

**SECRETARY-GENERAL'S PEACEBUILDING FUND
PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT TEMPLATE**



PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

COUNTRY: Myanmar

TYPE OF REPORT: SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL FINAL

DATE OF REPORT: December 14 2016 to December 13 2018

Project Title: Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee - Support Platform Project (JMC-SPP)	
Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:	
PBF project modality: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRF <input type="checkbox"/> PRF	If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund: <input type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund Name of Recipient Fund:
List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc): UN/DP: UNDP is the project administrator of the Project Initiation Plan (PIP), and the project is co-led with UNRCO, utilising DPA/MSU's ceasefire expertise	
List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental: The Responsible Party is the Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee - Technical Secretariat Center (JMC-TSC) receiving the funds on behalf of the tri-partite JMC. The JMC is comprised of signatories of the Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) with representatives of the Government, including the Tatmadaw / Myanmar Armed Forces and Ethnic Armed Organisations (EAOs). The JMC is also in the process of identifying Local Ceasefire Monitors (LCMs) who will monitor the ceasefire at local levels and be trained by Civil Society and Community Based Organisations (CSO, CBOs)	
Project commencement date ¹ : The PBF-IRF funding was received 14 December 2016, the IRF began 1 January 2017, and the JMC-SPP PIP began formally on 1 April 2017	
Project duration in months ² : The IRF duration is now 24 months (14-Dec-16 to 13-Dec-18), with two six-month no-cost extensions in 2018; the PIP is also 24 months, initially 1-Apr-17 to 31-Mar-18, then extended 1 more year to 31-Mar-19	
Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below: <input type="checkbox"/> Gender promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Youth promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-border or regional project	
Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization): PBF: \$ 2,363,641 JPF : \$ 2,996,607 NORWAY : \$ 946,803 UNDP : \$ 300,000 Total: \$ 6,607,051 <i>*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO's approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account</i>	

¹ Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.

² Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

How many tranches have been received so far: 2/2 tranches.

Report preparation:

Project report prepared by: Sophie Butcher, Lessons Learned and Reporting Specialist, UN/DP, PMU; and Moe Aung, Project Manager; Cleared by Aung Naing Oo, Executive Director, JMC-TSC; Aung Mrat Lurn, Donor Relations and Capacity Building Manager, JMC-TSC; Joerg Stahlhut, Chief of Governance and Sustainable Peace Unit, UNDP; Peter Barwick, Peace and Development Advisor, UNRCO

Project report approved by: Peter Batchelor, Country Director, UNDP

Did PBF Secretariat clear the report:

Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report:

Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach: The UN has supported several assessment exercises for the JMC, including two Technical Needs Assessments (TNA) of the JMC's core ceasefire mandate areas, TNA1 in 2017, TNA2 in 2018 with the TNA2 report pending at the time of writing. Two micro-capacity (HACT) assessments were also conducted in the project period, with a third in February 2019, reviewing JMC institutional capacity - HACT1 in 2017, and HACT2 in 2018. A Project Management Lessons Review (PMR) was completed in July 2018, to be used to guide the transition from the Phase 1 JMC-SPP to Phase 2 JMC's Multi-Support Platform (JMC-MSP). A Functional Needs Assessment (FNA) was completed in July 2018, to review the JMC's needs and options to transition to Phase 2 JMC-MSP. It identified new posts, new policies and other capacities and processes the TSC might need to perform all programme finance, donor fund management and programme governance, much of which is currently carried out by or jointly with UN/DP. An independent audit of the JMC, managed by and using UNDP criteria, on 1 April 2017 - 31 December 2017 was completed in July 2018. A lessons learnt document on project implementation has been prepared and the final PBF independent project evaluation process has been initiated, to review the full PIP project outputs and will take place in March - April 2019.

NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

- *Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general / common language.*
- *Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*
- *Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

PART 1: RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1 Overall project progress to date

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit): The PBF project period ended on 13 December 2018, after two years, and the PIP mechanism concludes on 31st March 2019. Project activities have been implemented and the closure of the project is being finalised.

A UNDP administered Project Initiation Plan (PIP) mechanism began on 1 April 2017, and was designed to be a 1-year initial project before a 2-year subsequent phase. In the 13th JMC-U meeting in November 2017 the JMC decided to begin the transition to a JMC-managed funding mechanism instead.

Implementation on both the JMC and UN/DP sides was also slower than planned in the results, activities, budget and indicators, the reasons for which have been outlined previously in reports (PBF and quarterly). Following the JMC-U decision on 3 April 2018, the project board then endorsed several new elements of the project timeline and implementation cycle: 1) in response to a 7 February 2018 request to the UN from the three JMC-U joint Chairs, the PIP project overall was extended 12 months with an annual work plan to March 2019, approved by UNDP HQ; 2) two donors – the Joint Peace Fund (JPF) and Norway – decided on 19 February to proceed with a 6-month no-cost extension, concluding on 30 September, and; 3) JMC requested a 6-month funding extension to 30 September. On 28 September, the JMC was further extended as Responsible Party to 13 December 2018. Phase 2 commenced in February 2019 when JPF funding for the JMC-managed Multi-Support Platform (JMC-MSP) began.

Given the recent/current political/peacebuilding/ transition situation/ needs in the country, has the project been/ does it continue to be **relevant** and well placed to address potential conflict factors/ sources of tensions/ risks to country's sustaining peace progress? Please illustrate. If project is still ongoing, are any adjustments required? (1500 character limit)

The JMC and project continue to be relevant and well placed to address state / region and local level mitigation, prevention and resolution of armed conflict. The JMC is largely institutionally established at the JMC-U and S levels, carrying out its core functions.

After a long history of conflict in Myanmar, the JMC represents the first 'joint and subnational' institution and lessons continue to be learnt and shared with other peace and government bodies. Aside from regular joint meetings, the JMC plays an active role in monitoring, reporting on and negotiating a resolution to conflict between signatories. Significant in Myanmar is its move towards more decentralisation on some issues to aid implementation in a manner customised to each state and local level situation.

In a context of a lack of significant and inclusive progress in the peace process, during the project period the JMC represented an example of a largely functioning institution working meaningfully towards peace. During the project, the JMC-U met 9 times, and the 5 JMC-S

committees met 12-14 times each, to jointly problem solve and create trust. Notably, only 2/10 planned JMC-L committees are established, only one of them is meeting and no armed group disengagement has been jointly agreed. Local civilian ceasefire monitors were recently selected under two JMC-S offices as a trial and each JMC-S committee conducted regular community public consultations.

In a few sentences, summarize **what is unique/ innovative/ interesting** about what this project is trying/ has tried to achieve or its approach (rather than listing activity progress) (1500 character limit).

The JMC is a ceasefire monitoring arrangement that is exceptional in that it does not rely on an external 3rd party to act as the principal monitoring party, but rather utilizes a hybrid formulation of the parties themselves, together with civilians and civil society actors to carry out many of the main functions. Consequently and untypically, this project uses a development mechanism, with challenges and opportunities in this approach.

The JMC represents the first time in Myanmar's history that ceasefires are expected to be fully and jointly implemented and monitored to international standards. Overall, armed clashes have reduced in NCA signatory areas, but necessary conditions to implement troop redeployment and disengagement - such as interim arrangements - are lacking. Committee members state that some trust and confidence has been built, despite the fact that two key EAOs had paused their involvement in the peace process and JMC at the conclusion of the project.

Inside the joint structures, three key elements are emerging: 1) growing responsibility, cohesion and effectiveness of the civilian members, whom although nominated by either side, aim to work neutrally and in the interest of the NCA, 2) development of the local civilian monitoring concept, and; 3) the institutional development that is being felt in both the U/S/L JMC and technical secretariat centre, which practically backstops the whole operation.

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

In a few sentences summarize **major project peacebuilding progress/results** (with evidence), which PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit): Although broader political challenges remain unresolved, and armed conflict between some signatories continues, the elements of Myanmar's only and first joint subnational peace architecture have largely been formed, and armed conflict in signatory areas has reduced since the signing of the NCA, bringing reported improvements for communities.

JMC-S committees are now conducting regular public consultations at the village level, commanders and former combatants wearing matching JMC vests, briefing on their joint responsibilities to implement provisions of the military code of conduct, including protection of civilian provisions. The JMC has demonstrated by its actions that joint decision making among former combatants is possible, albeit cumbersome and at times problematic. EAOs have raised questions and concerns about the power balance between actors in JMC structures and imbalances effecting decision making and functioning. Such reflection and other JMC progress has shown the importance of genuinely joint peace institutions to implementing peace agreements.

The JMC is significant in the Myanmar context as it is a new institutional and governance structure; joint in nature, a central role for citizens, prioritises community engagement and is working towards decentralisation and operation in government, non-government and areas of mixed control. Such aspirations are also shared for a Union/ State/ Local governance structure in the future and in other peace architecture.

In a few sentences, explain how the project has made **real human impact**, that is, how did it affect the lives of any people in the country – where possible, use direct quotes that PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

The JMC, particularly at the JMC-S and JMC-L, has provided ongoing opportunities for trust building and decision making across and between stakeholders and communities, noticeable differences in people's day to day lives as a result of peace and stability and opportunities for community involvement; for example as Local Civilian Monitors and in sport events as confidence building measures. A real human impact during the project period is best described by Naw Mei Lar Htoo below.

An excerpt from an interview with Naw Mei Lar Htoo, a civilian representative of the JMC-L (Hpapun), on the ceasefire monitoring situation and the successes, challenges and difficulties of the JMC, published in the JMC's June 2018 newsletter. It should be noted this was prior to clashes in the area, that have since subsided.

"Daw Khine Thiri Lin - Please tell what has changed since the NCA was signed, as compared to before it.

Naw Mei Lar Htoo - I don't even know how to begin. In the past, we were afraid to travel and communication was bad. We had no phone connection. Now you can make a return trip to Hpa-An on the same day, while in the past it was an overnight journey to even get to Kama Mung. There is no more forced labor or porters. People are now free to engage in their livelihoods and so-called taxes are no longer collected. However, a few cases still remain on the Kawthulei side. People can even travel at night time now. Even women can go alone without fear. These are the benefits of the NCA."

If the project progress assessment is **on-track**, please explain what the key **challenges** (if any) have been and which measures were taken to address them (1500 character limit).

Challenges and measure taken to address them:

- i) The continued roll out of the JMC-L and LCMs while slow, is getting attention from the JMC joint leaders, including amending TORs, information sharing, LCM selection processes, curriculum development and SOPs.
- ii) Project management has been challenging across and between all stakeholders, consequently the Project Management Review was undertaken and efforts have been made to implement the recommendations.
- iii) Practical progress has not been made on disengagement, however joint trainings and discussions continues on how to overcome this challenge.
- iv) New NCA signatories have only partially been integrated into the JMC structure, discussions are ongoing.
- v) The transition to phase 2, the JMC Multi Stakeholder Platform, has resulted in specific work tasks and amendments to the project. Plans were developed and executed for as smooth a transition as possible.
- vi) A lack of progress in the broader peace process has provided numerous challenges for the JMC, including a pause in the involvement of two EAOs in the peace process and JMC at the

end of the project period. Efforts have been made to keep dialogue open and to support the peace process whenever possible, in support of the JMC continuing and to respond to conflict issues as soon as possible to defuse and de-escalate tense situations.

vii) the logframe and M&E processes were never fully developed. Quarterly reporting and multiple evaluation processes have been completed

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

N/A

Please attach as a separate document(s) any materials highlighting or providing more evidence for project progress (for example: publications, photos, videos, monitoring reports, evaluation reports etc.). List below what has been attached to the report, including purpose and audience. The annual progress report, project board terms of reference, QPR 1-2, QPR 3, QPR4, QPR5 and QPR6 can be shared. QPR 7 (October - December 18) and an 18 month progress report are being review by management and can be shared shortly.

1.2 Result progress by project outcome

The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes. If your project has more approved outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.

Outcome 1: JMC is set up and carries out its core functions

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: *Describe main progress under this Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration), including major output progress (not all individual activities). If the project is starting to make/ has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context. Where possible, provide specific examples of change the project has supported/ contributed to as well as, where available and relevant, quotes from partners or beneficiaries about the project and their experience. (3000 character limit)?*

Outcome 1 contains the central purpose for this project and PBF expenditure: all of the funding required for the effective functioning of the JMC and its 4 core functions, namely the key instrument to implement provisions of the NCA, monitor adherence (of the parties) to the Military Code of Conduct, investigate alleged violations and undertake problem-solving functions. As mentioned above, at JMC-U and S levels, the outcome has largely been achieved. The JMC-U is fully established and has been operating for more than three years.

While only quantitative measures (see attached LogFrame), the regular meetings and ability of the union and state level committees to continue collaboratively coming to decisions reflects the progressive local-level creation of trust and cooperation among the tripartite membership. The 19th JMC-U meeting in November 2018 has been postponed due to concerns over the structure and functioning of the JMC and a lack of progress in the peace process. There are also perceptions of limited progress on the political front, some continuing armed conflict and allegations of violations, and numerous complaint letters received, being verified and resolution sought. The JMC's Complaint Management System, operational since July 2017, allows the JMC to better understand the pattern of complaints. 422 of the 601 (70%) official complaints received by the end of December 2018 were resolved and closed.

Important unresolved issues frequently relate to the absence of agreement over troop deployment and related ceasefire areas. At the JMC-L level, while 2 committees were established during the project, 10 was an original target, but political issues tied to the peace process are seen to have slowed or stalled progress.

Overall, the TSC- U and TSC-S offices are now operating at interim operational capability (as assessed) and the operational tempo of the TSC at all levels gained during the eleven months with the increasing number and regularity of meetings, workshops and public outreach events. Progress of TSC local level office functioning has been slower; offices were arranged and equipped quickly, but staff recruitment has been challenging and the offices have required backstopping from TSC state level staff. Key administrative systems and policies were put in place with support from the UN/DP-PMU and significant recruitment efforts undertaken. The procurement and installation of most TSC equipment and capital assets at the U and S levels have largely been accomplished or are in process. The TSC-U continues to put in measures to support TSC-S offices to become more operationally independent.

The JMC undertook training and development activities to develop knowledge and skills of committee members and TSC staff, guided by the September 2017 UN TNA (see below) and increasing amounts of internal and JMC-led trainings. Other partners such as CPCS, Norway, CHD, continue to provide technical expertise and support exposure visits.

Outcome 2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

During the project period, ceasefire technical assistance and capacity development activities of the UN/DP Project Management Unit (PMU) focused on five key areas, including cross-cutting of IHL and IHRL:

- i) Capacity assessment: the PMU coordinated two UN TNAs to support the JMC in identifying its technical and capacity needs, including to be in line with international laws and standards. TNA-1 in 2017, and TNA-2 in 2018. The same experts were deployed both times, with a third Maj. Gen. (Retd.) expert joining TNA-2. Both TNAs followed similar methodology, to ensure as comprehensive as possible an assessment of the tripartite JMC-U/S/L committees and TSC. At the first JMC-SPP Project Board Meeting, the JMC-U and TSC credited the TNA-1 assessment as having substantially contributed to the JMC's capacity building and technical assistance provision plans and the importance of the process in which it was undertaken. The TNA-2 report is pending and expected to be discussed at the 19th JMC-U meeting;
- ii) Comparative international mine action experience: coordinating with UNICEF and PMU on the invitation, during February 2018 the JMC sent a 3-person delegation for the first time to the UN mine action conference in Geneva, Switzerland, to learn of demining experiences from other countries and international laws on mines;
- iii) Communications and media capacity development: Recognizing that communications and transparency are crucial for building public confidence and knowledge of the JMC, a UN/DP led media training for 17 JMC-U/S/L secretaries and TSC-S Managers was held in February 2018 in collaboration with the JPF. It was verbally reported that many of the lessons from the training had been utilised by JMC Secretaries;

- iv) Facilitation, dialogue, mediation and negotiation skills: A number of trainings were conducted to enhance the understanding of JMC members and TSC staff and to strengthen their competencies for facilitation, dialogue, mediation and negotiation. The Netherlands Clingendael Academy held 3 Insider Mediation trainings with JMC members, and two TSC staff attended their global Train the Trainer course; and,
- v) Disengagement of forces and troop redeployment techniques and international norms, laws and standards: 4 workshops were implemented which focused on disengagement and the deployment of military forces to prevent clashes, and international experiences shared to a total of 93 participants. The same two experts developed and then conducted all workshops on disengagement and shared their experiences of the theory and practice of ceasefire implementation internationally.

The PMU has also continued Myanmar / English document translation for JMC and the project (JMC does its own translations as well, including into other ethnic languages). The PMU has also developed a glossary of technical ceasefire and other terms. The effort now includes: 423 terms, 340 terms that are ceasefire technical in nature, and 83 of them project technical.

Outcome 3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: off track

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

Throughout the project, the PMU continued to act as a “one-stop window” for UN support to the JMC, harnessing and integrating inputs from across the UN system. It also succeeded in maintaining positive relationships with the JMC and TSC.

UN/DP-SPP project management and institutional capacity development activities focused on:

- i) Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) micro-capacity assessments of the TSC: The assessments aimed to identify the status, strengths and gaps of the TSC, primarily for financial management but also for programme management, staffing and procurement. The TSC received a moderate (second from highest) overall assessment rating in both HACTs, a good outcome for a new institution, while identifying gaps in the TSC's administrative policies and practices, primarily for financial management but also for programme management, staffing and procurement. Similar to the TNA-1, the HACT-1 established a baseline on which UNDP and the TSC formulated capacity-development activities in support of strengthening the TSC's administrative capacities. ;
- ii) Management of the cash-advance cash transfer system: the PMU supported the TSC's implementation of the cash advance system from Q3, based on quarterly advances transferred only when reaching 80% or more expenditure, seeking to address over-budgeting, planning & cash management;
- iii) Institutional capacity development through UNDP ‘SURGE’ support: two international experts were deployed from the UNDP global SURGE roster to provide advice and inputs into the development of TSC administrative and operational policies and systems, in particular on procurement, finance, HR and anti-fraud measures;
- iv) Audit; UNDP arranged the external audit of the TSC in May 2018, including visits to JMC-S offices.

v) Programme management and preparation for the transition to Phase 2 JMC-managed multi-channel support platform (JMC-MSP): the Project Management Review assessed issues for not only the current platform, but provided recommendations for the JMC and donors to consider to improve capacity and more efficient processes to manage and support this complex and unique ceasefire mechanism and platform for international engagement.

vi) The Functional Needs Assessment (FNA): The FNA was conceived as an assessment to support the JMC to make evidence-based decisions on the design and set-up of the Phase 2 JMC-MSP. Based on its ToRs, jointly signed by the TSC and UN, it reviewed JMC-TSC options, and needs (policies, systems, staff capacities) to transition to Phase 2, across four areas - programme finance, donor fund management, programme governance, and core administrative functions. The UN submitted the final FNA report in July 2018, with three key areas of observation, 12 principal recommendations, and annexes with detailed options on new structures, staff and policies for the JMC-TSC.

Outcome 4:

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

Progress summary: (see guiding questions under Outcome 1)

1.3 Cross-cutting issues

<p><u>National ownership:</u> How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>As above, the JMC tripartite committee members and all TSC staff are 100% Myanmar, and the government has representatives at all three U/S/L levels. The project is grounded in legitimate joint requests and approval: the JMC-U co-Chairs first requested UN support in February 2016; in March 2016 the State Counsellor also requested UN support; in November 2016 the JMC-U co-chairs requested PBF funds, and; the State Counsellor-led Joint Coordinating Body for peace process funding (JCB) approved the PIP in February 2017. The TSC contribute to and clear all reports, including this one.</p> <p>A role the parties requested the UN to perform was to facilitate coordinated international support, so that at inception the JMC-TSC could stay focused on implementing the NCA across its members. While the peak body is the JMC-U, the Project Board is key for fiduciary oversight and programme monitoring. The Project Board is not only unique in Myanmar, also possibly globally for ceasefire bodies. The PMU facilitated negotiation on board ToRs which led to the UN co-lead the body with the Tatmadaw JMC-U Chair, who requested he be joined on the board by his co-chairs - the senior EAO General and the senior civilian member (Vice Chairs 1 and 2). Other JMC-U members routinely join the meetings to monitor and learn how it operates.</p>
<p><u>Monitoring:</u> Is the project M&E plan on track? What monitoring methods and</p>	<p>The JMC continues to focus on its role as a monitoring body, one of the four core NCA functions. Ambition in this</p>

<p>sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. (1500 character limit)?</p>	<p>regard is substantial: it requires joint consensus-based civil-military processes. Throughout the project, the M&E for the JMC continued to be the further development of its “MVR” efforts described above. The U bi-monthly and S monthly meetings remained primary mechanisms for reporting, evaluating and resolving complaints. These allow the parties to respond to local and regional armed conflict dynamics, and peace process progress.</p> <p>The set-up and impact of M&E project / donor systems have been more mixed. After the HACT-1 baseline, HACT-2 was completed in 2018. After the TNA-1 baseline, the TNA-2 field missions were completed in 2018, the report is expected shortly. The project is monitored financially and on outputs, but limited LogFrame indicator criteria, community perception surveys, capacity development baselines etc have been set. The indicators have not been broadly accepted by the JMC as adding value to the achievement of the JMC's core mandate. The PMR reported that Phase 1 indicator ambition was too high. There remains no full-time M&E capacity in the TSC, PMU, and the planned international M&E expert from the JPF did not materialise. Attention was subsequently diverted to the Phase 2 transition and its new proposal, budget and LogFrame. The PMR provided analysis and recommended actions to address some of these issues to be learnt for Phase 2.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The conduct of a final external and independent evaluation is clearly an important and sensitive exercise for the JMC. It was agreed by the JMC in late 2016 and provided for in the PBF project document, allowing one more comprehensive evaluation of Phase 1, instead of subjecting the JMC to multiple donor-specific assessments. From August 2018 the PMU coordinated UN and JMC planning and received guidance from PBSO. The PMU drafted a note to file that was submitted to JMC-U leadership for consideration on the methodology for conducting and providing oversight on the evaluation. That concept was accepted, an Expert Reference Group was formed with UN and JMC co-chairs, and the procurement commenced by UNDP in December 2018. After delays in the procurement process, the evaluation is planned to occur in March 2019, with a report expected shortly afterwards.</p>
<p>Catalytic effects (financial): Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from whom and how much? If not, have any specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Yes, additional funding was received from the Norwegian Government in 2016 and from the Joint Peace Fund in September 2017. PBF funding was also critical in February to April 2018 by providing stability through a period of uncertainty when the no-cost extension was being negotiated and re-drafted, as were all plans and agreements.</p>

	<p>The JMC-U's decision to move to the JMC-managed mechanism in phase 2 from 13 December presented challenges and opportunities for the programme and donor finance and management, leaving less time for TSC capacity building initiatives, and to identify (see Functional Needs Assessment Report) and recruit new staff and approve new policies and systems to manage it.</p> <p>The PBF funds have been critical and catalytic in allowing the JMC to develop as an institution to a point that they independently received funding from November 2018 through the JMC- Multi Stakeholder Platform (MSP).</p> <p>The PBF funds have also provided stability for UN support to the TSC, while two other donors ended their support to the JMC-SPP from 30 September to fund the TSC directly under the JMC-MSP.</p>
<p><u>Catalytic effects (non-financial):</u> Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>During a difficult period of Myanmar's peace process the JMC has largely been able to remain operational and support peace efforts because of its level of functionality and institutionalisation, possible through donor funding and UN support, including PBF support.</p> <p>Catalytic effects are often discussed but hard to measure or verify. The institutionalised nature of the JMC is providing an instructional example to it's sister organisation, UPDJC (mandated to support and facilitate political dialogue) and to other government institutions interested in undertaking reforms and key assessments. Further, relationships across the JMC parties and the jointness of the structure continues to be discussed as surprising and more than anticipated.</p> <p>Most strategic risks are beyond the JMC committees' mandate, and ceasefires between the Tatmadaw and now 10 EAOs have largely held. A multi-actor joint peace institution has been established and conflict resolution ToRs/SOPs have been agreed and many elements of the NCA and ToRs/SOPs are being implemented. The temporary halt of two EAOs in the peace process and the JMC at the conclusion of the project, provide an opportunity for reflection and negotiations on the JMC and progress of the peace process and may lead to adjustments in JMC structures and processes.</p>
<p><u>Exit strategy/ sustainability:</u> What steps have been taken to prepare for end of project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>Funding to the JMC, through the JMC-MSP funding mechanism will commence in November/ December 2018. The TSC and PMU have been working together on the transition, with a notable transfer of greater leadership and direction to and by the TSC and its JMC-U policy-making body.</p>

	<p>The JPF have now funded the JMC directly and the JMC have also received a donation from the Chinese Embassy in November 2018. The JMC now once again has financial stability.</p> <p>With the closure of the JMC-SPP project on December 13, 2018 the provision of ceasefire and institutional development technical assistance from the UN to the JMC remained more uncertain.</p> <p>In August the UN received a new request for continuous support to the JMC from the NCA signatories and is considering future activities and an approach. The final evaluation will also consider the possibility of future actions.</p>
<p>Risk taking: Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The JMC is a high risk yet necessary project, given the legacy of over 60 years of armed conflict, the interplay of political, security and economic (legal and illegal) activities that are at stake, and the current lack of progress on interim arrangements and in the peace process more broadly. Armed clashes have reduced in NCA signatory areas since the signing of the NCA, and members state that some trust and confidence is beginning to be built, though evidence of this is - to date - is indirect. When interviewed, community members articulate significant improvements in the conduct of their day to day lives, particularly in regards to reduced levels of taxation, freedom of movement, access to services and a reduction in forced recruitment and labour.</p>
<p>Gender equality: In the reporting period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women's empowerment? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>The JMC continued to take concerted efforts to strengthen the gender and inclusion provisions of its work (see attached LogFrame statistics). The civilian women members are significant because Myanmar Army and EAOs have few and seldomly nominated women commanders as committee members, as well that civilian members are essential for the conflict resolution in the JMC setting in general, and are specifically receiving SGBV cases. At the conclusion of the project, 48% of JMC civilian representatives were female and 38% of TSC staff were female.</p>
<p>Other: Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? (1500 character limit)</p>	<p>A second no-cost-extension of six months to 13 December was approved, taking the project to the maximum timeframe permitted under the IRF.</p>

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

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Outcome 1	Indicator 1.1					
	Indicator 1.2					
	Indicator 1.3					
Output 1.1	Indicator 1.1.1					
	Indicator 1.1.2					
Output 1.2	Indicator 1.2.1					
	Indicator 1.2.2					
Output 1.3	Indicator 1.3.1					
	Indicator 1.3.2					
Outcome 2	Indicator 2.1					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
	Indicator 2.2					
	Indicator 2.3					
Output 2.1	Indicator 2.1.1					
	Indicator 2.1.2					
Output 2.2	Indicator 2.2.1					
	Indicator 2.2.2					
Output 2.3	Indicator 2.3.1					
	Indicator 2.3.2					
Outcome 3	Indicator 3.1					
	Indicator 3.2					
	Indicator 3.3					
Output 3.1	Indicator 3.1.1					
	Indicator 3.1.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)	Adjustment of target (if any)
Output 3.2	Indicator 3.2.1					
	Indicator 3.2.2					
Output 3.3	Indicator 3.3.1					
	Indicator 3.3.2					
Outcome 4	Indicator 4.1					
	Indicator 4.2					
	Indicator 4.3					
Output 4.1	Indicator 4.1.1					
	Indicator 4.1.2					
Output 4.2	Indicator 4.2.1					
	Indicator 4.2.2					
Output 4.3	Indicator 4.3.1					
	Indicator 4.3.2					

PART 2: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS

2.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditures

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, delayed, or off track, vis-à-vis project plans and by recipient organization: *on track*

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and what is the overall level of expenditure against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far (500 characters limit): Two tranches of funds have been received. At the end of February 2019, the overall level of expenditure was 88%.

When do you expect to seek the next tranche, if any tranches are outstanding: N/A

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters limit): 88% of PBF funds were utilised by the end of February 2019 and it is anticipated that all funding will be exhausted by the end of the project. The JPF and Government of Norway funding was extended six months to 30 September 2018 and thus concluded prior to the PBF grant. Therefore all project expenditure after 30 September was from the PBF until the operational close on 13 December 2018, and January to March for transition and handover, administrative closure, and final evaluation activities.

Please state what \$ amount was planned (in the project document) to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women's empowerment and how much has been actually allocated to date: As a start-up ceasefire project, M&E and financial systems were not designed to perform this tracking, however, gender equality is in-part embedded in the JMC's ToRs, and in their increasing success in attracting senior women managers in the TSC, and JMC-S and JMC-L women civilian committee members. At the conclusion of the project, 48% of JMC civilian members were female.

Please fill out and attach Annex A on project financial progress **with detail on expenditures/ commitments to date using the original project budget table in Excel**, even though the \$ amounts are indicative only.