PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)
END OF PROJECT REPORT
COUNTRY: Myanmar
REPORTING PERIOD: 01 January 2013 - December 31st 2014

Programme Title & Project Number
Programme Title: Procurement for the Start-up of the Myanmar Peace Center (MPC)
Programme Number *(if applicable)*
MPTF Office Project Reference Number:[1] 00085918/IRF/64

Recipient UN Organizations	Implementing Partners
List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: UNOPS	List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations: Myanmar Peace Center (MPC)

Programme/Project Budget (US$)	Programme Duration
PBF contribution (by RUNO) **477,426**	Overall Duration *(months)* 23
	Start Date[2] *(dd.mm.yyyy)* 01.02.2013
Government Contribution *(if applicable)*	Original End Date[3] *(dd.mm.yyyy)* 31.12.2013
Other Contributions (donors) *(if applicable)*	Final End date[4] *(dd.mm.yyyy)* 31.12.2014
TOTAL: 477,426	

Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval.	Report Submitted By
Mid-Term Evaluation / Review - if applicable *please attach* ☐ Yes ☐ No Date: End of project Evaluation– *if applicable please attach* ☐ Yes ☐ No Date:	Name: Sanjay Mathur Title: Director and Representative Participating Organization (Lead): UNOPS

---

[1] The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to "Project ID" on the MPTF Office GATEWAY

[2] The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY

[3] As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

[4] If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed.

Email address: sanjaym@unops.org

PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1   Assessment of the project implementation status and results

For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project has contributed:

Priority Plan Outcome to which the project has contributed.
Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project has contributed.

For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project's overall achievement of results to date: on track

For both IRF and PRF projects, outline progress against each project outcome, using the format below. The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes.

Outcome Statement 1: Myanmar Peace Center (MPC) becomes an active and positive force to advance peace processes.

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

Indicator 1: MPC begins to implement its workplan. Indicator 2: Key Government, opposing non-State actors and third-party observers testify to value of MPC to the peace process Indicator 3: Additional funds are mobilized to support MPC	Baseline: MPC new and not yet operational Target: MPC in a position to undertake missions and travel and communicate with documentation of actions/findings/ made (as part of its workplan) Progress:on track (MPC now operational and conducting missions and travel) Baseline: Many third-party observers optimistic about role of MPC. Target: Opposing non-State actors articulate positive role for MPC. Third party observers continue to support. Progress:on track Baseline: No funds Target: EU funds MPC as planned. Progress:on track (EU is funding MPC)

Output progress at the end of project

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit).Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Project Output: Delivery and use of equipment to enable successful start-up of MPC:

1) Delivered 7 units out of 7 requested vehicles (100% completed)
   - 2 units of Toyota Land Cruiser
   - 1 unit of Toyota Prado
   - 1 unit of Toyota Hilux double cab
   - 3 units of Toyota Hiace

2) Delivered 300 units of handheld radio to MPC (100% completed)
3) Delivered 2 units of 100 KVA generator (100% completed)

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?
The MPC is a relatively new organisation. At the time of PBF funding to MPC through this project, MPC had limited funding options. The provision of equipment by PBF through UNOPS was therefore important for MPC to become operational, which in turn has been essential for it to "become an active and positive force to advance peace processes" in Myanmar. The equipment provided through this project is not the only equipment that MPC has received but it has helped MPC to establish itself as an organisation.

Until recently, there were issues with delays on the delivery of 3 units of Toyota Hiace. This has been due to unavailability of specifications locally and much negotiation with the MPC. As of 20 October 2014, the remaining cars were delivered to MPC with the specifications requested as agreed with MPC in July 2014.

UNOPS is not involved with monitoring details such as how each item of equipment has been used to conduct peacebuilding in individual field missions; this is beyond the scope of this project. Therefore it is not possible to measure the contribution to the outcome empirically. However, we can say that the procurement of equipment and wider peacebuilding are closely connected. MPC needs vehicles to move to different areas of the country to negotiate, implement and monitor ceasefires, as well as to travel between Yangon (MPC Office) and Nay Pyi Taw (centre of government and the President's Office to which MPC reports). MPC also needs radios to communicate with other peace-related actors, such as Tatmadaw (army) and non-state actors. Lastly, MPC needs generators to power the main office in the erratic electricity environment in Yangon, so that the office can function. In sum, one can conclude that these items are all necessary, they are being used, and they are contributing to the peacebuilding mandate of the MPC.

MPC has begun to implement its workplan and is moving forward in performing its role in ceasefire negotiations. We expect that key government and non-state actors testify to the value of MPC, as those actors are now engaging with the MPC in the various ceasefires and MPC is continuing its role. As regards third party observers, the support to MPC by international donors reflects their positive views on the MPC's value in the peace process in Myanmar.

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?
There were delays in implementation due to various factors. The process of negotiating the content and signing the Project Document was lengthy. Subsequently, after PBF funds were received, the process was repeated for the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA), which was the required legal document between UNOPS and MPC. These two documents required approval from not only MPC but also the President's Office, Government of the Union of Myanmar. There was much caution when signing this document, especially regarding who

4

would retain custody of the equipment, until what point, etc. It was the first time for either party to work with each other, which may have been a contributing factor. The process took longer than expected.

Following the signing of the above documents, the specifications of the 3 types of equipment have been subject to several changes from the original requirements. There was also an expansion of the requirements (e.g. internal specifications). The challenge has been to ensure that these changes fully satisfy our client (MPC) and funder (PBF) while remaining within the approved budget of the PBF award and fully in line with the UNOPS rules and regulations.

The delay of the last 3 vehicles was due to a need to re-specify the requirements with the MPC.

Outcome Statement 2:

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

Output progress at the end of project

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit).Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

Outcome Statement 3:

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

Output progress at the end of project

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit).Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

Outcome Statement 4:

Rate the current status of the outcome: on track

Indicator 1:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 2:	Baseline: Target: Progress:
Indicator 3:	Baseline: Target: Progress:

Output progress at the end of project

List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome (1000 character limit).Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.

Outcome progress at the end of project

Describe progress made toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers (3000 character limit)?

Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures

If sufficient progress was not made, what were the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How were they addressed (1500 character limit)?

1.2   Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender at the end of the project

Evidence base: What was the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report *(1000 character limit)?*	The evidence for the report is found in the following: -- The procurement documentation that UNOPS creates and records, e.g. tender documents. -- The procurement schedule created by Procurement Unit and shared with MPC. This has been included in previous reports sent to PBF. -- Emails and letters exchanged between MPC and UNOPS -- The actual goods after delivery; -- Receiving and Inspection Reports (RIR) that the MPC signs when the goods are delivered. Consultation has taken place within UNOPS Myanmar to verify the contents of this report, e.g. with Procurement Unit.
Funding gaps: Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. *(1500 character limit)*	MPC has, since its inception, attracted funding from a variety of donors. At the start-up phase, however, the funding options for MPC were more limited than now. The funds from PBF were instrumental and filled a funding gap by providing equipment to MPC that they would not otherwise have had.
Catalytic effects: Did the project achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional funding commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/ accelerate peace relevant processes? Briefly describe. *(1500 character limit)*	The funding that PBF provided led to, and was harmonised with, EU funding for other kinds of equipment for MPC. MPC's ability to attract other funding since may be a result of the PBF funds that were provided to it in the early stages of its existence, because the PBF funding gave MPC equipment that allowed it to become a proper organisation. The equipment is certainly related to accelerating ceasefires and peace initiatives that MPC undertakes.
Risk taking/ innovation: Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? *(1500*	With a procurement project, the risks are mainly those concerning procurement, e.g. the availability of suppliers, the customs processes. UNOPS, on behalf of the UNCT in Myanmar, partnered with an

character limit)	organisation that was recently established, with untested organisational capacity, and composed of diverse actors from a range of backgrounds. This was in a country that had just opened up after decades of international isolation. This was itself a significant risk taken by PBF, UNCT and UNOPS.
Gender marker: How have gender considerations been mainstreamed in the project to the extent possible? Is the original gender marker for the project still the right one? Briefly justify. *(1500 character limit)*	In this project, no gender marker score was included in the project document
Other issues: Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that should be shared with PBSO? This can include any cross-cutting issues or other issues which have not been included in the report so far. *(1500 character limit)*	

PART 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY

2.1 Lessons learned

Provide at least three key lessons learned from the implementation of the project. These can include lessons on the themes supported by the project or the project processes and management.

Lesson 1 *(1000 character limit)*	Procurement in accordance with UNOPS rules and regulations is detailed and systematic. In addition, conducting procurement in Myanmar, where the market is not so mature (e.g. in terms of local suppliers), has presented challenges. On account of the above, this project has been a learning experience for all parties. Our Myanmar partners may not be used to the thoroughness of the procurement processes that UNOPS conducts. At the same time, UNOPS has learned about local market conditions. In this sense, there has been some lessons learned for all parties in procurement and planning. Specific examples would be the need to define all requirements in detail before a procurement process commences, or the need to check availability of items with local suppliers.
Lesson 2 *(1000 character limit)*	MPC was, and is, a nascent organisation evolving with time. This is an observation less about their peacebuilding mandate but more about the core work and duties of any organisation, e.g. internal and external communications, planning, coordination. The need to take this into account should be emphasized.
Lesson 3 *(1000 character limit)*	Although seemingly small and straightforward, this project has required a significant amount of time and resources due to the current context of Myanmar and the procurement factors raised in Lesson 1 above. This should be taken into account when planning other seemingly small projects in future; they will require much more time than planned.
Lesson 4 *(1000 character limit)*	As a result of factors mentioned in Lesson 1 and 2, the need to follow up on all communication and planning is essential. From the mid-part of the project, timely and strong follow up was a core factor of smooth completion of the project.
Lesson 5 *(1000 character limit)*	

2.2 Success story (OPTIONAL)

Provide one success story from the project implementation which can be shared on the PBSO website and Newsletter as well as the Annual Report on Fund performance. Please include key facts and figures and any citations (3000 character limit).

PART 3 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure

Please rate whether project financial expenditures were on track, slightly delayed, or off track: delayed

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

Please see Reasons for Low Achievement and Rectifying Measures on page 4 above.

Please provide an overview of project expensed budget by outcome and output as per the table below.[5]

Output number	Output name	RUNOs	Approved budget	Expensed budget	Any remarks on expenditure
Outcome 1: Myanmar Peace Center (MPC) becomes an active and positive force to advance peace processes					
Output 1.1	Delivery and use of equipment to enable successful start-up of MPC	UNOPS	477,426	366,475	Some costs have yet to be settled, such as agent fees and UNOPS direct and indirect costs for the last quarter of 2014. These costs are estimated to be within the approved budget, and there will still be some surplus of funds. This will be returned to PBF.
Output 1.2					
Output 1.3					
Outcome 2:					
Output 2.1					
Output 2.2					
Output 2.3					
Outcome 3:					
Output 3.1					
Output 3.2					
Output 3.3					
Outcome 4:					
Output 4.1					
Output 4.2					
Output 4.3					
Total			477,426	366,475	

3.2 Comments on management and implementation arrangements

---

[5] Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of annual financial report to the Administrative Agent.

Please comment on the management and implementation arrangements for the project, such as: the effectiveness of the implementation partnerships, coordination/coherence with other projects, any South-South cooperation, the modalities of support, any capacity building aspect, the use of partner country systems if any, the support by the PBF Secretariat and oversight by the Joint Steering Committee (for PRF only). Please also mention if there have been any changes to the project (what kind and when) (2000 character maximum):

PBF's funding to the MPC was carefully considered and complimented the EU funding, as the EU was unable to provide certain types of equipment (e.g. radios). In this sense, there was harmonisation among funding agencies. The cooperation between PBF, RCO, UNOPS and ILO (who had existing good relations with MPC) also reflected effective UN coordination.

This procurement project has been educational, even if this is not explicitly stated as an aim of the project. As mentioned in 2.1 Lessons Learned, the detailed nature of the procurement process and the context of Myanmar has produced several lessons. For example, during the process, MPC will have learned about transparent and systematic procurement processes. Next time MPC is more likely to check all tender documents, define their specification requirements in advance fully, etc., as a result of this project. UNOPS meanwhile has learned about local suppliers and availability of items in the local market as a result of this project. Lastly, we can say that all parties - MPC, UNOPS, RCO, PBF - have become aware that what seems a simple and quick procurement is actually more complicated in Myanmar. We can be satisfied with this learning outcome and it will benefit future projects of a similar nature.