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**PBF PROJECT progress report**

*Updated October 2022*

**COUNTRY:** LIBERIA

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

**YEAR of report:**      **Final**

**Project overview**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** Protection and Support of Enabling Environment for Women Human Rights Defenders and LGBTQI Rights Defenders in Liberia-PROSEED  **Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway: 00125938** | |
| **If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:**  Country Trust Fund  Regional Trust Fund    **Name of Recipient Fund:** | **Type and name of recipient organizations:**    **NUNO     Kvinna till Kvinna (convening Agency)** |
| **Date of first transfer:** 12 Feb 2021  **Project end date:** 12 August 2022  **Has this project received a cost or no cost extension?      No**  **Will this project be requesting a cost or no-cost extension?       No**  **Is the current project end date within 6 months?** The project has ended | |
| **Check if the project falls under one or more PBF priority windows:**  Gender promotion initiative  Youth promotion initiative  Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions  Cross-border or regional project | |
| **Total PBF approved project budget (by recipient organization):**   * *Please enter the total amounts in US dollars allocated to each recipient organization* * *Please enter the original budget amount, amount transferred to date and estimated expenditure by recipient.* * *For cross-border projects, group the amounts by agency, even where transfers are made to different country offices. You can provide the detail in the attached budget.*      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Recipient organisation** | **Budget Allocated ($)** | **Amount Transferred to date ($)** | **Amount spent to date ($)** | | **Kvinna till Kvinna** | 495 000.00 | 495 000.00 | **495 000.00** | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | | **TOTAL** |  |  | **495,000.00** |   Approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget: 100%    \*ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE\*  **The budget templates are available** [**here**](https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/content/application-guidelines)    **Implementing partners**  To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money to date? 3 partners    Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each to date   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Name of Implementing Partner*** | ***Type of Organisation (ex. Govt, civil society, etc.)*** | ***What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner to date*** | ***Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner (175 mots)*** | | Community Health Initiative | Civil Society | 99 995 | Dialogues with community leaders, training in HRBA, support to community groups of women, LGBTQ!, youth and other marginalised groups | | LIWEN | Civil Society | 99 995 | Dialogues with community leaders, training in HRBA, support to community groups of women, LGBTQ!, youth and other marginalised groups | | LEGAL | Civil Society | 59 995 | Dialogues with community leaders, training in HRBA, support to community groups of women, LGBTQ!, youth and other marginalised groups | | INCHR | Govt | 7 000 | Main focus is strengthening of the INCHR for promoting a broader human rights agenda (no focus on HRDs). Complements this project by addressing some major gaps on the INCHR (which will, in turn, increase their capacity to support the Women Human Rights Defenders network). |     **Gender-responsive Budgeting:**  Indicate what percentage (%) of the budget contributes gender equality or women's empowerment (GEWE)? 92,75%    Indicate dollar amount from the project document to contribute to gender equality or women’s empowerment: 459,093 USD    Amount expended to date on efforts contributing to gender equality or women’s empowerment: 459,093 USD | |
| **Project Gender Marker: 3**  **Project Risk Marker: 1**  **Project PBF focus area: (2.3) Conflict prevention/management** | |
| **Steering Committee and Government engagement**  Does the project have an active steering committee?  No    If yes, please indicate how many times the Project Steering Committee has met over the last 6 months?        N/A    Please provide a brief description of any engagement that the project has had with the government over the last 6 months? Please indicate what level of government the project has been engaging with? (275 words max.)   During the reporting period, the Head of Office working in collaboration with the Liberian INGO Forum as the chair of the Coordinating Committee had meetings with government entities. This included meeting with the Ministry of Finance and Developing and Planning’s Hon. Augustus Flomo. This meeting was two-fold, one was discussion of the launching of the online accreditation process for Civil Society and NGOs working in Liberia; and discussing the shrinking space for Civil society in Liberia. Though was a LINGO community, the Chair of LINGO pointed out that the importance of INGOs working collaboratively and effectively with the GoL; this is even more important for local civil society. She highlighted that local civil society has had many challenges in the past with the reaccreditation process due to their involvement in advocacy activities. This high-level consultative meeting with the Deputy Minister Flomo; took place with members from the Coordinating Committee members. It was agreed that the online reaccreditation process should streamline reaccreditation processes for INGOs and local civil society for the future to ensure their operations are in compliance with the different governmental entities. Also in this reporting period, there was a localisation technical working group established within the INGO Forum. The purpose of the technical working group is two-fold: 1) Define and advocate for a shared spirit of localization across LINGO members and our sphere of influence (government, civil society, private sector and donor partners); 2)Coordinate localization efforts across our portfolios to enhance effectiveness over time.    Also, during this reporting period, the Independent National Commission on Human Rights’ (INCHR) Gender Department was supported. The Gender Department under INCHR held a 3-day training providing a summary of INCHR engagements in promoting and protecting the rights of individuals from the LGBTQI community. Though, INCHR is a government funded Institution, it does not under either the Executive, Judiciary or the Legislative and it is in partnership with the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI), Economic Community of West African States(ECOWAS) and African Union(AU). Discussions of the Human Rights Based Approach took place which covers the basic principles of Human Rights irrespective of their sexual orientation and identification. The objective of the training was to increase awareness and education surrounding the current discriminatory conditions affecting LGBTIQ in Liberia, human rights defenders, and especially for emerging youth Human Rights Defenders. The training ended with SOGIE issues    Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Expression (SOGIE) SOGIEs issues including the Truth and Reconcilliation Comission recommendations relevant to LGBTIQ persons. The discussion centered around ensuring LGBTQI persons experience full enjoyment and equal treatment of human rights by removing norms that criminalize and stigmatize individuals from this community.  **Report preparation:**  Project report prepared by: Aisha Lai  Project report approved by: Malin Brenk  Did PBF Secretariat review the report: Yes | |

***NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:***

*- Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general /common language.*

*- Report on what has been achieved in the reporting period, not what the project aims to do.*

*- Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*

*- Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

*- In the results table, please be concise, you will have 3000 characters, including blank spaces to provide your responses*

**PART 1: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS**

**Please rate the implementation status of the following preliminary/preparatory activities** *(Not Started, Initiated, partially Completed, Completed, Not Applicable):*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contracting of Partners | Completed |
| Staff Recruitment | Completed |
| Collection of baselines | Completed |
| Identification of beneficiaries | Completed |

Provide any additional descriptive information relating to the status of the project, including whether preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (i.e. contracting of partners, staff recruitment, etc.) (250 word limit):

The PROSEED project sought to support women’s rights organisations and activists and LGBTQI organisations and activists to claim their rights and help others claim their rights and, in that way, contribute to gender equality. The PROSEED project was well-positioned in the communities and completed on August 14th 2022. Across the 11 communities within the four counties the partner organisations have strengthened relationships with both community members and local leaders. The project has completed 98 planned activities. Community structures were established, while each partner organisation have established community exit strategies. The end of project evaluation showed a shift in the mindset of community structures and a better understanding of the human rights-based approach. This shows that there are opportunities in the future in restoring the lines of communication and trust between leaders/influencers and community members and re-establishing community members’ ability to recognise each other as ‘human beings’ regardless of gender, sexual orientation or health conditions, so that issues of joint concern to community members can be resolved peacefully. Though the evaluation showed that total acceptance of LGBTQI rights was not adopted; the foundation of the beginning steps of treating individuals from this population humanely were adopted. The evaluation also found that in general the project was very relevant though different partners implemented activities using different approaches depending on the approach, community dynamics and previous experiences. Several informants from various villages, who were interviewed by the evaluation team, reported that the project had contributed to reducing violence, crime, child marriage, gender-based violence, domestic violence and child abuse and other forms of discrimination. However, interviews with community members did not leave the impression that the project had addressed or benefitted the LGBTQI+ community directly. Notwithstanding, interviews with community members led the evaluation team to conclude that the project had made a significant contribution to promoting a non-violent culture, and to countering all forms of discrimination, including that based on sexual orientation.

FOR PROJECTS WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF COMPLETION: summarize **the main structural, institutional or societal level change the project has contributed to**. This is not anecdotal evidence or a list of individual outputs, but a description of progress made toward the main purpose of the project. (550 word limit):

      The level of change that was initiated by the partner organisations with support from Kvinna till Kvinna; was done within an environment amongst those from low socio-economic status, a decline of the social structures at the community and national level. Weak public institutions, and weak and loose institutional and structural mechanisms for conflict resolution and the protection of individualities’ rights. Despite the structural challenges within the fabric of society and within Liberia, the project worked to change the mindset of community leaders who in turn, changed the mindset of community human rights groups that were already in existence before the project. This has left the community structures with a stronger understanding of basic human rights which has led rightsholders to respect women and those from marginalised groups. Though most human rights groups will not outwardly express their support for those from the LGBTQI community, they have indirectly become advocates by leading by example in not mistreating or stigmatising individuals from the fringes of society.

The integrated security training for LEGAL’s staff and activists, provided by the project, contributed to strengthening staff’ understanding of what a human rights-based approach is, how it can be introduced to communities, and how staff can care for their own security and wellbeing to avoid risks and burnout.

Therefore, it is likely that the training on a human rights-based approach and the positive relationship between Kvinna till Kvinna and its partners contributed to the positive outcomes achieved at the community level. Multiple factors contributed positively to the outcomes achieved. The project, through CSOs, responded to communities’ basic needs for healthcare and the project was implemented in respect of and actively used the existing networks and power structures within communities to spread their message. Though the evaluation found ‘Informal governance systems differ from one community to another. A good analysis and understanding of the community governance systems are key to identifying the key influencers and to ensure that all key influencers are on board to deal with the key community challenges, including those of violence and discrimination.’ This in turn shows that despite challenges at the community level, key influencers can and if provided with adequate resources can continue to support peacebuilding interventions at a local setting”.

**PART II: RESULT PROGRESS BY PROJECT OUTCOME**

*Describe overall progress under each Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration). Do not list 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.*

* *“On track” refers to the timely completion of outputs as indicated in the workplan.*
* *“On track with peacebuilding results” refers to higher-level changes in the conflict or peace factors that the project is meant to contribute to. These effects are more likely in mature projects than in newer ones.*

**How many outcomes does the project have? One**

**Outcome 1:**  Strengthened protection and resilience of Women Rights Defenders and LGBTQI Rights Defenders to safely claim human rights for all and challenge current patriarchal structures.

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

**Progress summary:** *(350 word limit)*

During the closure of the project, it was shown that the major activities of integrated security approach for human right defenders, raising awareness of the human rights-based approach at a community level and national level advocacy showed a shift in the rightsholders. The project evaluation measured through qualitative focus group discussions and Key Informant interviews sought to answer the following questions:

* How relevant is the program to the context, women, LGBTQI persons and human rights defenders their needs and aspirations?
* How well does the interventions complement and comply with other initiatives operating in the same space, with relevant national frameworks and policies and with other on-going reconciliation and peacebuilding initiatives supported by the UN PBF in Liberia?
* How well was the program implemented and to what extent were partner organizations’ interventions consistent with the intended objectives of the project?
* How good, valuable, and important are the outcomes and impacts – short-term, medium-term, and long-term; intended and unintended, for both the communities, the human rights defenders and the duty bearers targeted?
* How institutionally and structurally sustainable are the outcomes achieved?

The methodology used Outcome Harvesting is designed for situations where organizations are interested in learning about *achievements* rather than activities, and about *effects* rather than implementation. It is especially useful when the aim is to understand the *process of change* and how the intervention as well as other factors have contributed to this change, rather than simply to accumulate a list of results. At the same time, if offers a useful methodology in contexts and situations where the intervention does not or is unlikely to ‘deliver’ predictable and standard outcomes (such as health care or education).

The findings showed the project as implemented on the ground is highly relevant. It contributes to promoting an understanding among community members and formal and informal leaders in four counties of what a human rights-based approach is, and how it can be applied in practice by community leaders and influencers, among women and community members and among members of grassroots human rights groups established by the project. The evaluation found that this work is fully in line with the UN Peace Building Fund’s priorities (Women’s empowerment, Youth political engagement and socio-economic empowerment, Rule of law, transitional justice and human rights, Prevention, and peaceful management of land-related conflicts) and contributes to ‘building peace from the bottom up’.

**Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured under this Outcome:** *(350-word limit)*

In the final evaluation, it was found that gender equality and women’s empowerment was ensured under this outcome due to the partner organisations approach and methodology approach during implementation. The evaluation found that the project has contributed to strengthening some women’s ability to claim their right to access resources; such as land, and to participate in decision making at the household or community levels. It has also helped introduce peaceful mechanisms for conflict resolution, and to reduce mob violence in reaction to criminal acts. It has helped diminish prejudices and strengthen tolerance towards minorities, including HIV/Aids survivors and LGBTQI+ persons as human beings, but not as human rights defenders or people with a specific identity or special needs or rights. The human rights-based approach that was introduced to community members was seen as a guide to ethical conduct and respect for all human beings and led participants to think more about how they interacted with each other, the boundaries between people, judgment effects and the best way to solve conflicts.

The participants interviewed reported that because of the Human Rights Based Approach training they adopted a wider perspective on human rights. They revised their positions towards discriminated groups, and some of them changed the way they communicated with others and became friendlier and more responsible. Others changed their behaviours and became less violent towards their most vulnerable family members (children, women). Also during the evaluation, key informants said project engagement had encouraged them to engage in local governance and become a community leader, and yet other women had been encouraged by the training to educate girls on their rights and how to prevent sexual abuse, child marriage and pregnancy. Some of the participants mentioned that they were more critical about whether they were respected and safe in their relationships.

**Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments- provide an update on the achievement of key outcome indicators for Outcome 1 in the table below**

* If the outcome has more than 3 indicators, select the 3 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. (3000 characters max per entry)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Indicator progress to Date** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** |
| Indicator 1.1  % of HRDs who report one concrete example of how the project has contributed to them feeling more secure in their work (disaggregated by sex, age, location, and stakeholder group) | **0** | **50%** | Based on evaluation of selected human right defenders, will be reported in final report.  No Data disagreed data to date, will be provided in final report. |  |
| Indicator 1.2  % of leaders who report having developed pledges for action (disaggregated by sex, age, location, and stakeholder group) | **0** | **20%** | 9% - 15 out of 173 leaders have openly pledged their support and acceptance of WHRD and LGBTQIA+ HRDs**.** 6 religious leaders committed and took strong actions to shift cultural/traditional norms and values. |  |
| Indicator 1.3  % of participants who report participating in developing advocacy plans in their communities (disaggregated by sex, age, location, and stakeholder group) | 0 | **30%** |  |  |

**How many Outputs does Outcome 1 have?** **3 outputs**

Please list up to 5 of most relevant outputs for outcome 1 and for each output, and using the project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against 3 most relevant output indicators

.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Indicator progress to Date** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** |
| Output Indicator 1.1.1 Increased knowledge on risk assessment and integrated security strategies among WHRDs and LGBTQI RDs (24 participants, expected 18 self-identifying as women, 6 self-identifying as men) | 5% | Target: 30% average increase on level of knowledge on risk assessment and integrated security strategies among WHRDs and LGBTQI RDs participating in training. | At the end of the refresher training, all 16 out of 24 (67%) participants mentioned increased knowledge of risk assessment and integrated security approach. |  |
| Output Indicator 1.1.2  Increased capacity to conduct training on risk assessment and Integrated security strategies among 6 staff of INHRC (3 women, 3 men) and 6 staff of the Women Human Rights Defenders Network (6 women); through the training of trainers | 0% | Target: 75% of trained participants report having sufficient knowledge of the methodology and feeling confident to roll-out trainings on the Integrated security approach | At the end of the refresher training, 20 out of 24 (80%) participants expressed confidence in rolling out the training.  Twelve of our 24 partners mentioned that we had shared knowledge and skills gained within their network and co-workers.  One partner (Sisters for Sisters) developed a concept to roll out the training to 20 LBTQ women in the project location. |  |
| Output Indicator 1.1.3 # of WHRDs, LGBTQI RDs and youth between 15-29 years, participating in the networking event. | **0** | Target: 20 WHRDs (female), 20 LGBTQI RDs (10 male, 10 female) and 40 youth (20 men, 20 women) participate in the networking event. | **40% Male and 60% Female** |  |
| Indicator 1.1.5  Partner organisations have addressed gaps (in terms of policies and systems) | 0 | **2** | **Indicator 1.1.5**    Partners have policies in place as per the organizational assessment, spot checks and audit.  Final Audit Report to be shared. |  |

**Output 1.2:** Increased understanding of Human Rights-Based approach and acceptance and protection of WHRDs and LGBTQI Rights Defenders by the community, traditional and religious leaders

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Indicator progress to Date** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** |
| Indicator 1.2.1  # Dialogue sessions conducted with traditional & community leaders and religious leaders, 65% men, 35% women. | **Output**    **0** | Target: 8 Dialogue sessions conducted with community members | 8 dialogue sessions were held targeting 173 traditional and community leaders.  No Data disagreed data to date, will be provided in final report. |  |
| Indicator 1.2.2  Increased knowledge on HRBA and HR-related content among project participants | **0** | Target: 20 % average increase on level of knowledge on HRBA and HR-related content among project participants | Results (from pre and post-tests and monitoring visits) from the dialogues sessions with influential leaders and training with traditional and religious leaders indicate an increased awareness of human rights issues, HRBA and related issues. It has led to Community Leaders being knowledgeable of Human Rights issues and able to identify and report on human rights cases.  No Data disagreed data to date, will be provided in final report. |  |
| Indicator 1.2.3  Increased acceptance of WHRDs and LGBTQI RDs among project participants | Target: 20 % average increase on acceptance level of WHRDs and LGBTQI RDs among project participants |  | 9%- A total of 173 traditional and religious leaders who participated in the dialogues and other engagements showed a willingness to support the project. 15 out of 173 have openly pledged their support and acceptance of WHRD and LGBTQIA+ HRDs. Out of the 15, 6 religious leaders committed and took strong actions to shift cultural/traditional norms and values. Two Imams and four Pastor have started including human rights messages within their constituencies.  No Data disagreed data to date, will be provided in final report. |  |

**Output 1.3:** Women, girls and boys (including sexual minorities), analyse, understand and respond to GBV, Harmful Traditional Practices, and other violations of their rights.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | Indicator progress to Date | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** |
| Indicator 1.3.1  Rightsholders' forums and groups report having improved their leadership and structures. | **0%** | Target: 70% of forums and groups report having improved their leadership and structures as a result of this project. | 61% A total of 25 groups were established, reaching 625 (25 in each group) people. Out of 25, 16 are active with strong leadership. |  |
| Indicator 1.3.2  The targeted rightsholder groups have increased knowledge and skills to raise awareness on women's rights and/or LGBTQI rights in their own communities. | **5%** | Target: 30% average increase in level of knowledge and skills to raise awareness on women's rights and/or LGBTQI rights among rightsholders' groups. | 80%- out of the 25 groups, 20 have shown increased knowledge and skill to raise awareness in the communities |  |
| Indicator 1.3.3  Support to established forums and community groups to develop action plans | **0** | 70% of the targeted community groups have seen the pledges of action partially or substantially completed. | The communities have outlined key issues to be addressed and used in advocacy awareness in regard to the trainings held around human rights, SRHR and GBV. |  |

**Please repeat the outcome level and output level reporting for each outcome and its respective outputs**

**PART III: CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

Is the project planning any significant events in the next 6 months (eg. national dialogues, youth congresses, film screenings, etc.)      N/A

If yes, please state how many, and for each, provide the approximate date of the event and a brief description, including its key objectives, target audience and location (if known)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Event Description*** | ***Tentative Date*** | ***Location*** | ***Target Audience*** | ***Event Objectives (150 word limit)*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Human Impact**

This section is about the human impact of the project. Please state the number of key stakeholders of the project, and for each, please briefly describe:

1. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implementation
2. The impact of the project on their lives
3. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Key stakeholder | What were the challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implementation? (350 words max) | What has been the impact of the project on their lives (350 words max) | Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group (350 words max) |
| LEGAL | Before the project LEGAL not only faced discrimination by Liberians in the community but also amongst those in civil society | During the life of the project, through dialogue sessions with partners and partner meetings, we have been able to introduce the HRBA to those of civil society. |  |
| CHI | In the initial phases of the project, we have come across many challenges. A summary of these challenges included the community’s acceptance of the project’s focus considering the context and the socio-economic status of individuals. However, we were relentless in ensuring project goals and objectives were achieved. Some of the challenges encountered includes  Community acceptance of the project considering the context  Most community people do not believe in human rights  Discrimination of a particular group of people | The partners approach to conflict mitigation and working through community influencers proved successful at daily interactions with community members improving. They even set up a committee through the HRG to create a vision board for the community. It was this vision board that contributed to the community requesting for community essentials that could benefit the whole community.  Men are now seeing women as partners and including them into decision making processes. While Community Policing systems have been established to respond to human rights violations  People feel empowered now to report violent cases using the referral pathway  Mutual respect for other people rights  Women are empowered with livelihood activities to generate revenue and 10% of proceeds generated are used toward aid and fast tracking violence cases  People can now talk for other people rights without fears |  |
| LIWEN | One of the major challenges was LGBTQI issue. When topic was introduced in all the communities from the beginning, most of the participants had serious. Amongst the participants, some did not know such people (LGBTQI community) existed in their community, from the training, they were knowledgeable.  problem especially for Kakata. Some participants’ remarks were; if we knew the project had to do with LGBTQI business, which is commonly called Gay” we would not have come to the workshop Quotation: | LIWEN established forum in all the project communities, the forum created awareness and radio talk show which sent signal about the project to communities, market areas, schools etc.  LIWEN empowered participants through livelihood training.  County and local authorities accepted the UNPBF project in the Counties and communities and their wiliness to work with us.  LGBTQI acceptance was a challenge but, it was observed that from the training with the community, traditional and religious leaders, there is increased in understanding in the 4 communities.  After the HRBA training in all LIWEN project communities, participants are now agent of change.  Kakata has dramatized in community on some of what they’ve learned in the training on HRBA. In the community, many people saw themselves in it and realized that they should refrain from their perception toward marginalized group.  Both cotton Tree and Kakata are in the process to in cooperate as CBOS  After the empowerment skills training in Kakata, they are now using the skills to establish village savings. | Patience Smith from Gorzohn, Grand Bassa County said, she used to look at HIV/AIDS and LGBTQI community differently. According to her, she discriminated her friend who was affected with HIV. They both live in the same house with their children but, she stopped talking and eating with her, went to the extent of stopping her children from playing with her friends’ children. After the HRBA training, she realized that no one should be discriminated. Everyone is the same regardless of who you are or whatever background you come from. |

In addition to the stakeholder specific impact described above, please use this space to describe any additional human impact that the project has had. (650 word limit):

      During the evaluation, Several informants, from various villages, who were interviewed by the evaluation team, reported that the project had contributed to reducing violence, crime, child marriage, gender-based violence, domestic violence and child abuse and other forms of discrimination. However, interviews with community members did not leave the impression that the project had addressed or benefitted the LGBTQI+ community directly. Notwithstanding, interviews with community members led the evaluation team to conclude that the project had made a significant contribution to promoting a non-violent culture, and to countering all forms of discrimination, including that based on sexual orientation. “As a result of this project, I totally changed my beliefs about women. Prioor to this project, I regarded women as slaves to their husbands/ Now I blieve they are human beings with rights”-Male community member, 47 year old, Conrtroe Village.

***How valuable is this outcome?*** Although this is not an outcome that was reflected in the projects’ results framework, the evaluation team finds that it is highly valuable, as it changes the negative ideas and perceptions that are at the root of discrimination and lays a foundation for dialogue and non-violent resolutions of disputes and conflicts at the community level.

You can also upload upto 3 ﬁles in various formats (picture ﬁles, powerpoint, pdf, video, etc..) to illustrate the human impact of the project and 3 links to online resources (OPTIONAL)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Monitoring:** Please list monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period (*350 word limit)*  *Throughout the life of the project, t*he partners carried out regular monitoring visits  Kvinna till Kvinna did three monitoring visits to review project progress and provide technical support to the partners. | Do outcome indicators have baselines?  If yes, please provide a brief description  Has the project launched perception surveys or other community-based data collection?  If yes, please provide a brief description (350 word limit) Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Evaluation:** Has an evaluation been conducted during the reporting period?  The evaluation was conducted during the last quarter of the project. | Evaluation budget (response required):      18,500  If project will end in next six months, describe the evaluation preparations *(350 word limit)*:      The evaluation was completed. |
| **Catalytic effects (financial):** Indicate name of funding agent and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project since it started. | Name of funder: Amount:  Irish Aid $120,000 |
| **Catalytic Eﬀect (non-ﬁnancial):** Has the project enabled or created a larger or longer‐term peacebuilding change to occur?  ***Please select***  No catalytic eﬀect  xSome catalytic eﬀect  Signiﬁcant catalytic eﬀect  Very Signiﬁcant catalytic eﬀect  Don't Know  Too early to tell | If relevant, please describe how the project has had a (non-ﬁnancial) catalytic eﬀect i.e. ways in which the project has supported the expansion or creation of programs and policies supporting peace, both within and outside the UN system (Please limit your response to 350 words)    Through this project, it was seen that there is an importance for civil society to work with not only human right defenders but civil society organisations that focus specifically on LGBTQI rights. It is through this engagement, that Kvinna till Kvinna was more involved with the two (women and LGBTQI) networks. Furthermore, it was this project that catalytically launched the formalisation of the Women Human Rights Defender’s Network. This network is now established and had an official launch after the close of the project. Finally, a small continuation of this project will continue in partnership with the Irish Embassy. This initiative will work with two civil society partners to continue community level Human Rights Based Approach dialogue sessions with community leaders and influencers. It is the expected outcome of this project to be transferred to a local civil society actor at the end of this project. Finally, the current cooperation between SIDA and Kvinna till Kvinna will include new partners that will be from the LGBTQI community to ehance a more inclusive women’s movement. |
| **Sustainability:** Does the project have an explicit exit strategy?Please describe any steps that have been taken to ensure the sustainability of peacebuilding gains beyond the duration of the project (350 word limit)  As this project focuses on information exchange, capacity development and knowledge transfer, building an involved or explicit exit strategy was not deemed necessary. The Integrated Security workshops included a Training of Trainers’ component, so that the approach can be replicated after the project ends. . This was further measured through the evaluation that The found that most of the influencers (traditional leaders) interviewed expressed their determination to promote a human-rights approach among other members of their groups. Some of them have also taken initiatives (individually or collectively) to sensitise community members to the importance of the human-rights approach and non-violent communication The evaluation found that, in some cases, influencers had organised themselves to plan awareness-raising and advocacy activities to promote human rights values. Many influencers admitted that they had already used their powers and social networks to solve conflicts without violence, and to support victims of discrimination in having their rights recognised. Finally the evaluation found community influencers had shared their resources and contacts with new human rights groups in the community and thereby had facilitated those groups’ mission to support victims of discriminations. The evaluation team also found examples of how influencers had stood alongside human rights’ defenders, including the LGBTQI+ rights’ defenders to protect them in conflict situations. The project represents a tangible response to a situation where community influencers face enormous challenges in maintaining peace and solving problems in their communities, due to the absence of formal governance powers and authorities. The project has equipped them with tools to respond to this challenge and facilitated connections to human rights’ groups that are ready to promote peace within the community and to prevent violence. These actions in themselves show examples of determination to implement learnings from the PROSEED program which in itself is actionable sustainability. At the end of the project, all partners developed community exit plans documenting the project and the stakeholders that were included. | |
| **Other:** Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? *(350 word limit)*    The recipient organizations continue to need support for this unique and dynamic project beyond funding from the Irish Embassy. The evaluation showed that the PROSEED project was very relevant and well accepted by the chosen communities. However, there is a need to continue engaging at the community level. This change at the community level can use the bottom-up approach to influence key decision makers to accept the human rights of marginalised groups. Though this project contributed to the creation of a women’s movement program funded by SIDA that will promote an inclusive women’s movement using an intersectional approach; this will only touch the surface of the need from the LGBTQI+ community for local level advocacy. In 2021, the LGBTQI community in Liberia was shaken by social media attacks via TiKTok revealing individuals’ sexual preference in a derogatory manner. This in turn resulted in some cases to physical violence, and family disturbances for these targeted individuals. Though this project, temporary support was provided to victims but there is a need to support members from the community in ensuring their information can be safe within the social media space. Initial discussions took place with Frontline Defenders on creating a responsive team of future similar incidences with the LGBTQI+ network. However with limited resources, there is still a gap to provide support if this situation were to happen again in the future. Finally, recipients need continuous, stable funding to ensure they can maintain human resource, hence retaining institutional knowledge. This will create more efficient and effective implementation. | |