# RUNO Half Yearly Reporting TEMPLATE 4.3

  

**[COUNTRY:** LIBERIA**]**

**PROJECT HALF YEARLY PROGRESS UPDATE**

**PERIOD COVERED: JANUARY – JUNE 20**15

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project No & Title:** | PBF/LBR/A-9, 00088029, Support to the establishment of a land disputes prevention and resolution system in Liberia - Phase 2 |
| **Recipient Organization(s)[[1]](#footnote-1):**  | UN-Habitat |
| **Implementing Partners (Government, UN agencies, NGOs etc):** | Land Commission |
| **Total Approved Budget :[[2]](#footnote-2)** | US$ 2 million |
| **Preliminary data on funds committed : [[3]](#footnote-3)**  | US$2 million  | **% of funds committed / total approved budget:** | 100% |
| **Expenditure[[4]](#footnote-4):** | US$1,662,000 | **% of expenditure / total budget: (Delivery rate)** | 83.1% |
| **Project Approval Date:** | 30 October 2013 | **Possible delay in operational closure date (Number of months)** | Not anticipated at this time |
| **Project Start Date:** | 30 October 2013 |
| **Expected Operational Project Closure Date:** | 30 June 2015 |
| **Project Outcomes:** | 1. Alternative land dispute resolution system fully operational and managed by a new national Land Agency.2. Overlaps eliminated and synergies established with the Justice and Security Hubs3. Policies and transition strategy established for alternative dispute resolution4. Improved land administration capacity for Land Commission/New Agency5. Improved understanding of urban disputes, and their effects on women, as well as the displaced, for Land Commission/New Agency |
| **PBF Focus Area[[5]](#footnote-5)**(select one of the Focus Areas listed below) | National Reconciliation (PBF outcome 5), Management of natural resources (Including land) (PBF Outcome 7) |

**Qualitative assessment of progress**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *For each intended outcome, provide* ***evidence*** *of progress during the reporting period.* *In addition, for each outcome include the outputs achieved.**(1000 characters max per outcome.)* | **Outcome 1:**Alternative land dispute resolution system fully operational and managed by the Land Commission (LC); the act creating the new national Land Agency has been drafted and submitted to the President. Data recorded on land disputes from January-June 2015 by Land Coordination Centers operating in six counties (Lofa, Bong, Nimba, Maryland, Margibi and Montserrado) reported increase in the number of persons that are aware of their land rights and preferred using the ADR system. 98.5% of officials (Superintendent, Districts Commissioners, Land Commissioners, Directors of Archive centers, Paramount and Clan Chiefs and Elders) including the Judiciary and 31% of the general population in the Districts were the LCCs are operating are aware of their land rights, ADR option and the LC.247 land disputes recorded. Disaggregated data indicate that 37 cases were reported by women and 210 by men. 67 cases were resolved, 51 were male and 16 women. **Outcome 2:**The Land Commission through the Land Coordination Centers (LCC) continued to increase collaboration with the justice and peace hub in Bong County to enhance information dissemination on earlier warning signs to prevent violent land conflict. Hub is a part of the Bong LCC Land Dispute Resolution Taskforce (LDRT) and has joint meetings with the LCC. **Outcome 3:**Transitional strategies have included: advocacy and involvement of county judges to support the ADR system in County where the LCCs are operating. Engagement of the MOJ and justice sector for the practice of ADR system. ADR policy has been drafted and awaiting inputs from LDRT members. 2 LDRT meetings held during the this first half of the year.**Outcome 4:**The Land Commision has established the surveyer teams; the teams have received 132 survey request and has surveyed 17 land disputed cases.  |
| *Do you see evidence that the project is having a positive impact on peacebuilding?**(1000 characters max.)* | The LCCs have reduced the threat and frequency of violent land conflict. the LC and its partners have trained mediation practitioner in the communities and group them in committees, which has helped resolved cases using traditional mediation methodology, that who have resulted in violence among people and communities, if the LCCs were not present. The LCCs are helping to strengthen the local capacity for land conflict management in collaboration with the community mediation practitioner committees which has lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development. the ADR has been accepted by the resident and endorsed by the Counties and Communities authorities, including the Judiciary.Former disputants have also recognized the efficiency and timeliness of the ADR system and are encouraging members of their communities to utilize same, by taken cases to the LCCs.Community and family relations are being consolidated. |
| *Were there catalytic effects from the project in the period reported, including additional funding commitments or unleashing/ unblocking of any peace relevant processes?**(1000 characters max.)* | The LC and its partners provided support for the establishment of five counties' (Maryland, Bong, Lofa, Margibi and Montserrado Counties) LCCs in land prone conflict counties. This has reduced the number of violent land conflict and impacted positively the peace building process at the decentralized level involving other stakeholders. Since two of the LC partners (Land Conflict Resolution Project and NRC) projects ended June 2014, the LCCs have functioned effectively through funding from PBF to help provide support to fill the gap for funding and technical supports that was left by these partners. Moreover County Authorities are requesting for extension of the work of the LCCs in other districts of their counties where the LCCs are not operating and have continuously requested the LCCs to intervene in land cases in their communities. The rest of the counties are also requesting the services of the LCCs; as such additional funding is needed to ensure such expansion.  |
| *If progress has been slow or inadequate, provide main reasons and what is being done to address them.**(1000 characters max.)* | Outbreak of EVD |
| *What are the main activities/expected results for the rest of the year?**(1000 characters max.)* | Evaluation of the LCCsEnd of project report |
| *Is there any need to adjust project strategies/ duration/budget etc.?**(1000 characters max.)* | The rest of the counties are also requesting the services of the LCCs; as such additional funding is needed to ensure such expansion, given the significance of the project..  |
| *What is the project budget expenditure to date (percentage of allocated project budget expensed by the date of the report) – preliminary figures only?**(1000 characters max.)* | US$1,662,000 million is total budget expendutre to date83.1% is project budget expensed as per the date of this report. |
| *Any other information that the project needs to convey to PBSO (and JSC) at this stage?**(1500 characters max.)* | PBO Funding expired June 2015, which leaves another gap that needs funding support because without this support numerous land cases will be left unresolved and some citizens may result to violet as an option.  |

**INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT*:*** *Using the* ***Project Results Framework as per the approved project document****- provide an update on the achievement of key indicators at both the outcome and output level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation in the qualitative text above.* (250 characters max per entry)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Performance Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Current indicator progress** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay****(if any)** | **Adjustment of target (if any)** |
| **Outcome 1**Alternative land dispute resolution system fully operational and managed by a new national Land Agency | Indicator 1.1Percentage of people who are aware of land rights, alternative land dispute resolution options and the Land Commission (disaggregated by men/women) | (Sep 2012): 35% of key informants (officials) and 9% of the general population (10% men, 8% women) | Jan 2015): 70% of key informants (officials) and 45% of the general population of which at least 30% of women(disaggregated by % men/women) | 98.5% of key informants (superintendent, Districts Commissioners, Land Commissioner, Directors of Archive Centers, Paramount and Clan Chiefs and Elders) and 31% of the general population of which at least 18% are women.  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2Number of cases taken in by Land Coordination Centres and resolved (disaggregated by number of cases submitted by men/women and cases resolved involving men/women)% cases holding after 1 yr | (June 2013): 148 cases taken by LCCs17 cases resolved by LCCs(not yet disaggregated by cases submitted by men/women and cases resolved involvingmen/women June 2013: no info.  | (May 2015): 550 cases taken by LCCs 200 cases resolved by LCCs, disaggregated by number of cases submitted by men/women and cases resolved involving men/womenMay 2015 75% have held (disaggregated by cases involving women)  | 247 land disputes cases recorded by the LCCs. Data showed that 37 cases were reported by women and 210 by men. 67 cases were resolved by the LCCs; 16 were report by women and 51 by male.85% of cases have held after 1 yr of closure and monitoring  |  |  |
| Output 1.1Support to LC and LCC outreach work-core support; technical assistance | Indicator 1.1.1Number of persons directly participating in county outreach activities by LC and LCCs (including at least 35% women);% of Liberians (gender disaggregated) expressing willingness to use land ADR system | Jun 2013: 2850 Jun 2013: no data | May 2015: at least 10,000Mar 2015: 50% of genpop and 50% of women expressing willingness | 1321 women and 2718 men directly participated in County Outreach activities.53% of Liberian who lived in the Districts where the LCCs operate express their willingness to use Land ADR system. 28% are women and 72% are men. |   |  |
| Indicator 1.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.25 LCCs supported- core staff funded and operational1 new LCC set up-staff recruited, trained-dispute resolvers trained | Indicator 1.2.1Performance reviews of LC and LCC staffDispute resolvers trained | June 2013: 0 performance reviews Jun 2013: 273 community members trained, (209 men and 64 women/30% women)  | May 2015: 30 (1 per LCC staff member)May 2015: 750 (including at least 40% women) | 505 disputes resolvers trained are stay being mentored |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.3 | Indicator 1.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2**Overlaps eliminated and synergies established with the Justice and Security Hubs; | Indicator 2.1Joint activities undertaken with Hubs | June 2013: 0 joint activities | May 2015:6 joint activities | 2 joint meetings with hub and other LDRT members |  |  |
| Indicator 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.1Harmonised activities with Hubs- Joint outreach trips- Land trainings by LC to Hub staff-Referrals | Indicator 2.1.1# of referrals by Hubs to LCCs or vice versa | Jun 2013: 1 referral  | May 2015: 30 referrals |  |  |  |
| 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**Policies and transition strategy established for alternative dispute resolution | Indicator 3.1Policy drafted; transition strategy agreed | June 2013: 0 policies/strategies | 1. May 2014: Land dispute resolution policy statement drafted;2. Aug 2014: Transition strategy finalized; 3. Jan 2015:ADR policy drafted  | Land ADR policy statement of intent completed and formed the basic for the Land ADR policyLC continues discussion with stakeholder for transition policy;Land ADR policy drafted and awaiting inputs from taskforce members  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.1 | Indicator 3.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.2 | Indicator 3.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.3 | Indicator 3.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 4**mproved land administration capacity for Land Commission/New Agency; | Indicator 4.1 Surveying capacity at LCCs  | Jun 2013: 0 surveyors | May 2015: 4 mobile surveyor teams (covering all 6 LCCs) | Surveyor team established covering the 6 counties. |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.1Surveying teams established and utilised-core support to teams-surveys undertaken | Indicator 4.1.1# surveys requested/carried out | Jun 2013: 0 | May 2015: 300 |  132 land dispute survey request and surveyed 17. |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Please note that where there are multiple agencies, only one consolidated project report should be submitted. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Approved budget is the amount transferred to Recipient Organisations. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Funds committed are defined as the commitments made through legal contracts for services and works according to the financial regulations and procedures of the Recipient Organisations. Provide preliminary data only.

4 Actual payments (contracts, services, works) made on commitments.

5 PBF focus areas are:

PBF Focus Areas are:

*1: Support the implementation of peace agreements and political dialogue (Priority Area 1)*:

(1.1) SSR, (1.2) RoL; (1.3) DDR; (1.4) Political Dialogue;

*2: Promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflicts (Priority Area 2)*:

(2.1) National reconciliation; (2.2) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Conflict prevention/management;

*3:Revitalise the economy and generate immediate peace dividends (Priority Area 3)*;

(3.1) Employment; (3.2) Equitable access to social services

*4) (Re)-establish essential administrative services (Priority Area 4)*

(4.1) Strengthening of essential national state capacity; (4.2) extension of state authority/local administration; (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources (including JSC/ PBF Secretariats) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)