
| Eand CM    | Evidence and Capacity Mapping   |
| GOS        | Government of Sudan   |
| HPS        | Humanitarian Protection Strategy Section (UNAMID)                               |
| IDP        | Internally Displaced Person   |
| IGA        | Income Generating Activities  |
| INGO       | International Non-Governmental Organisation                                     |
| IOM        | International Organisation for Migration  |
| JMST       | Joint Mediation Support Team  |
| MA         | Management Agent  |
| MPTF       | Multi Partner Trust Fund  |
| OECD DAC   | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance |
|            | Committee   |
| RC/HC      | Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator   |
| RCSO       | Resident Coordinator Support Office   |
| SLA/M      | Sudan Liberation Army/Movement  |
| TOT        | Training the Trainers   |
| TS         | Technical Secretariat   |
| UNAMID     | United Nations Mission in Darfur  |
| UNDP       | United Nations Development Programme  |
| UNV        | United Nations Volunteer  |
| USAID      | United States Agency for International Development                              |
| WASH       | Water, Sanitation and Hygiene   |
| WB         | World Bank  |

## A. PROJECT CONTEXT

### BACKGROUND

1. The armed conflict in Darfur Region, which erupted in early 2003, has had severe and lasting consequences on local communities, both pastoralists and sedentary farmers. To date, Darfur presents a particular challenge to crisis prevention, recovery and peacebuilding efforts. Over the past years, civilians have been subjected to systematic and widespread violations of human rights, causing massive displacement and the creation of a huge IDP community in the region. The deterioration of confidence in governance and rule of law institutions are further compounded by the destruction of infrastructure and livelihoods, and the near absence of basic social services. As a result of these destructive dynamics, a huge amount of war-affected people are today fully dependent on humanitarian assistance, in a context where weakened conflict-resolution mechanisms and livelihoods systems have disrupted the social capital. A third of Darfur's population continues to live in displacement camps and whilst evidence suggests an increasing number returning to their lands, the lack of adequate protection may make this movement temporary.
2. Conceived by the Darfur International Partners group and UN, the DCPSF a manifestation of the Darfur Joint Assessment Mission (D-JAM) and was forged on the anvil of optimism that preceded the peace talks in Sirte in October 2007. As a UNDP administered Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF), the DCPSF, established at the end of 2007, seeks to support community-level peacebuilding activities and foster social cohesion by drawing diverse communities together through processes of dialogue and consultations, while at the same time complementing assistance channeled through bilateral and multilateral humanitarian funding streams such as the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF).
3. In order to speedily operationalize the Fund the DCPSF has been shaped by *realpolitik*. The Sirte talks failed to inspire meaningful political dialogue and thus the anticipated umbilical linking the DCPSF to a political process was severed. As a result the DCPSF invested resources in community programming, particularly relating to peacebuilding and conflict resolution. Typically this has focused on identifying a neutral national/international organization to moderate processes of dialogue and consultation and enhances service delivery and community programming. With a portfolio as of 2011 comprising 24 partner projects and an allocation budget of over USD 30 million, the DCPSF has made significant progress in promoting conflict sensitive approaches that seek to engage diverse communities in processes of trust and confidence building. In drawing diverse communities together: Pastoralist/Sedentarist and Host/Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), increased inter and intra tribal cooperation, DCPSF programming promotes equity and thereby lessens tensions and conflict over the sharing of scarce assets and resources.
4. Whilst the DCPSF has applied a pragmatic interpretation of what can reasonably be achieved in Darfur, it was always expected that the dimensions and focus of the Fund would be reviewed in light of contextual changes. As appropriate, the DCPSF needs to evolve to reflect and generate opportunities and realities on the ground and the initial design of the Fund foresaw that it may be a mechanism through which funding for equitable and sustainable growth might flow.<sup>1</sup>
5. Despite the signature of several peace agreements, Darfur still presents a vast range of conflict and crisis related priorities for the UN system in Sudan. Whilst parts of the region continue to

---

<sup>1</sup> UN Sudan. "Darfur: Beyond Emergency Relief." September 2010. <[http://unep.org/disastersandconflicts/Portals/155/countries/sudan/pdf/consultations/Darfur\\_%20Recovery\\_Beyond%20Emergency%20Relief.pdf](http://unep.org/disastersandconflicts/Portals/155/countries/sudan/pdf/consultations/Darfur_%20Recovery_Beyond%20Emergency%20Relief.pdf)>.

require complex humanitarian operations in which preparations for early recovery and livelihoods support operations should begin, in other areas peace and recovery interventions are complicated by ongoing insecurity, natural disasters and political tensions. In all areas, security and recovery priorities overlap and critical interventions must be both conflict sensitive and recovery oriented, preventive in nature, and promoting of long-term peacebuilding and inter-communal reconciliation.

6. Women's situation in Darfur has been affected by economic and social consequences of armed conflict and of traditional cultural practices. One of the immediate impacts of the conflict is the increased number of female-headed households. Women and children comprise of 90% of the people forced out of villages<sup>2</sup> since the early days of the 2003/2004 Darfur conflict. According to the West Darfur Sate Situation Analysis 2011, female-headed households in Darfur are estimated up to 45% while in IDP camps the number increases to 65-70%. Insecurity and violence has become a part of life for many women who have in the recent past become direct targets of structural violence. It left them economically and physically vulnerable by limiting the access to livelihoods opportunities, health and educational services as well as being subjected to rape and other forms of gender based violence. A quick survey carried out by the DCPSF in May/June 2012 indicated that roughly 80% of the adult illiterate population comprises of women. Furthermore, women are still significantly underrepresented in peace negotiations as well as in local community conflict resolution mechanisms.
7. The conflict in Darfur has greatly accelerated the processes of environmental degradation that have been undermining subsistence livelihoods in the area over recent decades. In North Darfur for example precipitation has fallen by a third in the past 80 years says according to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The scale of climate change as recorded in North Darfur is almost unprecedented, and its impacts are closely linked to conflict in the region, as desertification has added significantly to the stress on traditional agricultural and pastoral livelihoods.

## DCPSF RATIONALE

8. The rationale of the fund is that, alongside any progress in the local peace process, the deployment of UNAMID and ongoing emergency relief, there needs to be a community-based, bottom-up approach to the stabilization of Darfur and the creation of conditions for local peace and equitable and sustainable growth.
9. The Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) was signed in 2006 by the government and one faction of the Sudanese Liberation Army/Movement (SLA/M) to stop the 3-year fighting, but lack of support for the agreement does not bode well for its ability to secure peace for the people of Darfur.<sup>3</sup> It is fair to say that the seven-year conflict has been punctuated by a string of broken ceasefires and failed higher level negotiations. Neither side has been able to defeat the other.<sup>4</sup>
10. In July 2011, the Doha Document for Peace in Darfur (DDPD) was signed following intensive, multi-stakeholder consultations in Doha, Qatar. While it is primarily an agreement between

<sup>2</sup> UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. "SUDAN: Militias ravage Darfur in gangs of hundreds." 10 March 2004. <<http://www.irinnews.org/report/48990/sudan-militias-ravage-darfur-in-gangs-of-hundreds>> Accessed 10 March 2006.

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Development Program. "Narrative Regional Workplan for Darfur 2001." <<http://mptf.undp.org/document/download/6871>> Accessed 12 September 2015.

<sup>4</sup> African Union High-level Panel on Darfur. "Darfur: The Quest for Peace, Justice and Reconciliation; Report of the African Union High-level Panel on Darfur October 2009." <<http://reliefweb.int/report/sudan/sudan-darfur-quest-peace-justice-and-reconciliation-report-african-union-high-level>> Accessed 12 September 2015

the Liberation and Justice Movement (LJM) and the Government of Sudan, the signatories have continued to call upon other actors and movements to sign onto the agreement. Its seven chapters provide a comprehensive framework for peace in Darfur that includes the need for rebuilding governance and security institutions, ensuring immediate, mid-term and long-term recovery or livelihoods for individuals and communities affected by the conflict (including IDPs, refugees), supporting community dialogue, justice, truth and reconciliation mechanisms, and, most importantly, identifying funding sources for all of the above through development and reconstruction funds as well as a dedicated bank. The document also includes provisions for a Darfuri Vice-President and an administrative structure that includes both the state structure and a strategic regional authority, the Darfur Regional Authority (DRA), to oversee Darfur as a whole.

11. While the signing of the agreement represented an important step forward in the peace process, and the DDPD provides a basis for reaching a comprehensive political settlement to the Darfur conflict, an inclusive and therefore lasting solution has not yet been reached. Long-term peace in Darfur is inextricably linked to the promotion of sustainable returns, early recovery, reconstruction and development. Against this background, and in line with the new strategy for Darfur launched by the Government of Sudan (GOS)<sup>5</sup> and in order to work towards achieving concrete peace results for the people of Darfur, DCPSF (phase 2) will continue focusing on addressing root causes and triggers of conflict at grass-root and locality level.
12. The DCPSF has become an increasingly well known, non-humanitarian funding mechanism. As a broadly experimental fund, the DCPSF has through its communication strategy sought and succeeded to distinguish itself from humanitarian funding streams. This reflects a conceptual difference in the type of and means through which assistance is delivered. For example, whereas humanitarian support in Darfur is firmly guided by the principles of life saving intervention, the DCPSF has sought to promote conflict sensitive approaches to stabilization that aim to promote trust and confidence across diverse communities. In so doing, DCPSF supported activities and processes enable diverse communities to coalesce around a common agenda leading to reconciliation and peaceful coexistence on a local level.
13. There are a number of key pillars that will continue to underpin the structure of the DCPSF. Chief among these is a formal proposals process that enables the DCPSF to allocate resources in an open and transparent way. Formal calls for proposals (with open or closed deadline) have proven to be a means to effectively allocate resources and DCPSF (phase 2) will continue channeling funds via this process.
14. Other pillars include:
  - a) An evidence and capacity mapping component that will allow the DCPSF (phase 2) to contract individuals or organizations to undertake work that responds to gaps in knowledge and understanding of issues including land management, gender and interaction between native and local government administration;
  - b) A component that seeks to identify credible, representative CSOs/NGOs and invest resources in both strengthening their capacity and ability to priorities, plan, design and implement priority projects leading to equitable and sustainable growth (including livelihoods, vocational training, employability); and

---

<sup>5</sup> Government of Sudan. "Darfur: Towards a new strategy for achieving comprehensive peace, security and development." September 2010. <[http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/300~v~Darfur\\_\\_Towards\\_a\\_New\\_Strategy\\_for\\_Achieving\\_Comprehensive\\_Peace\\_Security\\_and\\_Development.pdf](http://www.operationspaix.net/DATA/DOCUMENT/300~v~Darfur__Towards_a_New_Strategy_for_Achieving_Comprehensive_Peace_Security_and_Development.pdf)> Accessed 12 September 2015.



- c) A capacity development component with a view to increase peacebuilding and monitoring and evaluation capacity skills of partner staff. Intensive training will be provided to respond to gaps in knowledge and learning whilst imbuing partner staff with the necessary skills and competencies to mitigate conflict, address conflict and steer communities towards breaking cycles of violence and build trust and confidence and to measure effectiveness and impact of peacebuilding initiatives.
15. DCPSF programming has tended to be designed along two axes: i) independently brokered processes of dialogue and consultation that lead to the restoration of trust and confidence amongst diverse communities and ii) the delivery of material inputs (programmes and services) that both respond to community needs, whilst underpinning processes of dialogue and consultation. Programmatically there is reasonable variation across the current DCPSF portfolio with partner programmes addressing root causes and triggers of conflict related to grazing rights, land ownership and water scarcity/inequality. In promoting trust and confidence DCPSF programmes endeavor to de-escalate the tensions that exist between diverse communities competing over the assets and resources.
  16. In shaping allocations processes the DCPSF needs to consider realities on the ground. Chief among these is security, and access to rural communities is likely to remain challenging, as it has been in previous years. Further, the expertise and capacity of partner organizations to deliver DCPSF type programming is limited. With the NGO community operating at full tilt and national capacity limited, the DCPSF (phase 2) will need to continue to actively identify, accompany and strengthen partner organizations to deliver programming through future allocation rounds.
  17. Since its introduction, the DCPSF has experienced significant changes both in terms of the structures that guide the workings of the Fund, but also in terms of its strategic focus. Although the initial architecture, notably the utilization of Thematic Working Groups<sup>6</sup> has been replaced by a more general approach that looks to promote trust and confidence between diverse communities by applying conflict sensitive approaches, the DCPSF (phase 2) will also cover equitable and sustainable growth initiatives directly contributing to maintaining stability. Where possible, the DCPSF (phase 2) will capitalize on an improving security situation by expanding its activities towards longer term sustainability. The rationale of the fund is that, alongside any progress at the Darfur peace talks in Doha, the deployment of UNAMID and emergency relief, there needs to be a community-based, bottom-up approach to the stabilization of Darfur and the creation of conditions for local peace and equitable and sustainable growth, as well as the engagement of women and youth in peacebuilding.
  18. It is recognized that peacebuilding processes must include the active participation of men and women. Gender equality and women's empowerment is a core goal of human development and will be actively pursued by the DCPSF as a cross-cutting priority, guided by the UNDP's Eight Point Agenda and the UN Security Council Resolutions 1325, 1820, 1888, and 1889 relating to Women, Peace and Security.

## LAYERS OF CONFLICT AND THEIR ROOT CAUSES

19. As described in the OECD DAC Guidelines on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation, causes of conflict are generally varied and intertwined. It is difficult to delineate clearly or

---

<sup>6</sup> DCPSF. "Terms of Reference" (Phase 1).

weigh the influence of different elements. These can be destabilizing social conditions, such as extreme social disparities and exclusion. A comprehensive and integrated knowledge of the needs for state and civil society to work properly together is key to understanding the origins and dynamics of violent conflict. Indigenous capacities may already exist. Supporting them to the extent possible, and ensuring that they are not displaced, can strengthen the possibilities for peace and development.

20. Structural factors, which must be viewed on a long-term horizon, are those which create a potential climate for violent conflict without, however, making its eruption inevitable. They include such interrelated political, social and economic factors as the level and distribution of wealth and opportunity, the state of the resource base, the structure and ethnic make-up of society, and the history of inter-group relations.
21. Imbalanced economic growth and disparities in the distribution of its benefits can also increase tensions. This can result in the marginalization of vulnerable groups and the neglect of less dynamic regions. These inequalities are particularly important when coupled with increased perceptions of disparity, and a lack of institutions to respond to these inequalities.
22. Ethnic, tribal and cultural differences, in themselves, seldom cause conflict. In an atmosphere of heightened tensions resulting from socio-political conflicts, however, they can offer fertile ground for political exploitation. Competition over shared resources can also contribute to increased tensions, without resilient political means to manage such competition. Localized and regional scarcity of water and productive land (sometimes caused by rapid changes in population density), changes in land tenure systems, environmental disruption or degradation, lead to conflicts over the management, distribution and allocation of resources.<sup>7</sup>
23. As the AUPD describes, the crisis in Darfur consists of three different levels of conflict:
  - local disputes, internal to Darfur, over resources and administrative authority;
  - conflicts between Darfur and the centre of power in Khartoum, relating to the political and economic marginalization of Darfur and power and wealth sharing;
  - an internationalized conflict between Sudan and neighboring countries, specifically South Sudan and Chad.
24. The conflict in Darfur has greatly accelerated the processes of environmental degradation that have been undermining subsistence livelihoods in the area over recent decades. The implication of this is that environmental drivers of conflict have worsened as a result of the current crisis. Darfur suffers both from an overall paucity of resources and a high degree of variability in the availability of resources. This scarcity and variability have required a high level of community management, given that different groups use resources in different ways for their livelihoods. The UN University of Peace conference 'Environmental Degradation as a Cause of Conflict in Darfur', held in Khartoum in December 2004, describes the following links between the environment and conflict:
  - The increase in population density intensifies cropping and grazing;
  - This means shorter fallow periods for fields and overgrazed rangeland;
  - These processes cause deterioration in yields and carrying capacities;
  - Larger areas are needed to support the same yields and herds, but demands and herds are increasing;

---

<sup>7</sup> OECD DAC. "Guidelines on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation." < [www.oecd.org/dac/dacguidelinesandreferenceseries.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/dacguidelinesandreferenceseries.htm) >. Accessed 12 September 2015.

- Herders and farmers compete for access to resources, leading to conflict.
25. All of these layers of conflict must be addressed and resolved for peace, security and reconciliation in Darfur to become a reality. The roots of the Darfur conflict lie at once in its unequal incorporation into Sudan and locally within Darfur itself, its own social, economic and political history, and the particular stresses to which it has been exposed in the past decades.
26. DCPSF partner project reports indicate the following main root causes of local conflict:
- mismanagement of and un-equal access to natural resources including land and water;
  - occupation of (IDP) land by new settlers;
  - crop destruction by animal;
  - reduced grazing areas by increased crop cultivation;
  - blocked animal migratory routes;
  - breakdown in communication between sedentary and nomadic leadership;
  - disconnect between youth and traditional leaders;
  - lack of meaningful opportunities for youth;
  - perception by nomads that their needs are being ignored;
  - power imbalances felt by host farmers and IDPs, and unhealthy relationships between those groups;
  - collapse of traditional justice mechanisms;
  - cattle rustling;
  - looting and harassment by armed groups;
  - denial of access to existing basic services imposed by one community to another;
  - governance vacuum resulting in a weak response of the institutions of governance and rule of law;
  - breakdown and dismantling of the Native Administration structure during years of conflict– a structure that was typically tasked with resolution of community-based conflict.
27. Whilst recognizing that the conflict in Darfur cannot be resolved on a permanent basis unless it is part of a comprehensive process radically to transform the historical legacy of unequal development and political participation in Sudan, Darfuris also point out that the tasks of local reconciliation and finding common solutions to problems internal to Darfur could be achieved by Darfuris using their existing social mechanisms, provided they are given the opportunity to do so.<sup>8</sup>
28. The peace movement gained new momentum in July 2011, when after 20 months of negotiations in Doha, the Government of Sudan and the Liberation and Justice Movement (LJM) signed the Doha Document for Peace in Darfur (DDPD). The proposal included provisions for a Darfuri Vice-President and an administrative structure that includes both the state structure and a strategic regional authority, the Darfur Regional Authority (DRA), to oversee Darfur as a whole. The DRA was officially inaugurated in February 2012 in El Fasher and all Ministries and Commissions were established and political appointments concluded. Preparations are ongoing to meet the agreed milestones in the DDPD and negotiations are progressing to broaden the signatories to the peace agreements. While the signing of the agreement represented an important step forward in the peace process, and the DDPD provides a basis for reaching a comprehensive political settlement to the Darfur conflict, an inclusive and therefore lasting

---

<sup>8</sup> African Union High-level Panel on Darfur. "Darfur: The Quest for Peace, Justice and Reconciliation; Report of the African Union High-level Panel on Darfur October 2009." <<http://reliefweb.int/report/sudan/sudan-darfur-quest-peace-justice-and-reconciliation-report-african-union-high-level>> Accessed 12 September 2015

solution has not yet been reached. Long-term peace in Darfur is inextricably linked to the promotion of sustainable returns, early recovery, reconstruction and development.

29. DCPSF (phase 2) will contribute to this opportunity in supporting community-level driven peacebuilding initiatives which are addressing the above mentioned root causes of conflict.

## B. PROJECT STRATEGY- CONCRETE PEACEBUILDING STEPS

### OVERVIEW

30. In line with AUPD findings, peace within communities is an important but undervalued part of the overall peace process. Indeed, sustainable peace in Darfur must go hand in hand with securing peace within and between these local communities.
31. As described in the AUPD report, there are groups and individuals across Darfur who are working to bring people together. However, their efforts are necessarily limited in scope and remain fragile because of the lack of an overarching peace agreement. Nor do they have the ability to establish security while large parts of the region remain actual or potential battlegrounds between the Armed Movements and the Government, and while there is neither disarmament nor the existence of strong and effective law enforcement agencies. In this regard, the report also refers to the activities of the Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund and suggests that those activities are essential and must be sustained as a prelude to the re-launching of the Darfur Joint Assessment Mission (D-JAM).<sup>9</sup>
32. Lack of trust and confidence between diverse communities, polarized opinions amongst tribal/civil society leaders vis-à-vis processes for reconciliation, high proportion of reconciliation mechanisms functioning without adequate legitimacy, authority or capacity, inadequate representation of vulnerable groups (including women representation), inadequate access to and dissatisfaction with reconciliation mechanisms, widespread tensions over the sharing of assets and resources are just a few concrete examples of the challenges addressed by the DCPSF. In some instances, local power relations have been radically altered during the course of the conflict and communities, which were formerly resident and enjoyed jurisdiction over their land, must now pay for the privilege of farming the land, dependent on the goodwill of those who were their adversaries during the war.
33. The DCPSF mid-term review, carried out under the auspices of the DCPSF Steering Committee in early 2010, revealed that activities and processes supported through the Fund are starting to demonstrate impact and progress in those parts of Darfur where DCPSF projects are implemented though coverage is still limited to specific areas of mostly south and west Darfur.
34. Empirical evidence and DCPSF implementing partners' reports, prove that through the provision of training in peacebuilding, mediation and conflict mitigation skills in more than 60 traditional community based resolution mechanisms, local level reconciliation has become more effective. In DCPSF areas of operation, surveys reveal that crop destruction cases are now being handled more effectively, damage payment systems are improved, trust and confidence in existing or newly established community conflict resolution mechanisms have increased and fear for retaliation has decreased.

---

<sup>9</sup> African Union High-level Panel on Darfur. "Darfur: The Quest for Peace, Justice and Reconciliation; Report of the African Union High-level Panel on Darfur October 2009." <<http://reliefweb.int/report/sudan/sudan-darfur-quest-peace-justice-and-reconciliation-report-african-union-high-level>> Accessed 12 September 2015

35. Over 70 joint income generating (IGA) initiatives have increased cooperation between communities over disputed livelihoods assets and income generating opportunities. Over 20 jointly managed water resources (including large water catchment systems and hafirs) have increased cooperation between competing communities and contributed to restoring trust and confidence. Equal access to basic social services has increased via more than 10 schools and clinics, often focusing on nomadic communities.
36. Acknowledging the continuing need for a community-based approach to the stabilisation of Darfur and given the significant contribution of on-going DCPSF funded programmes to peace and stability, DCPSF (phase 2) will continue supporting local peacebuilding initiatives.
37. Whilst sufficiently broad based to remain consistent with other UN planning frameworks, the DCPSF strategy is bespoke and oriented towards community level peacebuilding and conflict resolution.
38. A window of opportunity exists however for the DCPSF (phase 2) to support innovative initiatives leading to equitable and sustainable growth in Darfur -using lessons learnt from phase 1- deemed necessary to keep those areas which have been stabilized, stable.
39. There is a need for improving NRM and environmental governance by addressing the inequitable access for marginalised groups (including women), supporting the community management of resources, and building capacity for dispute resolution.

## LESSONS LEARNED

### **LESSON 1: NO SUCCESS WITHOUT IN-DEPTH UNDERSTANDING OF LOCAL COMMUNITY DYNAMICS AND PEACEBUILDING SKILLS**

40. As Gareth Evans, President of the International Crisis Group in 2005 noted, "one size of peacebuilding certainly does not fit all, and it is crucial to recognize that every such task - not least every post-conflict peacebuilding situation - is likely to require a quite different approach, adjusting to local circumstances."<sup>10</sup> This is all the more applicable on Darfur where dynamics are volatile. As Evans goes on to note, "it is critical to have a close understanding of both the cultural norms and the internal dynamics of the society that one is trying to rebuild...the planning and execution of projects should be sensitive to local cultures and local dynamics. What also matters is that outside peacebuilders recognize not only what they can do but what they cannot, including taking ownership of another's land, people and culture, even temporarily. If that mindset of taking ownership of another's culture exists by outside peacebuilders, any attempt at building peace-sustaining institutions in that country is destined to fail."<sup>11</sup> Failure to understand local dynamics, underestimation of the complexities of the conflict and neglecting the imperative of local ownership lead to unsuccessful and potentially harmful outcomes.
41. Though time consuming, DCPSF partners' work has shown the importance of an in-depth understanding of the local dynamics in the area of operation in order to be effective.
42. While current DCPSF implementing partners have accumulated a wealth of expertise in conflict sensitive approaches one of the key lessons learned has been the relative limited capacity

---

<sup>10</sup> Keynote Address by Gareth Evans, President, International Crisis Group, to the UN Office at Geneva (UNOG)/Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) Seminar on Security and Peacebuilding: the Role of the United Nations. Geneva, 27 October 2005. < <http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/publication-type/speeches/2005/peacebuilding-six-golden-rules-for-policy-makers.aspx>> Accessed 13 September 2015.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

in peacebuilding skills among DCPSF partner staff. The INGOs rely heavily on national staff to identify conflict issues as well as guiding and implementing the programmes.

43. Following a mapping exercise of key peacebuilding skills required, DCPSF (phase 2) intends to engage an experienced trainer to provide intensive training to respond to gaps in knowledge and learning whilst imbuing partner staff with the necessary skills and competencies to mitigate conflict, address conflict and steer communities towards breaking cycles of violence and build trust and confidence. The peacebuilding staff will be trained as Trainers of Trainers (TOT). As such the staff will use the knowledge and impart it to their beneficiaries.
44. Where appropriate DCPSF (phase 2) the TS will continue to guide, coach and mentor implementing partners. Regular DCPSF partner meetings will also continue to be a means to share lessons learned and where partners can learn from each other. Where appropriate, those meetings could be opened up by inviting DCPSF direct beneficiaries including representatives of traditional justice mechanisms and representatives of vulnerable groups.

## LESSON 2: FOCUS ON NEEDS, NOT CATEGORIES

45. Funding categories (early recovery, humanitarian aid, emergency relief, etc) are part of the current reality of assistance that incentivizes certain activities and behaviors (be it humanitarian, development, peacebuilding, state-building or stabilization).
46. Just as there is a poverty trap, there is significant statistical evidence to suggest a conflict trap as well. Low Income Countries Under Stress (LICUS) face a 15 times greater risk of conflict. And even after a conflict has ended a post-conflict country still faces a 10 times higher risk of relapse into conflict.<sup>12</sup> While DCPSF (phase 2)-supported initiatives will continue to be underpinned by conflict assessments prior to implementation it is critical that DCPSF (phase 2) remains a flexible channel for support that is tailored to community needs coupled with addressing root causes and triggers of conflict rather than in line with predetermined funding categories.<sup>13</sup> Some DCPSF implementing partners mention a high demand by the communities for resources for “recovery” that is not part of their DCPSF projects. DCPSF projects will require a well balanced approach between two principles: “no development without peace” and “no lasting peace without development”.

## LESSON 3: PEACE CAN NOT BE IMPOSED WITH DEADLINES

47. Externally constructed agreements imposed on conflicting parties coupled with deadline diplomacy usually lead to failing peace agreements. As J. Brickhill notes, enduring peace agreements cannot be imposed on the parties, and “in every conflict the ripe moment needs to be reached – where conflicting parties conclude that the cost of conflict is unbearable.”<sup>14</sup>
48. While recognizing that higher level peace negotiations have neither really improved the security situation in Darfur nor led to a comprehensive political solution to the conflict, DCPSF projects have been successful, be it on a local level, in lessening conflicts and restoring trust and confidence among communities. Home-grown solutions to specific root causes and triggers of

<sup>12</sup> The World Bank. “Breaking the Conflict Trap, A World Bank Policy Research Report.” 2003. < [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServlet/WDSP/IB/2003/06/30/000094946\\_0306190405396/additional/310436360\\_200500070100031.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServlet/WDSP/IB/2003/06/30/000094946_0306190405396/additional/310436360_200500070100031.pdf)> Accessed 13 September 2015.

<sup>13</sup> Overseas Development Institute. “Early recovery from conflict: the challenges of integrating humanitarian and development frameworks.” November 2009. < <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/events-presentations/631.pdf>> Accessed 13 September 2015.

<sup>14</sup> Brickhill, J. ‘Protecting Civilians Through Peace Agreements - Challenges and Lessons of the Darfur Peace Agreement.’ 2007. < <http://www.gsdrc.org/document-library/protecting-civilians-through-peace-agreements-challenges-and-lessons-of-the-darfur-peace-agreement/>> Accessed 13 September 2015.

conflict and local ownership as well as grassroots brokered peace negotiations and agreements are key to long-term solutions. Good dialogue processes require time, preparation, goodwill and confidence; they may experience setbacks, sabotage and even derailments; stoicism and persistence are necessary; and one can never tell how long it is going to take - or indeed how long it will take for facilitated dialogue to become self-sustaining.

49. In line with the OEDC DAC principle 9 "Act fast...but stay engaged long enough to give success a chance," DCPSF will fund initiatives that recognize that peacebuilding and restoring trust and confidence is a lengthy process. Recognizing that volatility of engagement is potentially destabilizing, DCPSF (phase 2) will therefore improve support predictability in covering a programme period from 2011 until 2015.<sup>15</sup>

#### LESSON 4: CHALLENGE OF ENSURING WOMEN ARE REPRESENTED

50. As a UNESCO report describes, "situations of armed conflict as well as periods of post-conflict reconstruction provide special challenges for the advancement of gender equality and the protection of women's rights."<sup>16</sup> During conflicts women endure high levels of sexual violence and assault, leading to consequences including HIV infection, pregnancy and other health complications, as well as possible stigmatization and exclusion from their communities. As UNESCO's report further notes, "women [can experience] intense insecurity that comes both from being isolated from their habitual support systems and from the additional physical insecurities often present in situations of forced displacement. However, despite the horrific consequences of conflict for many women, it would be wrong to see women only as "victims" of conflict and to ignore their very important role in peacemaking and conflict resolution."<sup>17</sup>
51. Women's engagement in peace-building is recognized by many international institutions as a crucial element of recovery and conflict prevention – a fact reflected in UN Security Council Resolution 1325, which commits the United Nations and its member states to engaging women in conflict prevention and peace-building. Further UN Security Council Resolutions have emphasized the need to protect the rights of women during armed conflicts, to prevent sexual violence, and to fully integrate women into post-conflict reconciliation and reconstruction processes. In particular, Resolution 1820 and Resolution 1888 highlight the ongoing crisis of sexual violence used as a tactic of war, and call for the immediate cessation of this type of violence.
52. However, DCPSF (phase 1) revealed limited female involvement in community-based reconciliation mechanisms. With some success, umbrella Natural Resource Committees set up separate women groups to deal with women's needs. Women's voices are not traditionally heard at the community level when it comes to conflict mitigation and reconciliation.<sup>18</sup> Other studies show similar trends:

*Trying to address women's underrepresentation and to find influential women, various international organizations have shown a specific interest for the 'hakkama', women war singers who commemorate past victories and encourage fighters for upcoming battles...but it is also debatable whether their songs express their own views or merely reflect the sentiments of their community or its male leaders.<sup>19</sup>*

<sup>15</sup> OECD DAC. "Fragile States (and Situations) Principles." < <http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/>>.

<sup>16</sup> UNESCO. "Conference Report: Gender and Post-Conflict: Promoting Participation of Women in Post-Conflict Reconstruction" < [http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SHS/pdf/gender\\_confreport\\_22062011.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SHS/pdf/gender_confreport_22062011.pdf)> Accessed 12 September 2015

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> DCPSF. Annual Report 2009. < [http://mptf.undp.org/document/search?fund=DPSoo&document\\_areas=fund,project&go=true](http://mptf.undp.org/document/search?fund=DPSoo&document_areas=fund,project&go=true)> Accessed 13 September 2009.

<sup>19</sup> Murphy, T. Tubiana J. Civil Society in Darfur. Special Report 249. September 2010. < <http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/Civil%20Society%20in%20Darfur%20-%20Sept.%202010.pdf>> Accessed 13 September 2015.

Various DCPSF (phase 1) partners did involve the 'hakkama' women in singing for peace, but their impact is yet to be seen.

53. Having said that, given the context of Darfur, it is critical to improve women's capacities as change agents in supporting peacebuilding and early recovery in conflict affected regions. In addition, a result of the survey recommended to a) better access of education for both women and girls, through formal and civic education and b) affirmative action to give women better chances at leadership, c) improve women's economic power through income generating activities. Guidance will be developed during the CfP process as well as the scoring sheets for applicants in line with the UNDP's Eight Point Agenda and the UN Security Council Resolutions relating to Women, Peace and Security.

## **LESSON 5: RESTORATION OF EQUITABLE AND SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE IS KEY FOR RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT**

54. Darfur lies on the edge of a desert, in an area that suffers both from an overall paucity of resources and from a high degree of variability in the availability of resources. As a result of population growth, climate change, poor governance and conflict, it faces immense environmental challenges.
55. Given the role of environmental degradation and the failure of environmental governance in undermining Darfur's livelihoods and fostering conflict, environmentally sensitive recovery and development and peacebuilding programming aimed at building capacities to respond to these challenges is key.
56. There are signs that by promoting programming around natural resource management, opportunities exist to protect the fragile resource base and to support the structures by which it is governed. In this way, programming may be undertaken in a way that promotes conditions for sustainable peace in areas relating to natural resources.
57. Environmental impact assessments and conflict-sensitive approaches should be a standard requirement for all DCPSF interventions.

## **LESSON 6: THE BENEFITS OF A "DO"SCENARIO OUTWEIGH THE COSTS OF A "DO-NOTHING"SCENARIO**

58. Peacebuilding activities bring about changes that tend to be more qualitative than quantitative, and affect attitudes and relations rather than concrete structures, and usually bear fruits only in the long-term. This only makes measuring impact more complex. However, there is overall evidence of the benefits of a do-scenario:
59. 'Since the 1990s more conflicts have successfully ended through negotiated settlements than through armed settlements: between 2000 and 2005 negotiated outcomes were four times as numerous as armed victories. However, it must not be forgotten that the longer-term success of these negotiated outcomes is as yet unknown, and inevitably fragile, as the case of Sudan currently illustrates.'<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Fisher S, Zimina L. Just Wasting our Time? Provocative Thoughts for Peacebuilders. Berghof Handbook Dialogue Series No. 7. 2009. <<http://www.gsdr.org/document-library/just-wasting-our-time-provocative-thoughts-for-peacebuilders/>> Accessed 13 September 2015.



60. In line with the above, DCPSF (phase1) has successfully contributed to processes leading to several tribal agreements over the use of natural and physical resources including water, roads and land use between conflicting communities. Community driven negotiations resulted in locally brokered agreements at community level and engaged the participation of all stakeholders including traditional leadership, local administration, often facilitated by DCPSF partners and UNAMID. The importance of dialogue processes will continue to be a key principle for DCPSF (phase 2) initiatives as they prove to be an effective means to end local conflicts.

## OUTPUTS

Following the revision of DCPSF result framework in November 2013; DCPSF outputs were reduced from 5 to 4 outputs. While output one is maintained as is, output two was re-worded and output three and four were merged together. The last output which became output four was revised in a way to ensure that community peace interventions will feed into wider peace fora and agenda in Darfur. The updated outputs are:

### **OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE**

61. In line with recommendations in recent DfID papers on traditional justice, continued support to (traditional) justice mechanisms is required. Acknowledging that traditional mechanisms are not perfect is not a reason to withhold support and rejection of certain elements of traditional justice does not amount to a rejection of traditional justice entirely. In fact, the core of traditional mechanisms is still valued in Darfuri society. However the task is to adjust the mechanisms to changing demands.<sup>21</sup> Recognizing that a high proportion of community-level reconciliation mechanisms function without adequate legitimacy, authority or capacity, DCPSF will support at least 130 community based conflict resolution mechanisms.
62. Initiatives eligible for funding comprise capacity development in peacebuilding, facilitation, conflict mitigation, participatory approach, record keeping, community mobilization, community awareness campaigns on crop destruction and deforestation.
63. Given the high number of mechanisms lacking adequate representation of vulnerable groups including women and youth, IDPs or returnees, at least 90 conflict resolution mechanisms will have at least one member of each vulnerable group effectively representing their interests.
64. DCPSF will encourage mutual learning. Current DCPSF implementing partners and suggestions from several traditional justice mechanisms indicated the need for contacts among themselves to learn from one another's' experience and to promote their work.
65. Where possible and appropriate, the Fund will encourage creating more effective civil society organizations in the justice sector, will promote stronger links between formal and informal justice systems and will pilot mechanisms to increase equal access to justice.

---

<sup>21</sup> UN Sudan. "Darfur: Beyond Emergency Relief." September 2010. < [http://unep.org/disastersandconflicts/Portals/155/countries/sudan/pdf/consultations/Darfur\\_%20Recovery\\_Beyond%20Emergency%20Relief.pdf](http://unep.org/disastersandconflicts/Portals/155/countries/sudan/pdf/consultations/Darfur_%20Recovery_Beyond%20Emergency%20Relief.pdf)>.

## **OUTPUT 2: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITIES ENHANCED THROUGH SHARED LIVELIHOOD ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES ACTIVITIES**

66. With widespread tensions over the sharing of assets and resources in Darfur there is a need to support initiatives that deliver collaborative livelihoods and IGAs and increase equitable access for all, including IDPs and returnees.
67. The DCPSF will support at least 220 community initiatives that deliver collaborative livelihoods and income generating strategies which result in an increase of commercial transactions across Darfur between diverse communities by 30%.
68. Whilst markets exist across Darfur, many are segregated by communities or need to be rehabilitated. The DCPSF will support rehabilitation of at least 15 markets targeted as a means to enable diverse communities to interact/cooperate and restore Darfur's role as a distribution centre in the region.

## **OUTPUT 3: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMPETING COMMUNITIES OVER MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ACCESS TO BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES INCREASED**

69. Growing competition for, uneven access to and inequitable and weak management of scarce resources continue to heighten tensions between diverse communities and are fuelling conflict locally.
70. DCPSF will continue supporting initiatives including community-led water harvesting focusing on fair and effective harnessing of water resources. At least 200 water catchment systems, dams, water pumps are targeted.
71. Aside from competition over natural resources, unequal access to basic social services (including education and health) are equally sources of anxiety between communities locally and between Darfur and other states in Sudan. Particularly (labor) market relevant vocational training is key for providing healthy alternatives and opportunities to youth, desperate to make a living and easy target for criminal activities even further destabilizing Darfur.
72. In order to ensure equal access to diverse communities to basic social services, DCPSF will support at least 110 education and health initiatives.
73. Baseline-data show that there is a considerable need in increasing the number of well equipped schools, offering the proper physical environment. At least 50 new or rehabilitated, well equipped schools will be targeted while preferably using innovative sustainable building techniques including Soil Stabilized Blocks.
74. Baseline data show that a majority of the rural population does not have reasonable access to primary health services and infrastructure. The number of people with reasonable access to primary health care services should increase by 400,000 by the end of the programme.

## **OUTPUT 4: A NETWORK OF EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVE PEACEBUILDING INITIATIVES CREATED AND FEEDING INTO WIDER PEACE FORA AND DARFUR AGENDAS**

75. In facilitating processes that seek to restore trust and confidence, concurrent to upgrading community services and programmes, DCPSF (phase 2) - through its implementing partners - hopes to demonstrate the value that peaceful coexistence can bring to target communities.

The aggregated impact and learning of DCPSF sponsored initiatives will be systematically catalogued by the DCPSF TS. Whilst the DCPSF (phase 2) does not overestimate its influence in terms of advancing peace in Darfur, it is hoped that demonstrable progress at a community level, will inform wider peace fora and Darfur agendas.

76. Demonstrating the impact of community level peacebuilding/conflict resolution initiatives the world over is notoriously hard to ascertain. For Darfuris to overcome the deep-rooted tension and suspicion that exists between many diverse communities, requires more than simple processes for restoring trust and confidence. DCPSF funded community-oriented initiatives have the potential to inform broader peace processes. As such, output 5 will result in:
- DCPSF becomes a repository of best practices in promoting grass roots level peacebuilding and conflict resolution in the context of Darfur shared with actors and stakeholders in the wider peace fora and Darfur agendas<sup>22</sup>;
  - the work sponsored through the DCPSF informs the development of future early recovery processes;
  - a clearer sense of priority regarding the allocation of future resources;
  - a deepened understanding of community dynamics, notably sources of tension, models of negotiation and resolution and capacity/credibility of civil society arbitration;
  - a systematic monitoring of operational progress to gauge the impact of DCPSF sponsored peacebuilding and dispute resolution initiatives;
  - lessons learned from ongoing initiatives factored into future programming decisions.

## ENGAGEMENT WITH OTHER ACTORS

77. With a view to promote greater consistency and coherence within the peacebuilding and conflict resolution agendas and to effectively feed community level demands into the broader peace domain, DCPSF TS will engage with other actors including:
78. Government authorities at state and regional level: Many DCPSF partners have already established fruitful cooperation with line ministries particularly with regard to themes relating to agriculture, grazing areas, migratory routes, education or WASH. This network of contacts will be utilized to advocate conflict sensitive approaches in programming and implementing early recovery activities. While DCPSF (phase 2) will continue focusing on community level initiatives, increased engagement with local government institutions will be encouraged, particularly on a local and state level, including locality commissioners and (deputy-) governors with a view to advocate conflict sensitive programming. The DCPSF will also actively engage with the Darfur Regional Authority to ensure that DCPSF interventions are in line with DRA's efforts to implement the stipulations outlined in the DDPD as well as to ensure that support is provided to the DRA if and where necessary.
79. UN Country Team and the Humanitarian Country Team: To ensure that activities supported by the DCPSF are complementing ongoing broader emergency relief and early recovery efforts in the region and to support a smooth transition towards longer term stability and development in the region, the DCPSF TS will engage with the UN Country Team and the Humanitarian Country Team through the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator, including regular briefings on ongoing activities, joint monitoring visits, sharing of lessons learned and input into UNCT and HCT activities and strategy development.

---

<sup>22</sup> See also next section, 'Engagement with other actors'

80. Bilateral and multilateral funding partner initiatives: The DCPSF TS will actively engage with bilateral funding partners (including the “traditional” as well as the “emerging” funding partners) as well as multilateral funding partners (including but not limited to the World Bank and the African Development Bank). The engagement will aim at: (i) ensuring that the DCPSF supported activities are complementary to other ongoing initiatives receiving funding through bilateral/multilateral channels; (ii) continuously sharing information and lessons learned from past and ongoing initiatives; and (iii) informing and providing synergies with bilateral engagement strategies in the region.
81. African Union/United Nations Hybrid operation in Darfur (UNAMID): The DCPSF TS will actively engage with relevant sections of UNAMID to ensure that activities are well coordinated and facilitate the sharing of information and lessons learned with a view to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of DCPSF supported interventions. Specifically, the TS will liaise with the following UNAMID sections:
- Civil Affairs: The Civil Affairs Section is a civilian component in UNAMID that works at the social, administrative and sub-national political levels to facilitate the implementation of the UNAMID mandate and to support the population and government in creating and strengthening conditions and structures conducive to sustainable peace in Darfur.
  - Humanitarian, Protection Strategy Coordination (HPS): HPS is the forefront of UNAMID’s actions to help Darfur make the transition from conflict to recovery and development. The issues they work on range from information-sharing to facilitation and support in the provision of humanitarian assistance. The division develops policies relating to the protection of civilians and facilitates the return of refugees and internally displaced persons. It is the custodian of UNAMID’s Protection of Civilian strategy.
  - Human Rights: The Human Rights Section monitors, investigates early warning and reports on human rights violations, sexual gender-based violence (SGBV) and abuses.
  - Gender Unit: It’s a section that works for gender mainstreaming in all aspects of UNAMID activities, especially as it concerns the peace process, women rights, development and their adequate participation and representation in all aspects of society in line with the various Security Council resolutions passed to promote the rights of women.
82. In order to engage with different actors, the DCPSF TS will make use of existing coordination fora, such as the state-level Peacebuilding Working Groups, the Early Recovery and Recovery coordination forum, and Area Humanitarian Coordination Teams, which will be the most suitable discussion and feedback mechanism.

#### DCPSF PRINCIPLES FOR FUNDING

83. In order for project proposals to be eligible for funding, they need to:
- Be based on a conflict assessment that addresses root causes as well as manifestation of conflict where rapid intervention might be necessary;
  - Inclusive and participatory in nature, project inception, design, implementation and in terms of community-wide benefits received;
  - Have a clear conflict prevention, reconciliation and peacebuilding component with clear actions that build and consolidate social capital, social cohesion, and inter-communal reconciliation;
  - Include distinct components by which the capacity of community-based institutions for mitigating risk and preventing future conflict is enhanced and institutionalized;

- Respond to immediate stabilization and recovery goals while taking into account long-term growth and development where peace dividends are consolidated and expanded;
- Projects involving community initiatives for sustainable growth must be part of decision-making on community priorities and promote cooperation among communities in their desire to work together to resolve their differences; and ensure that they jointly plan, implement and manage their common interests.
- Projects must address the participation of and engagement with women and demonstrate gender equality in their activities, with clear methodology of how women and youth will be engaged in all aspects of the project and especially in peacebuilding and conflict resolution mechanisms as much as possible. Projects must disaggregate the beneficiaries to indicate male and female including youth.
- Projects must include an analysis of the environmental and social impacts of the proposed project to ensure these considerations are factored into decision-making, design and execution. Environmental impacts include the physical, biological and social interactions surrounding a specific activity. The proposal must identify ways for preventing, minimizing, mitigating, or compensating for adverse consequences and for enhancing positive ones.

## C. RESULTS FRAMEWORK

2011-2013

| <b>PROJECT TITLE: DARFUR COMMUNITY PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND (PHASE 2)</b>   |   |  |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Purpose:</b> Communities stabilized and trust and confidence between communities is restored paving the way towards early recovery                     |   |  |   |   |  |   |
| <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline 2010</b>  | <b>Milestone 1 (2011)</b>  | <b>Milestone 2 (2012)</b>   | <b>Milestone 3 (2013)</b>   | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>   | <b>Sources</b>  |
| % of female and male community members sampled declaring that trust and confidence is restored  | A high proportion of community members, outside DCPSF areas of operation, indicate a lack of trust and confidence between diverse communities | 30%  | 50%   | 80%   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spoilers interfere in the processes necessary to restore trust and confidence</li> <li>• Lack of access and insecurity problems delay the implementation of outputs necessary to achieve the purpose</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>• Feedback from DDDC consultations</li> <li>• Focus groups</li> </ul> |
| % of tribal/civil society leaders both men and women sampled agreeing to a common and/or collaborative approach on how to address root causes of conflict | Polarized opinion exists amongst tribal/civil society leaders vis-à-vis process for reconciliation  | 60% of tribal/civil society leaders sampled share a common understanding of reconciliation initiatives | 75 % tribal/civil society leaders sampled advocating for coherence and consistency in | 75% tribal/civil society leaders sampled agree on the process for | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tribal leaders/local and central government are willing to agree, promote and implement common reconciliation agendas</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>• Feedback from DDDC consultations</li> <li>• Focus groups</li> </ul> |

| <b>PROJECT TITLE: DARFUR COMMUNITY PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND (PHASE 2)</b>   |               |                    |   |  |                       |   |
|---|---------------|--------------------|---|--|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Purpose:</b> Communities stabilized and trust and confidence between communities is restored paving the way towards early recovery |               |                    |   |  |                       |   |
| Indicator   | Baseline 2010 | Milestone 1 (2011) | Milestone 2 (2012)                      | Milestone 3 (2013)                               | Risks and assumptions | Sources   |
|   |               |                    | implementing reconciliation initiatives | and implementation of reconciliation initiatives |                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local leadership and peacebuilding study</li> <li>Monitoring media reports on decline (or rise) in tension in areas where DCPSF-funded programmes are implemented</li> </ul> |

| <b>OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE</b> |  |  |   |   |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Indicator  | Baseline 2010  | Milestone 1 (2011)                       | Milestone 2 (2012)                                  | Milestone 3 (2013)                                  | Risks and assumptions  | Sources   |
| Number of community based resolution   | Outside DCPSF areas of operation, a high proportion of mechanisms, function without adequate | 30 community based resolution mechanisms | 30 additional community based resolution mechanisms | 30 additional community based resolution mechanisms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New or reformed platforms lose credibility after being established due to inability to meet expectations</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>Feedback from DDDC consultations</li> <li>Focus groups</li> </ul> |

| OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE            |   |   |  |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Indicator  | Baseline 2010   | Milestone 1 (2011)  | Milestone 2 (2012)   | Milestone 3 (2013)   | Risks and assumptions   | Sources   |
| mechanisms <sup>23</sup> functioning effectively   | legitimacy, authority or capacity   | functioning effectively   | functioning effectively  | functioning effectively  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoilers interfere in the process of increasing legitimacy and capacity of mechanisms</li> <li>Existing community based resolution mechanisms are receptive to new ideas and techniques</li> </ul>   |   |
| Number of vulnerable group representatives (women, youth, minorities) within community based resolution mechanisms | Outside DCPSF areas of operation, a high proportion of mechanisms lack adequate representation of vulnerable groups | In at least 20 resolution mechanisms at least one member of each vulnerable group representing their concerns | In at least 20 additional resolution mechanisms at least one member of each vulnerable group representing their concerns | In at least 20 additional resolution mechanisms at least one member of each vulnerable group representing their concerns | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Though vulnerable groups are represented, their representative are unable to voice the concerns of their constituencies</li> <li>Existing community based resolution mechanisms are willing to accommodate the views of vulnerable groups</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul> |

<sup>23</sup> Including Reconciliation Committees, Peace Committees, NRMs, Water Management Committees, Legal Aid networks



| <b>OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE</b> |  |                           |                           |                           |  |   |
|--|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline 2010</b>   | <b>Milestone 1 (2011)</b> | <b>Milestone 2 (2012)</b> | <b>Milestone 3 (2013)</b> | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>   | <b>Sources</b>  |
| % of community members with access to and satisfaction with reconciliation mechanisms                          | Outside DCPSF areas of operation, a high proportion of community members declare not having access to and dissatisfaction with reconciliation mechanisms | 50%                       | 70%                       | 70%                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficulties in monitoring as community members might not be willing to share sensitive information on satisfaction with reconciliation mechanisms</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul> |

| <b>OUTPUT 2: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITIES OVER DISPUTED LIVELIHOODS ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES INCREASED</b> |   |                           |                           |                           |  |   |
|---|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline 2010</b>  | <b>Milestone 1 (2011)</b> | <b>Milestone 2 (2012)</b> | <b>Milestone 3 (2013)</b> | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>   | <b>Sources</b>  |
| Number of community initiatives that deliver collaborative livelihoods and income generating                                    | Outside DCPSF areas of operation, widespread tensions over the sharing of assets and resources, fuelling conflict | 40                        | 60 additional             | 70 additional             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited availability of opportunities for collaborative livelihoods and IGAs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul> |

**OUTPUT 2: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITIES OVER DISPUTED LIVELIHOODS ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES INCREASED**

| Indicator  | Baseline 2010  | Milestone 1 (2011) | Milestone 2 (2012) | Milestone 3 (2013) | Risks and assumptions  | Sources   |
|--|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| strategies (including joint labor, transactions)                           | between communities  |                    |                    |                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope for diversifying and creation on new livelihoods and enhancing income generating opportunities exist</li> </ul> |   |
| % in increase of commercial interactions between target sample communities | Outside DCPSF areas of operation, transactions between diverse communities are impeded by a lack of trust and confidence | 10%                | 20%                | 30%                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contingent on the progress of livelihoods and income generation projects</li> </ul>                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul>   |
| Number of new/re-established markets                                       | Whilst markets exist across Darfur, many are segregated by community   | 5                  | 10                 | 10                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to markets is</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>Tufts/FIC Livelihoods Vulnerability and Choice programme</li> </ul> |

**OUTPUT 2: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITIES OVER DISPUTED LIVELIHOODS ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES INCREASED**

| Indicator   | Baseline 2010                             | Milestone 1 (2011) | Milestone 2 (2012) | Milestone 3 (2013) | Risks and assumptions | Sources  |
|---|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--|
| that enable diverse communities to interact/cooperate | thereby inhibiting the free flow of trade |                    |                    |                    | maintained/enhanced   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNDP CSO/NGO Livelihoods Mapping and Capacity Assessment</li> </ul> |

**OUTPUT 3: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMPETING COMMUNITIES OVER ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES AND BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES INCREASED**

| Indicator  | Baseline 2010   | Milestone 1 (2011) | Milestone 2 (2012) | Milestone 3 (2013) | Risks and assumptions  | Sources   |
|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| Number of community initiatives jointly managing water resources (water points, hafirs, bore wells, water pumps etc) | Access to and the management of water resources across Darfur is uneven | 30                 | 50 additional      | 70 additional      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoilers interfere in the equitable delivery and management of resources</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul> |

**OUTPUT 3: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMPETING COMMUNITIES OVER ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES AND BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES INCREASED**

| Indicator  | Baseline 2010   | Milestone 1 (2011) | Milestone 2 (2012) | Milestone 3 (2013) | Risks and assumptions   | Sources   |
|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Number of joint education and health initiatives | Reports indicate that a lack of availability and equitable access to education/health initiatives are a source of tension | 20                 | 20 additional      | 30 additional      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoilers interfere in the equitable delivery and management of services</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul> |

| <b>OUTPUT 4: EQUITABLE AND SUSTAINABLE GROWTH AND ACCESS TO BASIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROMOTED, WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO ENSURING THAT STABILISED RURAL AND URBAN AREAS REMAIN STABLE</b>          |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline 2010</b>  | <b>Milestone 1 (2011)</b>   | <b>Milestone 2 (2012)</b>   | <b>Milestone 3 (2013)</b>   | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>  | <b>Sources</b>   |
| Number of civil society organizations able to prioritize, plan, design and implement priority projects leading to equitable and sustainable growth (including livelihoods, vocational training, employability) | Mapping assessments suggest weak capacity of Darfuri civil society in advocating, planning and implementing priority projects leading to equitable and sustainable growth | At least 9 additional civil society organizations are able to advocate, plan and design priority projects | At least 9 additional civil society organizations are able to advocate, plan and design priority projects | At least 9 additional civil society organizations are able to advocate, plan and design priority projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited absorption capacity and availability of adequate CSOs</li> <li>There is an interest amongst key stakeholders including INGO sector to upgrade Darfuri civil society</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul>  |
| Number of well equipped new or rehabilitated schools   | Baseline data indicate a need for well equipped new or rehabilitated school infrastructure  | 5   | 15 additional   | 15 additional   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>Statistical data from Ministry of General Education</li> </ul> |

|  |   |        |         |         |  |   |
|--|---|--------|---------|---------|--|---|
| % in increase of enrolment in formal or non-formal (vocational) training | Consultation processes suggest that increased availability of alternative (vocational) training to all Darfuris is essential in maintaining stability | 10 %   | 15 %    | 25 %    |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul>   |
| Number of people with reasonable access to primary health care services  | Baseline data indicate a majority of rural communities do not have proper access to primary health care services                                      | 50,000 | 100,000 | 300,000 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient primary health care personnel will be available</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>Statistical data from Ministry of Health</li> </ul> |

**OUTPUT 5: EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVE DCPSF GRASSROOTS PEACEBUILDING INITIATIVES COLLECTED AND FED IN WIDER PEACE FORA AND DARFUR AGENDAS**

| Indicator   | Baseline 2010  | Milestone 1 (2011)  | Milestone 2 (2012)   | Milestone 3 (2013)   | Risks and assumptions  | Sources   |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Number of best practices in peacebuilding identified and shared with stakeholders and fora in the wider peace fora and Darfur agendas | Feeding in best practices in the wider peace fora and Darfur agendas can be enhanced | At least 2 events organized whereby DCPSF best practices are shared | At least 2 additional events organized whereby DCPSF best practices are shared | At least 2 additional events organized whereby DCPSF best practices are shared | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an interest amongst key stakeholders to be informed</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Events reports produced by the DCPSF TS</li> </ul> |

| <b>OUTPUT 5: EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVE DCPSF GRASSROOTS PEACEBUILDING INITIATIVES COLLECTED AND FED IN WIDER PEACE FORA AND DARFUR AGENDAS</b> |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline 2010</b>   | <b>Milestone 1 (2011)</b>   | <b>Milestone 2 (2012)</b>  | <b>Milestone 3 (2013)</b>  | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>   | <b>Sources</b>   |
| Number of activities informing future early recovery processes   | Baseline data indicate a need for effective conflict sensitive early recovery programming and implementation | At least 2 events organized whereby DCPSF best practices are shared | At least 2 additional events organized whereby DCPSF best practices are shared | At least 2 additional events organized whereby DCPSF best practices are shared | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an interest amongst key stakeholders to be informed</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Events reports produced by the DCPSF TS</li> </ul>  |
| % in increase of enrolment in formal or non-formal (vocational) training   | Number of Mand E activities gauging the impact of DCPSF  |   | At least 6 DCPSF flagship projects visited and impact gauged                   | At least 6 additional DCPSF flagship projects visited and impact gauged        |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual reports produced by the DCPSF TS</li> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> </ul> |

*Note on financial envelope and target percentages per output:*

The proposed financial envelope necessary to achieve the above results is estimated at minimum 40 million USD. The estimation is based on the funding level of DCPSF Phase 1 (i.e. around 30 Million USD) which is roughly targeting similar milestones as those mentioned under outputs 1, 2 and 3. The proposed financial envelope also takes into consideration the current absorption capacity of potential implementing partners in the field of peacebuilding and early recovery in Darfur (including constraints related to hiring international and local staff).

Considering funding levels in current DCPSF funded programmes, the estimated target percentages per output is as follows:

- Output 1: Effective community-level conflict resolution and prevention platforms in Darfur are in place: 33%;
- Output 2: Increased cooperation between communities over disputed livelihoods assets and income generating opportunities: 30 %;
- Output 3: Increased cooperation between competing communities over access to natural and physical resources and services: 27 %;
- Output 4: Equitable and sustainable growth and access to basic services and infrastructure promoted, with particular attention to ensuring that (DCPSF) stable rural and urban areas remain stable: 10 %;
- Output 5: Evidence of effective DCPSF grassroots peacebuilding initiatives collected and fed in wider peace fora and Darfur agendas: limited in cost, please see also paragraph 48.



## DCPSF Result framework 2014 -2017

| <b>PROJECT TITLE: DARFUR COMMUNITY PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND (PHASE 2)</b>   |   |                                     |  |  |                                     |   |  |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Purpose:</b> Communities stabilized and trust and confidence between communities is restored paving the way towards early recovery |   |                                     |  |  |                                     |   |  |
| <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Milestone 4 (2014)</b>           | <b>Milestone 5 (2015)<sup>24</sup></b> | <b>Milestone 6 (2016)<sup>27</sup></b> | <b>Target (2017)</b>                | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>  | <b>Sources</b>   |
| % of community members sampled stating that trust and confidence is restored  | A high proportion of community members, indicate a lack of trust and confidence between diverse communities<br><br>92% (2012) <sup>25</sup> | 90%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | 90%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%)    | 90%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%)    | 90%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different types of conflicts that DCPSF does not address (e.g. conflicts between the national and armed groups) do not affect the situation (A)</li> <li>• Willingness of tribal leaders/local and central government to agree, promote and implement common reconciliation agendas (A)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCPSF monitoring visits</li> <li>• DCPSF perception survey</li> <li>• Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>• Narrative based survey tools e.g. SenseMaker, most significant changes.</li> </ul> |
| % of tribal/civil society leaders sampled agreeing to a common and/or collaborative approach on                                       | Polarised opinion exists amongst tribal/civil society leaders vis-à-vis process for reconciliation  | 85%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | 85%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%)    | 85%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%)    | 90%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spoilers interfere (R)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring media reports about tension in areas</li> </ul>  |

<sup>24</sup> Milestone numerical indicators were calculated based on the targets set by partners in the submitted proposal. They will be updated following new call for proposal. The milestone of indicators that require community based survey were determined based on the outcomes of previous perception survey conducted by DCPSF-TS.

<sup>25</sup> DCPSF Perception Survey carried out in January 2013 covering activities from 2012. The survey was conducted only in the areas where DCPSF projects operate.

**PROJECT TITLE: DARFUR COMMUNITY PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND (PHASE 2)****Purpose:** Communities stabilized and trust and confidence between communities is restored paving the way towards early recovery

| Indicator                              | Baseline   | Milestone 4 (2014) | Milestone 5 (2015) <sup>24</sup> | Milestone 6 (2016) <sup>27</sup> | Target (2017) | Risks and assumptions   | Sources                                      |
|--|------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|---|--|
| how to address root causes of conflict | 94% (2012) |                    |                                  |                                  |               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of access and in-security problems (R)</li> </ul> | where DCPSF-funded projects are implemented. |

**OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE**

| Indicator  | Baseline  | Milestone 4 (2014) | Milestone 5 (2015) | Milestone 6 (2016) | Target <sup>26</sup> (2017) | Risks and assumptions  | Sources   |
|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Number of community based resolution mechanisms (CBRM) functioning | A high proportion of mechanisms function without adequate legitimacy, authority or capacity<br>194 (2013) | 63 additional      | 72 additional      | 16 additional      | 360                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing community based resolution mechanisms are willing to accommodate the views of vulnerable groups (A)</li> <li>Support from government institutions for the</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DCPSF monitoring visits</li> <li>DCPSF perception survey</li> <li>Progress reports submitted by</li> </ul> |

<sup>26</sup> This the cumulative targets that represent the overall targets of DCPSF phase II.

| OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE |  |   |   |   |                              |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| Indicator   | Baseline   | Milestone 4 (2014)  | Milestone 5 (2015)  | Milestone 6 (2016)  | Target2 (2017) <sup>26</sup> | Risks and assumptions   | Sources   |
| % of community members with access to CBRM  | 95% (2012)   | 70%<br>(for newly targeted communities)<br><br>95% (maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | 70%<br>(for newly targeted communities)<br><br>95% (maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | 70%<br>(for newly targeted communities)<br><br>95% (maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | 95%                          | <p>conflict resolution mechanisms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of different types of conflicts that CBRM does not address (e.g. conflicts between the national and armed groups) remain unchanged (A)</li> <li>• People are satisfied with the resolutions delivered by the mechanisms (A)</li> </ul> | <p>DCPSF Implementing Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative based survey tools e.g. SenseMaker, most significant changes.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> |
| % of community members stating satisfaction with CBRM   | A high proportion of community members declare not having access to and dissatisfaction with reconciliation mechanisms<br><br>83% (2012) | (maintain 2012 level +/- 5%)  | 85%   | 85%   | 85%                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulties in monitoring as community members might not be willing to share sensitive information on related to cases and conflict reconciliation mechanisms (R)</li> </ul>  |   |

| <b>OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE</b> |   |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                    |  |                |
|--|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>   | <b>Milestone 4 (2014)</b>        | <b>Milestone 5 (2015)</b>        | <b>Milestone 6 (2016)</b>        | <b>Target2 (2017)<sup>26</sup></b> | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>   | <b>Sources</b> |
| % of the number of cases submitted that are successfully addressed   | A high proportion of communal cases are not resolved amicably<br>42% (2014) 2 | 50%                              | 60%                              | 75%                              | 75%                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spoilers disrupt the work of the mechanism(R)</li> <li>• Though vulnerable groups are represented, their representative are unable to voice the concerns of their constituencies (R)</li> </ul> |                |
| % of community members stating an increase in the percentage of cases submitted and successfully addressed     | 56% (2014) 3a   | 70% of sampled community members | 70% of sampled community members | 75% of sampled community members | 75% of sampled community members   |  |                |
| % of community members stating a decrease in communal conflicts because of the presence of CBRM                | 80% (2014) 3a   | 80%                              | 80%                              | 80%                              | 80%                                |  |                |

| OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE |   |                    |                    |                    |                              |                       |         |
|---|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|
| Indicator   | Baseline  | Milestone 4 (2014) | Milestone 5 (2015) | Milestone 6 (2016) | Target2 (2017) <sup>26</sup> | Risks and assumptions | Sources |
| % of CBRM with active participation of vulnerable groups in the decision making process of the CBRM     | A high proportion of mechanisms lack adequate representation of vulnerable groups<br>56% (2013) 4a<br><br>90% | 90%                | 90%                | 90%                | 90%                          |                       |         |

## OUTPUT 2: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITIES ENHANCED THROUGH SHARED LIVELIHOOD ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES ACTIVITIES

| Indicator   | Baseline   | Milestone 4 (2014) | Milestone 5 (2015) | Milestone 6 (2016) | Target (2017)  | Risks and assumptions  | Sources  |
|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Number of community initiatives that deliver collaborative livelihoods and income generating opportunities (including joint labour, trading, community youth and women) | 98 (2012)  | 50 additional      | 52 additional      | 56 additional      | 328 cumulative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope for diversifying and creation on new livelihoods and enhancing income generating opportunities exist (R)</li> <li>• Physical access to market ensured (e.g. existence of roads, transportation, security along the road) (A)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>• DCPSF monitoring visits</li> <li>• DCPSF perception survey</li> <li>• Narrative based survey tools e.g. SenseMaker, most significant changes.</li> </ul> |
| Number of new/re-established markets that enable diverse communities to interact/cooperate  | Whilst markets exist across Darfur, many are segregated by community as a result of the protracted conflict in Darfur, thereby inhibiting the free flow of trade and interaction | 10 additional      | 15 additional      | 4 additional       | 54 cumulative  |  |  |

| <b>OUTPUT 2: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITIES ENHANCED THROUGH SHARED LIVELIHOOD ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES ACTIVITIES</b> |                 |                           |                           |                           |                      |                              |                |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Baseline</b> | <b>Milestone 4 (2014)</b> | <b>Milestone 5 (2015)</b> | <b>Milestone 6 (2016)</b> | <b>Target (2017)</b> | <b>Risks and assumptions</b> | <b>Sources</b> |
|   | 15 (2012)       |                           |                           |                           |                      |                              |                |
| % of community members stating an increase in the economic interventions between diverse communities                                      | 80%(2014) 3     | 80%                       | 85%                       | 85%                       | 85%                  |                              |                |

| OUTPUT 3: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMPETING COMMUNITIES OVER ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES AND BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES INCREASED  |   |                    |                    |                    |   |   |  |
|---|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| Indicator   | Baseline  | Milestone 4 (2014) | Milestone 5 (2015) | Milestone 6 (2016) | Target (2017)                                     | Risks and assumptions   | Sources  |
| Number of community based management mechanisms <sup>27</sup> for natural resource (water, pasture, forest reserves, migration routes, minerals, etc) <sup>28</sup> | 70 (2014) <sup>2</sup>  | 13 additional      | 51 additional      | 36 additional      | 100 cumulative                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community responsiveness/willingness to regeneration of pastureland and reforestation (A)</li> <li>Lack of availability and equitable access to education/health initiatives are a source of tension (A)</li> <li>Supported facilities are accessible to diverse groups (A)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>DCPSF monitoring visits</li> <li>Statistical data from line Ministries.</li> </ul> |
| Number of migratory routes demarcated / cleared /rehabilitated through communal consensus   | Lack of clearly defined migratory routes gives rise to conflicts between farmers and nomads in Darfur<br><br>16 migratory routes (526 Km) (2014) <sup>2</sup> | 3 additional       | 11 additional      | 2 additional       | 16 routes (308 Km of migratory routes demarcated) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spoilers interfere in the equitable delivery and management of resources (R)</li> <li>Sufficient educators and primary health care personnel will be available to serve all communities represented (A)</li> <li>There are enforcement mechanisms to implement the agreed</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DCPSF perception survey.</li> <li>Narrative based survey tools e.g. Sense Makers, most significant changes.</li> </ul>                                |

<sup>27</sup> The information monitored is not the number of infrastructure but the management mechanisms.

<sup>28</sup> This to be disaggregated according to activity ie water, pasture, migration route, minerals, etc in reporting



| OUTPUT 3: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMPETING COMMUNITIES OVER ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES AND BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES INCREASED    |   |                    |                    |                    |  |  |         |
|---|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|---------|
| Indicator   | Baseline  | Milestone 4 (2014) | Milestone 5 (2015) | Milestone 6 (2016) | Target (2017)                                | Risks and assumptions  | Sources |
| Number of areas of restoration of communal pasture/fodder/communal forests  | 11 (5 pasture land, 3 communal forest and 3 resting area for nomads) (2014) 2 | 3 additional       | 4 additional       | 9 additional       | 16 (44060 ha of communal land rehabilitated) | migratory routes demarcation (A)<br>• Indigenous norms and historical rights respected (A) |         |
| % of community members confirming communal consensus around restoration of migratory routes/pasture/fodder/communal forests | 70% (2014) 3  | 70%                | 70%                | 75%                | 75%  |  |         |
| Number of social service infrastructure rehabilitated/newly built <sup>29</sup>   | 184 including 39 joint health and education initiative, 30 schools/classes    | 124 additional     | 52 additional      | 38 additional      | 434 cumulative                               |  |         |

<sup>29</sup> This to be disaggregated by the social service rehabilitated or built i.e. school, clinic, etc. in reporting

| <b>OUTPUT 3: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMPETING COMMUNITIES OVER ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES AND BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES INCREASED</b>  |                                    |                           |                           |                           |                      |                              |                |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>                    | <b>Milestone 4 (2014)</b> | <b>Milestone 5 (2015)</b> | <b>Milestone 6 (2016)</b> | <b>Target (2017)</b> | <b>Risks and assumptions</b> | <b>Sources</b> |
|  | and 115 water facilities (2013) 4a |                           |                           |                           |                      |                              |                |
| % of community members stating an increase in the number of interactions between diverse communities through basic services (health initiatives, schools, vocational education, water) | 81% (2014) 3a                      | 81%                       | 85%                       | 8%                        | 85%                  |                              |                |

| <b>OUTPUT 4: A NETWORK OF EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVE PEACEBUILDING INITIATIVES CREATED AND FEEDING INTO WIDER PEACE FORA AND DARFUR AGENDAS</b>   |  |                           |   |                           |                      |   |   |
|--|--|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Milestone 4 (2014)</b> | <b>Milestone 5 (2015)</b>                                       | <b>Milestone 6 (2016)</b> | <b>Target (2017)</b> | <b>Risks and assumptions</b>  | <b>Sources</b>  |
| Number of civil society organisations develop capacity to prioritise, plan, design and implement projects leading to equitable and sustainable growth (including peacebuilding skills, livelihoods skills, vocational training, etc) | Mapping assessments suggest weak institutional capacity of Darfuri civil society in advocating, planning and implementing priority projects leading to equitable and sustainable growth<br><br>4830 (2012) | 35 additional             | 35 (The mentorship of the CSO identified in 2014 will continue) | 12 additional             | 74 cumulative        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited absorption capacity and availability of adequate CSOs (R)</li> <li>• There are approvals from the Governments to implement peacebuilding activities (A)</li> <li>• There is an interest amongst key stakeholders including INGO sector to upgrade Darfurian civil society (A)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCPSF monitoring visits</li> <li>• Progress reports submitted by DCPSF Implementing Partners</li> <li>• SGPM capacity building evaluation report.</li> </ul> |

<sup>30</sup> These include the 18 running projects that partner with local NGO and CBOs. Each implementing partner has one partner except World Vision has three NEF and CIS have two partners each, and 26 projects are run by the SGPM project.

**OUTPUT 4: A NETWORK OF EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVE PEACEBUILDING INITIATIVES CREATED AND FEEDING INTO WIDER PEACE FORA AND DARFUR AGENDAS**

| Indicator   | Baseline   | Milestone 4 (2014)                     | Milestone 5 (2015)  | Milestone 6 (2016) | Target (2017) | Risks and assumptions   | Sources |
|---|--|--|---|--------------------|---------------|---|---------|
| Number of Civil Society implementing and practicing peacebuilding activities                          | Mapping assessments suggest weak capacity of Darfuri civil society in implementing peacebuilding activities<br>4631 (2012) | 40 additional                          | 40 (The mentorship of the CSO identified in 2014 will continue) | 1 additional       | 41 cumulative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is support from the federal level Government (A)</li> <li>• There is willingness within the high level mechanisms to be connected with conflict based resolution mechanisms and natural resources management mechanisms.</li> <li>• Impartiality and neutrality of the high level mechanisms.</li> </ul> |         |
| Number of collective interaction of conflict resolution mechanisms with higher level Fora and Agendas | 3 (2014) 2   | At least 7 interactions at state level | 26 additional   | 4 additional       | 37 cumulative |   |         |

<sup>31</sup> 20 ongoing projects in 2012 (excluding SGPM) and 26 projects under SGPM

## D. RISK ANALYSIS

| # | Description   | Date Identified  | Type                 | Impact and probability on a scale from 1(low) to 5 (high) | Countermeasures / Mgmt response   | Owner   |
|---|---|--|----------------------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Spoilers interfere in the processes necessary to restore trust and confidence   | During the drafting of DCPSF Phase 2<br>During the implementation of DCPSF Phase 1 | Political, Strategic | P=3, I = 3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urge and support implementing partners to increase inclusive, participatory, inter-community consultations specifically focusing on 1) mitigating risks of spoilers , 2) establishment of early warning mechanisms – all for the purpose of preventing future conflict</li> <li>The project approval cycle foresees the provision of feedback from the field on potential security concerns, via the AHCT</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing Partners</li> <li>DCPSF TS</li> <li>AHCT</li> </ul> |
| 2 | Access to project sites is impossible due to unstable and unpredictable security situation in the 3 Darfur States, continued presence of armed groups; prolonged rainy season, road closures and inaccessibility; | During the drafting of DCPSF Phase 2<br>During the implementation of DCPSF Phase 1 | Political, security, | P=3, I = 4  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of data and political analysis through multiple sources to assess the political risk and urges implementing partners to act on or change implementation plans accordingly as part of the regular monitoring process; assessment mis-</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing Partners</li> </ul>                                 |

| # | Description  | Date Identified   | Type          | Impact and probability on a scale from 1(low) to 5 (high) | Countermeasures / Mgmt response  | Owner  |
|---|--|---|---------------|---|--|--|
|   | safety of staff travelling by road and otherwise                           |   | environmental |   | <p>sions are always cleared by UNDSS who offer security clearances as well road conditions, and armed escorts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request the authorities to improve security and protection</li> <li>• If necessary, suspend DCPSF projects until security on the ground permits quality service delivery.</li> <li>• Encourage implementing partners to factor environmental risks in their action plans</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCPSF TS</li> <li>• AHCT</li> <li>• SC</li> </ul> |
| 3 | Inadequate monitoring due to insecurity, instability and restricted access | <p>During the drafting of DCPSF Phase 2</p> <p>During the implementation of DCPSF Phase 1</p> | Strategic     | P=2, I=3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask implementing partners to increase delegation of Mand E functions to local partners, and sharpening their understanding of indicators for adequately measuring peace and stability</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing Partners</li> </ul>                  |

| # | Description   | Date Identified                            | Type                | Impact and probability on a scale from 1(low) to 5 (high) | Countermeasures / Mgmt response   | Owner   |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
| 4 | Implementing partners become targets because of collaboration with UN or because of unclear or inadequate engagement with authorities | During the implementation of DCPSF Phase 1 | Political, security | P=2, I=3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCPSF TS transparently engages with government on purpose and activities of the Fund, and seeks high-level UN support where/when needed</li> <li>• Reduce exposure through low-profile approach in sensitive areas</li> <li>• Develop and effect a clear, open and continuous communication strategy and manage expectations, pre-empt open communication with key-stakeholders and the wider public</li> <li>• Ensure that the knowledge and capacities of implementation partners in conflict-sensitive programming</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing Partners</li> </ul> |
| 5 | New or reformed platforms lose credibility after being established due to inability to meet expectations                              | During the implementation of DCPSF Phase 1 | Strategic           | P=2, I = 2  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge implementing partners to ensure that platform members are selected according to accepted principles and enjoy community support</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing</li> </ul>          |

| # | Description  | Date Identified                            | Type      | Impact and probability on a scale from 1(low) to 5 (high) | Countermeasures / Mgmt response  | Owner   |
|---|--|--|-----------|---|--|---|
|   |  |  |           |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased community dialogue, peacebuilding training, ensure that projects meet infrastructure and operational needs of platforms during the selection and implementation process</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partners</li> <li>DCPSF TS</li> </ul>              |
| 6 | Though vulnerable groups are represented, their representatives are unable to voice the concerns of their constituencies | During the implementation of DCPSF Phase 1 | Strategic | P=3, I = 3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased information sharing with all stakeholders involved, will guarantee the transparency and foster goodwill and cooperation with the local actors preserving the stakeholders across all groups from mistrust.</li> </ul>                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing Partners</li> <li>DCPSF TS</li> </ul> |
| 7 | Limited absorption capacity and availability of adequate CSOs which negatively impacts implementation and monitoring     | During the implementation of DCPSF Phase 1 | Strategic | P=3, I = 3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased focus on capacity building of CSOs through tailored training sessions and increased partnership between INGO and NNGOs</li> <li>Provide more time for applicants to design proposals in reply to DCPSF Calls for Proposals</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing Partners</li> </ul>                   |



| # | Description   | Date Identified                         | Type                    | Impact and probability on a scale from 1(low) to 5 (high) | Countermeasures / Mgmt response  | Owner   |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|---|--|---|
|   |   |   |                         |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCPSF TS</li> </ul>                                  |
| 8 | Organizational and programme management is challenged by slow recruitment, and overall regulatory environment | During the drafting of DCPSF Phase 2    | Regulatory, Operational | P=4, I=3  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senior-level UN engages with UNDP HR with a view to priorities staffing</li> <li>• Senior-level UN timely engagement with relevant government bodies for expedient issuance of visas and stay permits</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP (HR)</li> <li>• SC</li> <li>• GoNU</li> </ul>   |
| 9 | Fraud and Corruption can jeopardize the impact, and sustainability of DCPSF                                   | During the update of DCPSF phase II TOR | Financial               | P=1, I= 4   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP-FMU provided all IPs with a fraud-mitigation toolkit, highlighting the importance of fraud mitigation. The toolkit also provides guidance for DCPSF to develop and implement effective risk management-based anti-fraud measures.</li> <li>• IPs are required to prepare and submit an Anti-Fraud Policy.</li> <li>• UNDP-FMU will conduct a fraud assessment survey to help design training in fraud mitigation.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP/FMU</li> <li>• Implementing partners</li> </ul> |



## E. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

84. The DCPSF is governed in line with the UN Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) architecture. Specifically, the DCPSF management arrangements will be as follows:

### STEERING COMMITTEE (SC)

85. The overall management of the DCPSF activities is led by a Steering Committee (SC), co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator and a representative of a contributing donor. Based in Khartoum, the Steering Committee includes contributing partners, an appointed INGO representative, and a representative(s) of Participating UN Organization(s). Relevant and interested institutions and donors can participate in the steering committee membership as observer provided their participation is approved by the steering committee members. The Administrative Agent (AA) and the Technical Secretariat (TS) will join as ex-officio members. Membership is not fixed and may include other members if required, including selected peacebuilding and recovery experts to provide technical advice on relevant issues.

This body, inter alia, will:

- a) Mobilize resources in accordance with the needs of an evolving Darfur planning framework and priority interventions;
- b) Provide strategic guidance based on agreed and publicized principles and criteria for the identification of priorities to be funded by the DCPSF, to ensure appropriate support is being provided to communities, target beneficiaries and organizations, and address unresolved areas of overlap or conflict between programmes or projects;
- c) Approve proposals for DCSF funding and issue instructions for disbursement of approved funding for compliant programmes and projects, to the Administrative Agent;
- d) Commission independent evaluations covering review and lessons learned of the DCPSF in its entirety;
- e) Ensure appropriate coordination with any UNAMID initiatives;
- f) Review and approve the consolidated biannual and annual progress and financial reports of the DCPSF submitted by the TS and AA.

### TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT (TS)

86. A Technical Secretariat (TS), oversees the day-to-day management of the Fund, and develops the ground for decision-making processes related to the DCPSF for approval of the Steering Committee. In line with the SC decision in February 2012, the TS is housed by UNDP.

87. The TS, as an impartial entity, provides technical and substantive support to the Steering Committee and streamlines the preparation, decision-making and evaluation processes related to the DCPSF financed activities.
88. The Secretariat shall undertake four functions under one management structure: (i) technical support; (ii) managing call for proposals, (iii) overseeing project appraisal; (iv) ensuring Fund level monitoring of the DCPSF, and (v) regular reporting and communication on DCPSF funded initiatives.
89. The TS consists of eight staff, including the Head of the TS, who is supported by a Peacebuilding Specialist, a Monitoring and Reporting Specialist and 3 national Monitoring Officers, a Reporting and Communication Analyst, and a national Administrative and Finance Associate. The TS falls under the supervision of UNDP's Head of Programme and will be supported by relevant UNDP programme, management support and operation units.
90. With the approval of the SC the TS will commission individual pieces of work that serve to deepen contextual understanding of issues surrounding communities and conflict in Darfur. This in turn will inform future allocations processes. It is the responsibility of the TS to engage potential partners in those activities.
91. TS should prepare annual work plan and budget for approval by the Steering Committee.
92. Visibility: A banner that includes all DCPSF donors logo should be used by DCPSF implementing partners for visibility purpose. Information or publications or website by the implementing partners about the Project, including at conferences or seminars, shall indicate that the Project has received donors funding and display the logo in an appropriate way.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENT (AA)

93. The Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) of the United Nations Development Programme serves (UNDP) as the Administrative Agent (AA) and is responsible for concluding Standard Administrative Arrangements (SAA) with donors and Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with Participating UN Organizations. It receives, administers and manages contributions from Donors. It disburses these funds to the Participating UN Organizations in accordance with the decisions of the DCPSF Steering Committee through its Chair. Finally, the AA prepares and submits financial reports and statements on the DCPSF account to the DCPSF Steering Committee and to each donor that has contributed to the DCPSF.

#### MANAGING AGENT (MA)

94. UNDP will act as Managing Agent (MA) for NGO implemented projects. UNDP's responsibilities as the MA will be executed by the Sudan UNDP Country Office which operates separately from UNDP's role as the Administrative Agent in accordance with UNDP's policy of maintaining clear separation of its dual functions as Administrative Agent and Participating UN Organization under MPTFs and Joint Programmes (see UNDP's Accountability when acting as Administrative Agent in

MPTFs and/or UN Joint Programmes using the pass-through fund management modality). UNDP Sudan as the MA will undertake the following activities:

- a) Coordinate the contracting process on receipt of approved allocation from DCPSF-SC
- b) Ensure timely fund disbursement to NGOs on receipt of approved documents
- c) Follow on quarterly financial progress of the projects based on approved budget
- d) Coordinate project end report along with final financial report from the partners as per the timeline laid down in the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA).
- e) Maintain information on fund disbursement to NGOs.
- f) Provide information to DCPSF-SC on fund utilization by NGOs as required (on a quarterly basis and as needed);
- g) Maintain yearly data base of NGO partners in terms of allocated amount, contract status and fund utilization.
- h) Provide information to DCPSF-SC on the performance of NGO partners, particularly, any critical issues.
- i) Conduct a project level monitoring of achievements at planned activities or verification of the NGOs financial reports.

## **F. FUNDING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS**

### **CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DCPSF**

95. Contributions to the DCPSF may be accepted from governments, inter-governmental or non-governmental organizations, and private-sector organizations. Since the DCPSF will focus on a limited range of priority activities, donor contributions will be accepted as un-earmarked contributions, the allocations of which will be approved by the SC. Contributions to the DCPSF may be accepted in fully convertible currency or in any other currency that can be readily utilized. Such contributions shall be deposited into the bank account designated by the Administrative Agent. The value of a contribution payment, if made in other than United States dollars, shall be determined by applying the United Nations operational rate of exchange in effect on the date of payment. Gains or losses on currency exchanges shall be recorded in the DCPSF account established by the AA to transfer funds to Participating UN Organizations.
96. As an exceptional measure, particularly during the start up phase of the DCPSF (Phase 2), subject to conformity with their financial regulations, rules and directives, Participating UN Organizations may elect to start implementation of project activities in advance of receipt of initial or subsequent transfers from the DCPSF account by using their own resources. Such advance activities shall be undertaken in agreement with the DCPSF SC on the basis of funds it has allocated or approved for implementation by the particular Participating UN Organization following receipt by the AA of an official commitment form or signature of the Standard Administrative Arrangement by donors contributing to the DCPSF. Participating UN Organizations shall be solely responsible for decisions to initiate such advance activities or other activities outside the parameters set forth above.

## ELIGIBILITY

97. Any Participating UN Organization and IOM that has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Administrative Agent is eligible to receive funding from the DCPSF. Through the MA, NGOs, CSOs and other designated institutions or entities may receive funds directly from the DCPSF based on a programme or project document and agreement concluded with such entities. PUNOs can use their normal implementation modality and partner with NGOs and CSOs as required. Use of funds, reporting obligations, liability, audit and other matters relating to the management of the funds provided and the activities shall be addressed in such programme or project agreements in the manner that is customary for the concerned Participating UN Organizations.

## PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS

98. Each Participating UN Organization and IOM shall assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to it by the AA. Each Participating UN Organization shall establish a separate ledger account under its financial regulations and rules for the receipt and administration of the funds disbursed to it by the AA from the DCPSF account. This separate ledger account shall be administered by each Participating UN Organization in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures, including those relating to interest. This separate ledger account shall be subject exclusively to the internal and external auditing procedures laid down in the financial regulations, rules, directives and procedures applicable to the Participating UN Organization.
99. Each Participating UN Organizations and IOM shall carry out its activities contemplated in the approved proposal in accordance with the regulations, rules, directives and procedures applicable to it, using its standard implementation modalities. This includes adherence to the aforementioned principles and criteria for approval of programme or project proposals.

## PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND FUNDING WINDOWS

100. The Technical Secretariat issues policy guidelines to steer the allocation process. These guidelines will specify the available resources apportioned to fund the programme/project of the DCPSF, in line with the Terms of Reference of the DCPSF. Participating UN Organizations and IOM, Non-Governmental Organizations and their partners are requested to submit to the Technical Secretariat proposals for DCPSF funding, in accordance with the policy guidelines.
101. The DCPSF considers two types of proposals for support. The main DCPSF funding window is open to all Participating Organizations and funds will be used to support priority programmes and projects promoting peace and stability in Darfur in line with the DCPSF outputs outlined in the results framework:

102. DCPSF has got two modalities for funding; both of them aim at achieving DCPSF outputs, but differ in the specific fund recipients and the size of the grant. Window one funding is open for national and international NGOs and UN agencies while competition for accessing fund under window two is limited to national NGOs. Both funding modalities aim at achieving the following DCPSF outputs:

- Output 1: Effective community-level conflict resolution and prevention platforms in Darfur are in place
- Output 2: Cooperation between communities enhanced through shared livelihood assets and income generating opportunities.
- Output 3: Cooperation between competing communities over management of natural resources and access to basic social services increased.
- Output 4: A network of effective collaborative peacebuilding initiatives created and feeding into wider peace fora and Darfur agendas.

103. To complement the main DCPSF funding window and with the aim of facilitating access of CSOs working in Darfur to DCPSF funding, a capacity building programme has been created under DCPSF (phase II) which is dedicated to CSOs. This program was initiated to build the financial and administrative capacity of CSOs and enhance their ability to implement peacebuilding activities and interventions. Key advantages of this funding window includes the ability to reach and support a greater number of national partners in Darfur, building the capacity of CSOs to seek and manage larger initiatives for peace and stability, diversifying the portfolio of projects and initiatives, and allowing for a quicker response to catalytic prevention and peacebuilding initiatives and activities.

104. Resources from the DCPSF will be utilized for the purpose of meeting the direct and indirect costs of programmes and projects managed by the Participating UN Organizations, NGOs and CSOs (for the latter two UNDP performing the MA function). Details of such projects, including respective budgets and implementation partners (NGOs, CSOs) will be set out in the relevant programme or project documents. Indirect costs of the Participating UN Organizations recovered through programme support costs will be 8%. In accordance with the UN General Assembly resolution 62/208 (2007 Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review principle of full cost recovery), all other costs incurred by each Participating UN Organization in carrying out the activities for which it is responsible under the Fund will be recovered as direct costs. .

## VALUE FOR MONEY


105. The core governing principle of the DCPSF is to obtain the best value for money, i.e. ensuring the optimal use of resources to achieve the intended outcomes. Best value for money should not be equated with the lowest initial price option rather requiring an integrated assessment of the proposal to ensure that the best results possible are obtained from the money spent, which includes an analysis of various considerations, including reliability, quality, experience, reputation, past performance, cost/fee realism and reasonableness, but also social, environmental and other strategic objectives as deemed relevant and appropriate.

106. In the context of the DCPSF obtaining “best value for money” means selection of projects for funding which presents the optimum combination of life-cycle costs and benefits, which meet the overall objectives of the Fund. The principle of best value for money is applied at the award stage to select the offer that effectively meets the stated requirement. To ensure that best value for money is obtained, the process of soliciting offers and selecting an Implementing partner will:
- “Deliver-as-One,” utilizing PUNOs comparative advantages.
  - Maximize competition;
  - Minimize the complexity of the solicitation, evaluation, and the selection process;
  - Ensure impartial and comprehensive evaluation of solicited offers; and
  - Ensure selection of the Implementing Partner whose offer has the highest degree of realism and whose performance is expected to best meet the overall DCPSF objectives and those outlined in the specific call for proposals.
107. As a key objective of the DCPSF is to identify credible, representative national CSOs and NGOs and invest in both strengthening their capacities and ability to design and implement sustainable peacebuilding and development interventions, value for money considerations might be adapted, especially under the second window for funding, to take into consideration capacity development opportunities for the selected partner organization.
108. Furthermore, the SC will commission a mid-term review of the new governance structure no later than December 2013, to assess the value-for-money progress, taking into account the specific Darfur work environment.



## FUNDING APPROVAL AND DISBURSEMENT PROCESS

109. The DCPSF Project and Funding Approval Process is shown in Figure 1 below.



## G. PROJECT SELECTION AND APPROVAL CYCLE

### PRINCIPLES OF PROJECT SELECTION AND AWARD

110. The DCPSF project selection and approval cycle is governed by the principles of transparency, accountability, value-for-money, equal treatment and non-discrimination. Project proposals submitted for funding are evaluated by Appraisal Committees against a set of eligibility and evaluation criteria set out in the Call for Proposals documentation. Typically, the budget for projects would range between USD 200,000 and USD 1,500,000 for the main window for funding and between USD 100,000 and USD 300,000 for window two.
111. Appraisal Committees play a crucial role in maintaining the integrity of the DCPSF by ranking proposals against principles and criteria that underpin the Fund. The Committees gauge the technical viability of proposals and rank individual proposals according to criteria set out in Call for Proposals documentation. The TS identifies a pool of experts willing to appraise the technical viability of proposals submitted in response to a Call for Proposals. These individuals form a pool of experts available on call.
112. Project proposals should be based on the standard application form enclosed in Annex 5. For each Call for Proposals the DCSPF will issue an updated guidance note for applicants (Annex 6), outlining the application procedures and criteria for evaluation and project selection.

### COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF APPRAISAL COMMITTEES

113. The Appraisal Committees comprise experts with expertise in multi-disciplinary integrated projects covering peacebuilding/conflict prevention, recovery, basic social services, livelihoods and cross cutting issues. The Committees are composed of a chair (usually a non-voting staff member from the DCPSF TS) and an odd number of voting members (minimum 3, maximum 5) depending on availability.
114. The Chairperson is responsible for coordinating the appraisal process in accordance with the procedures set in the call for proposals and for ensuring its impartiality and transparency. The voting members of the Appraisal Committee have collective responsibility for appraising in an impartial manner proposals and are responsible for recommendations taken/made by the Committee. The quality of the applications forms must be assessed on the basis of the appraisal grid attached in the call for proposals containing the appraisal criteria.
115. All members of the Appraisal Committee must sign a Declaration of Impartiality and Confidentiality. Any member of the Appraisal Committee who has a potential conflict of interest with any applicant must declare it and immediately withdraw from the Appraisal Committee. Members of the Appraisal Committee participate as individual experts and do not represent their respective employers' organization.

116. The Appraisal Committees will be composed of selected experts from specialized agencies within Sudan and independent experts contracted specifically for the appraisal process. In order to ensure an impartial and independent appraisal process, experts from specialized agencies within Sudan cannot participate if a proposal from their respective agency is being appraised. In this case the appraisal committee will consist entirely of independent experts.

#### ONWARD HANDLING

117. While the proposals will be appraised against a set of criteria established in the call, the appraisal procedure foresees that actors in the field (AHCT among other competent individuals chosen by the TS) will offer their comments on the feasibility of shortlisted proposals in the specific Darfur context.

118. Following the recommendations made by the selection committee, the DCPSF SC will meet to review proposals either unconditionally or conditionally approve (or reject) shortlisted proposals and request the Administrative Agent/Managing Agent to disburse the funds accordingly.

#### H. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

119. In order to assess impact and capture results of the DCPSF, the TS has developed a comprehensive Mand E framework. The Mand E strategy is guided by the DCPSF Results Framework outlined in Section C and aims at:

- Gaining an improved understanding of the DCPSF funded projects, the conflict sensitivity and the conflict context in which it is being implemented and their interaction processes;
- Assessing operational progress towards achieving outputs and outcomes, while analyzing the results collated from the field;
- Taking into consideration lessons learned from on-going initiatives into future programming/allocation decisions to increase the positive impacts of DCPSF funding on stabilizing areas in Darfur and identify opportunities for equitable and sustainable growth;
- Reviewing current partnerships and informing the formation of new partnerships as needed;
- Measuring the impact of DCPSF in target communities in Darfur through commissioned impact evaluations (undertaken through external evaluators)

120. Monitoring tools include desk monitoring, regular DCPSF partner meetings, field monitoring and the DCPSF Results Framework. As a start, DCPSF projects will all be mapped, geographically and in terms of themes and activities, into UNDP's Crisis and Recovery Mapping and Analysis (CRMA) tool, which will become the basis for onward monitoring of the DCPSF projects, as well as for purposes of information management/sharing (this will be costed and partially financed by the

USD300,000 envelope identified in point 46, and in line with point 12 and output 5 of the DCPSF RRF).

## DESK MONITORING AND REPORTING

121. The TS will conduct regular desk monitoring of DCPSF funded activities. Desk monitoring will be based on a critical analysis of programmatic and financial progress by DCPSF partners obtained through the review of biannual programmatic updates. The TS will work with partners to ensure that reports and updates provide an assessment on processes of promoting trust and confidence at community-level as well as an update on progress made towards the planned outputs. In addition, regular financial updates are to be provided by the partners to the TS. Where necessary, the TS will provide constructive feedback to partners to ensure that their reports and updates provide the necessary information and analysis.

122. Biannual reports submitted by DCPSF partners will (please see Annex 4 for the reporting template):

- Focus on conflict sensitive relevance of the activities carried out in the context of the local conflict dynamics;
- Provide updates in the conflict analysis and identified peacebuilding gaps;
- Provide a Darfur situation analysis summary;
- Describe how the project addresses specific peacebuilding gaps;
- Describe how the project interacts with the conflict context;
- Focus on effectiveness demonstrating to what extent the project achieves its intended outputs;
- Focus on sustainability and partnerships;
- Describe lessons learned, challenges and obstacles;
- Provide recommendations to the DCPSF TS.

123. Through the desk monitoring, the TS will:

- Review biannual and annual reports submitted by DCPSF partners;
- Provide detailed feedback provided via feedback letters and/or regular meetings with field staff;
- Provide tailored advice on how to strengthen the conflict sensitivity of projects and re-direct activities where appropriate;
- Identify opportunities for equitable and sustainable growth.

## FIELD MONITORING

124. Field monitoring will serve the purpose of validation of results reported by DCPSF partners. The emphasis of field monitoring will be on observing and ascertaining credible information on progress made towards the attainment of results as well as their quality and sustainability. Field monitoring activities aim at:

- Obtaining first-hand observation of the project environment and setting;

- Assessing the extent to which the proposed strategies are the most appropriate interventions to address the specific causes of conflict identified during the conflict analysis;
- Verifying data for assessing project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact;

125. Field monitoring activities will be coordinated by the DCPSF TS, and relevant partners, including funding partners will be invited upon request at their own cost.

#### SPOT CHECKS

126. The TS will carry out regular spot checks to assess the implementation of activities in the field. The visits will be structured in a way that they coincide with the performance of critical tasks. Spot-check visits will verify accountability, make recommendations, identify bottlenecks, and rate progress.

#### COMMUNITY PERCEPTION SURVEYS

127. The purpose of community perception surveys is to gauge the community's views in terms of changes in security, peaceful tribal co-existence and reconciliation. The Darfur State-level DCPSF Peacebuilding working groups will be tasked with conducting a series of focus group workshops in their project operation areas to extract opinions on reconciliation and peaceful co-existence. It is planned that such surveys will be undertaken at the beginning of the projects with a view to provide baseline information. Regular follow-up surveys commissioned to independent experts, will serve to assess progress in the stabilization of conflict areas against collected baseline data.

#### THEMATIC AND REGIONAL STUDIES

128. Regular thematic and regional studies may be commissioned to assess the performance of DCSPF using a gender, environment or vulnerable group (youth, women) lens or the performance of DCPSF in specific geographical areas. These studies may be either specific studies or components of a wider commissioned impact evaluation.

#### DCPSF PARTNER MEETINGS

129. Regular DCPSF partner meetings will be:

- A forum open for debate and exchange of information, ideas and lessons learned;
- A tool to facilitate cross-project partnerships.

## COMMISSIONED IMPACT EVALUATIONS

130. Recognizing that DCPSF impacts are contingent on the broader conflict and peacebuilding dynamics in Darfur, the SC will identify an external, professional, and well-reputed evaluation firm/consultant(s) to undertake all evaluations related to the DCPSF-funded programmes, including baseline determination and impact evaluations during Phase II of DCPSF, mid-term and at the conclusion of Phase II, as well as annual evaluations of a sample or all DCPSF projects. The evaluations will:

- a) Aim at measuring the longer-term direct and in-direct effects of specific peacebuilding strategies utilized in DCPSF projects in achieving the DCPSF goal and beyond;
- b) Aim at measuring the contribution of DCPSF programmes in stabilizing Darfur at grassroots level and beyond;
- c) Require a balanced use of quantitative methods and qualitative research aiming to avoid reductionism so that the measurement of quantitative analysis will be sequenced with qualitative impacts;
- d) Evaluations will attempt to gauge the preventive success of DCPSF projects, and what would have occurred in their absence in comparison with what has occurred with the programme implemented, also considering the attribution challenge.

## I. REPORTING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

131. For each project approved for funding from the DCPSF, each Participating UN Organization will provide the Technical Secretariat and Administrative Agent with the following statements and reports prepared in accordance with the accounting and reporting procedures applicable to the Participating Organization concerned. The Participating Organizations will endeavor to harmonize their reporting formats to the extent possible:


- a) Biannual cumulative progress reports by the end of the first following month to the of Q2 and Q4 (31 July and 31 January) DCPSF TS; a revised reporting format is enclosed in Annex 4;
- b) Quarterly progress updates will be submitted, outlining programmatic achievements as well as provisional updates on financial updates;
- c) Annual certified financial statements as of 31 December of each year with respect to the funds disbursed to it from the DCPSF Account, to be provided no later than four months after the end of the calendar year (i.e. by 30 April);
- d) Final narrative progress reports, after the completion of all project activities financed from the DCPSF and including the final year of the DCPSF, to be provided no later than four months into the year following the financial closing of all project activities financed from the DCPSF (i.e. by 30 April);

- e) Certified final financial statements and final financial reports, after the completion of all project activities financed from the DCPSF and including the final year of the DCPSF, to be provided no later than six months into the year following the financial closing of all project activities financed from the DCPSF (i.e. by 30 June).
132. The Administrative Agent shall submit to the DCPSF Steering Committee and the Technical Secretariat - for approval and endorsement and for onward submission to donors that have contributed to the DCPSF - consolidated financial reports based on the statements and reports submitted by the Participating United Nations Organizations in accordance with the following reporting schedule:
- a) Consolidated annual financial reports no later than five months after the end of the calendar year (i.e. by 31 May);
  - b) Consolidated final financial reports after the completion of all project activities financed from the DCPSF and including the final year of the DCPSF, no later than seven months into the year following the financial closing of all project activities financed from the DCPSF (i.e. by 31 July).
133. The Administrative Agent will also provide the Steering Committee and the Technical Secretariat with the following statements on its activities as Administrative Agent, for onward submission to the donors that have contributed to the DCPSF:
- a) Monthly unofficial statements of contributions, commitments and disbursements related to the DCPSF Account available from the MPTF Office GATEWAY.
  - b) Certified annual financial statement ("Source and Use of Funds"), to be provided no later than five months after the end of the calendar year (i.e. by 31 May); and
  - c) Certified final financial statement ("Source and Use of Funds"), to be provided no later than six months into the year following the financial closing of all project activities financed from the DCPSF (i.e. by 30 June).
134. The Technical Secretariat will provide the Steering Committee with the following documents for onward submission to the donors that have contributed to the DCPSF:
- a) Consolidated biannual narrative progress reports, no later than two months after the end of Q2 and Q4;
  - b) Consolidated final narrative progress reports produced by the Technical Secretariat, no later than six months into the year following the financial closing of all project activities financed from the DCPSF (i.e. by 30 June).
135. The DCPSF Steering Committee may also request quarterly narrative progress updates on project activities financed from the DCPSF for consolidation by the Technical Secretariat and onward submission to the donors and the Administrative Agent.
136. Independent "lessons-learned and (impact) evaluation exercises" of the entire operation of the DCPSF will be commissioned by the Steering Committee and the Participating United Nations Organizations. A Mid Term Review will be commissioned by the end 2013 at the latest by the Steering Committee.





**ANNEX 1: DCPSF STRUCTURE**



## ANNEX 2: DCPSF WINDOW 2 GUIDELINES

To complement the main DCPSF funding window that is open to all, and with the aim of facilitating access of national CSOs to DCPSF funding, a second funding window has been developed and will be dedicated to national CSOs. Key advantages of this funding window include the ability to reach and support a greater number of national partners in Darfur, building the capacity of national CSOs to seek and manage larger initiatives for peace and stability, diversifying the portfolio of projects and initiatives, and allowing for a quicker response to catalytic prevention and peacebuilding initiatives and activities.

Taking into account the lessons learned from similar funding windows in UNDP, including the DDR small grants as well as Window 2 of the Joint Conflict Reduction programme (JCRP), this funding window will have the following proposed parameters:

1. **Percentage of the fund:** 10% or a maximum of USD 2 million
2. **Amount of individual grants:** USD 100,000-200,000. This would be a reasonable amount that is in line with existing capacities for national NGOs in Darfur and would not contradict or overlap with the presence of the main funding window
3. **Duration:** 12-24 months. This would be in line with the smaller amounts granted while at the same time granting more flexibility to IPs
4. **Areas of funding:** with a focus on catalytic initiatives and peace dividends, areas of funding remain similar to the overall funding interests of DCPSF, merging soft and hard peacebuilding components including support of local-level, formal and informal peacebuilding processes and actions, as well as recovery initiatives that promote stability, conflict prevention, long-term peacebuilding and reconciliation. DCPSF would also encourage and look favorably upon projects that support the implementation of the DDPD. Strategic priority issues and areas will be identified on the basis of a conflict analysis process that informs the CFP, as well as collected and analyzed CRMA data
5. **Eligibility:** along with the general requirements included in the ToR, the core criterion for this window of funding is to be a registered national NGO/CSO with relevant and valid permits to operate in Darfur, primarily in their area of presence/registration and/or other states in Darfur.
6. **CfP orientation:** the orientation session will be undertaken in English with Arabic translation. During that session (or on other occasions primarily designated for capacity building of national CSOs), important requirements for DCPSF recipients as well as details of the proposal will be shared, including the need for a conflict analysis at the start of each project and how it relates to the project's implementation plan.
7. **Enhancing accountability:** For the purpose of accountability, one experienced and reputable NGO could be sub-contracted to oversee the quality of the work of a set of NGOs, to mentor them and

to strengthen their accountability mechanisms without having any implementation responsibilities.

8. **Language of submission:** a simplified, English language proposal template will be made available to applicants, and applicants will be encouraged to present a synopsis of the proposal in Arabic for review. If the proposal is written in Arabic and translated to English for purposes of submission to DCPSF, and in case the proposal is successful, the translation cost will be considered an eligible cost that can be charged to the project. It will be envisaged that organizations may submit a proposal exclusively in Arabic.
9. **Appraisal Committee:** The composition of the appraisal committees designated to review proposals submitted under this window will include Arabic speakers to enable committee to make deliberations in the language of the proposal.
10. **Reporting:** required narrative reports will be submitted in English (Arabic reporting depends on the availability of Arabic-speaking staff in DCPSF or if UNDP is able to support this function), while financial reports can be submitted in English or Arabic.

## ANNEX 3: BIENNIAL REPORTING TEMPLATE

### BIENNIAL/ ANNUAL REPORT

#### IMPORTANT NOTE

- ✓ Biennial reports should be submitted by 31 July (period 1 January-30 June) and Annual Reports by 31 January (period 1 January-31 December).
- ✓ Please pay specific attention to the achievement of the DCPSF outputs and outcomes while using conflict sensitive baseline data and conflict assessments and; please explain how activities and outputs have contributed to restoring trust and confidence amongst the communities in your project area.
- ✓ The report should emphasize the interaction between the conflict context and the project activities as well as how and if transformative processes of peacebuilding have led to lessening tensions and improving relationships.

Bear in mind that the reporting has the following key objectives:

- ✓ To enhance accountability for the use of resources;
- ✓ To measure the achievement of the **project outputs and DCPSF outputs contributing to the DCPSF purpose using the agreed indicators**;
- ✓ To learn lessons for improved implementation of your own project and the DCPSF as a programme;
- ✓ To share best practices and lessons learned.

Please ensure your report is concise and maximum 6 pages (additional information may be attached to the report).

If you have any questions or concerns, don't hesitate to contact Jennifer Paton, DCPSF Reporting Officer, at [Jennifer.paton@undp.org](mailto:Jennifer.paton@undp.org) and +249 090 018 2884, jenpaton on Skype.

## Cover Page

[INSERT Hi-Resolution Photo/s or other images, please email as attachment to Jennifer.paton@undp.org]

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Name of the organization:</b></p> <p><b>Project Title and Ref. Number:</b></p> <p><b>Project Duration:</b></p> <p><b>Start Date:</b></p> <p><b>Reporting Period:</b></p> <p><b>Project Budget:</b></p> <p><b>Funds Available for Reporting Period:</b></p><br><p><b>Contact Person:</b></p> |
|---|

## Table of Contents

List all the sections (I-VII) with page numbers

|   |
|---|
| <b>I. Executive Summary (half a page)</b> |
|---|

This section is intended to provide a snapshot of the activities of the project in the period under review. It presents a description of the achievements, challenges and progress towards the accomplishment of the project objectives in the reporting period.

The executive summary should:

- Be maximum half a page long;
- Focus on main achievements, challenges and lessons learned in the reporting period.

- Include recommendations for the attention of the DCPSF SC if necessary.

## II. Introduction (half a page)

This section is a resume of the approved project. **It should be kept brief** as partners have already received the project document and should focus on changes that affect implementation.

The introduction should include:

- Brief background for project rationale;
- Main objective and outputs expected;
- Reference to how the programme relates to current Darfur environment and how it aims to support peacebuilding and conflict resolution objectives;
- Project Approach, including:
  - Project Set up and management and coordination arrangements;
  - Listing of the main implementing partners;
  - Mand E: describe the tools that are used to monitor and evaluate the project.

## III. Darfur Situation Update ( maximum one page)

- I. Please provide **brief update of the humanitarian situation and conflicts that erupted in project's areas of intervention (project site, locality and state)**, their impact on project implementation.
- II. Describe the role of project's reconciliation mechanisms in mediating a solution or reconciliation. How did the project respond to changes in Darfur situation?

## IV. Progress Review (max 2-4 pages)

This section is intended to present an assessment of the extent to which the project has progressed in relation to **(i) DCPSF outputs and annual milestones and (ii) the project output targets expected for the year.**

The review should be as concise as possible and cover the entire reporting period on a cumulative basis. The review consists of the following sections:

1. Conflict and peacebuilding: A **narrative review** of achievements with an emphasis on description of **conflict resolution and peacebuilding processes** carried out as per planned output and how the outputs have contributed (or not) to the goal of your project; particular emphasis should be made in explaining how the project activities and each output have contributed to **restoring trust and confidence** amongst the various communities in your project area, while using the project baseline data.
2. Empowerment of women and gender equality: A **narrative review** that reflects achievement made in mainstreaming gender, empowerment of women and realizing gender equality as per planned output. A brief description of how the role of women in reconciliation and decision making has been strengthened and how their access to resources has been improved should be given.
3. Direct beneficiaries: Provide the number of the direct beneficiaries of the different activities with disaggregated data by gender in a tabular form.

| <i>Activity/Mechanism</i> | <i>Total no. of Direct Beneficiaries</i> | <i>No. of Direct women beneficiaries</i> | <i>No. of beneficiaries youth</i> |
|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
|                           |  |  |                                   |
|                           |  |  |                                   |

4. Log frame: A progress review carried out in a **table format** (see the template below), based on the activities and outputs stipulated in the Results and Resources Framework and the Workplan as presented in the Project Document detailing:

- Progress made against planned outputs in relation to the output targets expected for the year using the agreed indicators;



- Activities implemented and their results;
- Any additional information necessary, i.e. why certain activities were not implemented as planned, what have been the challenges, etc.

**ANNEX 4. PROGRESS MATRIX**

| Purpose: Communities stabilized and trust and confidence between communities is restored paving the way towards early recovery |   |                                     |                |  |   |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| DCPSF Indicators   | DCPSF Base-line   | DCPSF Mile-stones (Tar-get)         | Project Target | Progress Achieved by project   | Challenges  |
|  |   |                                     |                | (i) Please use the same DCPSF indicators listed to report your project progress. <b>If data is not available, write N/A and state reason. Please still provide narrative report on progress. If indicator is not relevant, write N/R.</b><br><br>(ii) Please add additional indicators when needed. Please also indicate if your projects are on track or delayed compared with the project annual work plan.<br><br>(iii) Data should be disaggregated by gender. | <b>Briefly</b> indicate (IF NEEDED) obstacles faced and what measures were taken to address them. |
| <b>% of community members sampled stating that trust and confidence is restored</b>  | A high proportion of community members, indicate a lack | 90%<br>(maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) | <b>N/A</b>     |  |   |

|   |  |                                  |  |  |  |
|---|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|   | of trust and confidence between diverse communities  |                                  |  |  |  |
|   | 88% (2014) <sup>32</sup>   |                                  |  |  |  |
| <b>% of tribal/civil society leaders sampled agreeing to a common and/or collaborative approach on how to address root causes of conflict</b> | Polarised opinion exists amongst tribal/civil society leaders vis-à-vis process for reconciliation | 85% (maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) |  |  |  |
|   | 94% (2014)   |                                  |  |  |  |

<sup>32</sup> DCPSF Perception Survey carried out in January 2013 covering activities from 2012. The survey was conducted only in the areas where DCPSF projects operate.

|  |     |     |  |  |  |
|--|-----|-----|--|--|--|
| <b><i>[Optional: Additional indicator if included in project proposal]</i></b> | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
|--|-----|-----|--|--|--|

| PROJECT OUTPUTS INDICATORS   | PROJECT BASELINE INDICATOR | PROJECT ANNUAL TARGET (12 month target) | DCPSF ANNUAL MILESTONE (2015) | KEY IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS FOR PROJECT from 1 Jan to 30 June | Q1 (1 Jan – 31 March achievement)  | Q2 (1 April- 30 June achievement) | PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING OUTPUTS   |
|--|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>(i) Please use the same DCPSF indicators listed to report your project progress. <b>If data is not available, write N/A and state reason. Please still provide narrative report on progress. If indicator is not relevant, write N/R.</b></p> <p>(ii) Please add additional indicators when needed. Please also indicate if your projects are</p> |                            |   |                               | <p>For each implemented KEY activity, state its result.<sup>33</sup></p> | <p>This should match what was reported for quarterly, please highlight and discrepancies</p> |                                   | <p>Referring to Q1 and Q2 achievement, clearly and concisely state progress towards achieving outputs.</p> |

|   |  |  |   |  |  |                  |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|------------------|--|
| <p>on track or delayed compared with the project annual work plan.</p> <p>(iii) Data should be disaggregated by gender.</p> |  |  |   |  |  |                  |  |
| <p><b>OUTPUT 1: EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY-LEVEL CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION PLATFORMS IN DARFUR ARE IN PLACE</b></p>       |  |  |   |  |  |                  |  |
| <p><b>1.1 Number of community based resolution mechanisms (CBRM) functioning</b></p>  |  |  | <p>72</p>                                       | <p>3 trainings held, reaching 500 people.</p> <p>5 meetings of CBRMs conducted</p> |  |                  |  |
| <p><b>1.2 % of community members with access to CBRM</b></p>  |  |  | <p>70%<br/>(for newly targeted communities)</p> | <p>7 CBRMs established and running at time of reporting period.</p>                | <p><b>NA because community survey has not yet been conducted</b></p> | <p><b>NA</b></p> |  |

<sup>33</sup>Avoid the repetition of the planned activities and be as specific as possible in measuring progress.

|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | 95% (maintain 2012 level +/- 5%) |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 % of community members stating satisfaction with CBRM  |  |  | 85%                              |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 % of the number of cases submitted that are successfully addressed.  |  |  | 60%                              |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 % of community members stating an increase in the percentage of cases submitted and successfully addressed |  |  | 70%                              |  |  |  |  |

|   |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|
| <p>1.6 % of community members stating a decrease in communal conflicts because of the presence of CBRM</p>          |  |  | <p>80%</p> |  |  |  |  |
| <p>1.7 Number of vulnerable group representatives (women, youth, minorities) actively participating within CBRM</p> |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>ADD<br/>ADDITIONAL<br/>INDICATORS<br/>WHERE<br/>RELEVANT,<br/>IF YOU<br/>INCLUDED</b></p>                     |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |



| <i>IN PROJECT SHEET</i>   |  |  |    |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|----|--|--|--|--|
| <b>OUTPUT 2: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITIES ENHANCED THROUGH SHARED LIVELIHOOD ASSETS AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES ACTIVITIES</b>   |  |  |    |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 Number of community initiatives <sup>34</sup> that deliver collaborative livelihoods and income generating opportunities (including joint labour, trading, community youth and women) |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Number of new/re-established markets that enable diverse communities to interact/cooperate  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

---

<sup>34</sup> An "initiative" is counted as an opportunity created for collaborative livelihood and income generating opportunities (e.g. three training sessions to establish one income generating opportunity are not counted as three but as one).

|  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|
| <p>2.3 % of community members stating an increase in the economic interventions between diverse communities</p>                                      |  |  | <p>85%</p> |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>ADD<br/>ADDITIONAL<br/>INDICATORS<br/>WHERE<br/>RELEVANT,<br/>IF YOU<br/>INCLUDED<br/>IN PROJECT<br/>SHEET</b></p>                             |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>OUTPUT 3: COOPERATION BETWEEN COMPETING COMMUNITIES OVER MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ACCESS TO BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES INCREASED</b></p> |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
| <p>3.1 Number of community based management</p>  |  |  | <p>51</p>  |  |  |  |  |

|   |  |  |           |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| <p>mecha-<br/>nisms<sup>35</sup> for<br/>natural re-<br/>source (wa-<br/>ter, pasture,<br/>forest re-<br/>serves, mi-<br/>gration<br/>routes, min-<br/>erals, etc)<sup>36</sup></p> |  |  |           |  |  |  |  |
| <p>3.2 Number of<br/>migratory<br/>routes de-<br/>marcated /<br/>cleared /re-<br/>habilitated<br/>through<br/>communal<br/>consensus</p>  |  |  | <p>11</p> |  |  |  |  |
| <p>3.3 Number of<br/>areas of restora-<br/>tion of commu-<br/>nal pasture/fod-<br/>der/<br/>communal for-<br/>ests</p>  |  |  | <p>4</p>  |  |  |  |  |

---

<sup>35</sup> The information monitored is not the number of infrastructure but the management mechanisms.

<sup>36</sup> This to be disaggregated according to activity ie water, pasture, migration route, minerals, etc in reporting

|  |  |  |            |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|------------|--|--|--|--|
| <p>3.4 % of community members confirming communal consensus around restoration of migratory routes/pasture/fodder/communal forests</p> |  |  | <p>70%</p> |  |  |  |  |
| <p>3.5 Number of social service infrastructure rehabilitated/newly built<sup>37</sup></p>  |  |  | <p>52</p>  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>3.6 % of community members stating an increase in the number of interactions between di-</p>  |  |  | <p>85%</p> |  |  |  |  |

---

<sup>37</sup> This to be disaggregated by the social service rehabilitated or built ie school, clinic, etc in reporting

|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>verse communities through basic services (health initiatives, schools, vocational education, water)</p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>ADD<br/>ADDITIONAL<br/>INDICATORS<br/>WHERE<br/>RELEVANT,<br/>IF YOU<br/>INCLUDED<br/>IN PROJECT<br/>SHEET</b></p>                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>OUTPUT 4: A NETWORK OF EFFECTIVE COLLABORATIVE PEACEBUILDING INITIATIVES CREATED AND FEEDING INTO WIDER PEACE FORA AND DARFUR AGENDAS</b></p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>4.1</b> Number of civil society organisations de-</p>   |  |  | <p>35 (The mentorship of the CSO identified in 2014 will continue)</p> |  |  |  |  |



|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>velop capacity to prioritise, plan, design and implement projects leading to equitable and sustainable growth (including peacebuilding skills, livelihoods skills, vocational training, etc)</p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>4.2 Number of Civil Society implementing and practicing peacebuilding activities</p>   |  |  | <p>40 (The mentorship of the CSO identified in 2014 will continue)</p> |  |  |  |  |
| <p>4.3 Number of collective interaction of</p>  |  |  | <p>15</p>  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |           |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>conflict resolution mechanisms with state and regional For a and Agenda</b></p>                                    |  |  |           |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>4.4 Number of collective interaction of conflict resolution mechanisms with higher level For a and Agendas</b></p> |  |  | <p>11</p> |  |  |  |  |





## V. Comments on deviations and modifications-If any (half a page)

- This section is optional in case any changes in the project context impacting on the achievement of the outputs have occurred. Options on the way forward shall be discussed and presented.
- Explain the reasons why changes had been introduced, **the processes** that led to the changes and how the changes will have an **improved impact** on the project.

## VI. Challenges and Lessons Learned (half a page)

This section should outline:

- **Challenges/obstacles:** Key challenges, gaps and/or reasons for delays which occurred in the implementation; any significant changes in the project's operating environment, weakness from the counterparts, but also from the Technical Secretariat side, etc.;
- **Lessons learned:** describe the lessons learned during your project and how solutions offered have turned challenges into opportunities or will minimize the damage; describe lessons learned which can be useful for other DCPSF supported projects.
- **Recommendations** for the attention of the Technical Secretariat which might be useful for future DCPSF calls for proposal.

## VII. Partnerships and Sustainability (half a page)

This section should include information on:

- Partnerships, including new ones built in the course of the project (national counterparts, donors, UN agencies, implementing agencies – CBOs, NGOs, etc.);
- The impact that these partnerships have on achieving results;
- Any problems encountered with partners during the implementation;
- How national counterparts and/or local communities are/were involved in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the project to ensure sustainability of the project;
- Explain whether there is **need for continued support** for the communities after the end of the project, describe the nature of support, how your organization plans to address this and **how DCPSF can contribute (this should be assessed only for annual reports and end of project reports)**.

