

PBF June 2024 Project Progress Report



PROJECT OVERVIEW

Thank you for taking the time to complete the PBF Progress report. For projects with more than one recipient, please consult among co-recipients prior to filling out the form to ensure collaboration on the responses. You can generate a print out of the blank form by clicking on the *print* icon on the top right corner of the page. If you have any questions or require technical assistance in filling out the form, please send an email to gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org

Click Next below to start

» Report Submission

| | |
|--|---|
| Type of report | * |
| <input type="radio"/> Semi-annual | |
| <input type="radio"/> Annual | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Final | |
| <input type="radio"/> Other | |
| Date of submission of report | * |
| 2024-07-30 | |
| 2024-07-30 | |
| Name and Title of Person submitting the report | * |
| Madina Diallo, Project Coordinator | |
| Name and Title of Person who approved the report | * |
| Yvonne Forsén | |

Have all fund recipients for this project contributed to the report?

*

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Did PBF Secretariat or RCO focal point review the report?

*

If there is no PBF secretariat in country, please select "Not applicable". If there is a PBF secretariat, you should normally ensure that they have an opportunity to review.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not Applicable

» Project Information and Geographical Scope

Is this a cross-border project?

*

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Please select the geographical region in which the project is implemented

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Asia and the Pacific | <input type="radio"/> Central & Southern Africa | <input type="radio"/> East Africa |
| <input type="radio"/> Europe and Central Asia | <input type="radio"/> Global | <input type="radio"/> Latin America and the Caribbean |
| <input type="radio"/> Middle East and North Africa | <input type="radio"/> West Africa | |

Country of project implementation

*

Other, please specify

*

Project Title

*

Write the 8 digit MPTFO number and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document

*

EXAMPLE: 00118938: Community-based prevention of violence and social cohesion using innovation for young people in displaced and host communities

Please select the geographical region(s) in which the project is implemented *

If the project you are looking for does not appear in the following question, please make sure that you have selected the correct regions. A limited number of cross border projects span multiple geographic regions. For example, a cross border project between Niger and Chad spans both West Africa and Central & Southern Africa

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asia and the Pacific | <input type="checkbox"/> Central & Southern Africa | <input type="checkbox"/> East Africa |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Europe and Central Asia | <input type="checkbox"/> Global | <input type="checkbox"/> Latin America and the Caribbean |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle East and North Africa | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> West Africa | |

Please select the title of the project for which you are submitting the report *

- ☐ 00130614/5/6: AILP : Appui aux Initiatives Locales de promotion de la Paix
- ☐ 00114134/5: Appui aux initiatives transfrontalières de dialogue communautaire avec les acteurs de la sécurité et de la justice pour la consolidation de la paix au Mali et au Niger
- ☒ 00129231/2: Building cross border peace and strengthening sustainable livelihoods of cattle herders and crop farmers in Sierra Leone and Guinea
- ☐ 00106947/8/9: Burkina Faso/Niger/Mali: contribution to the United Nations Strategy for the Sahel
- ☐ 00128878/9: Consolider la Cohésion Sociale transfrontalière entre la Côte d'Ivoire et la Guinée pour une meilleure compréhension et anticipation des risques et le renforcement de la confiance et de la collaboration entre les acteurs locaux
- ☐ 00119702/3: Cross border engagement between Cote d'Ivoire and Liberia to reinforce social cohesion and border security – Phase II
- ☐ 00125153/4: Gestion des conflits et renforcement de la résilience agro-pastorale à la frontière Mauritanie-Malienne
- ☐ 00113700/1: Jeunes et paix: "Une approche transfrontalière entre le Mali et le Burkina-Faso"
- ☐ 00120376/7/8: Programme d'appui à la prévention des conflits et de l'extrémisme violent dans les zones frontalières du Bénin, du Burkina et du Togo
- ☐ 00120162/4/5: Promotion d'une transhumance pacifique dans la région du Liptako-Gourma
- ☐ 00129587/8: Renforcer la gouvernance des zones frontalières pour consolider la cohésion sociale et prévenir les conflits
- ☐ 00129699/700: Supporting Cross-Border Cooperation for Increased Community Resilience and Social Cohesion in The Gambia and Senegal
- ☐ 00140260_1_2: Programme d'appui à la prévention des conflits et de l'extrémisme violent dans les zones frontalières du Bénin du Burkina Faso et du Togo Phase 2
- ☐ 00119957_8: Femmes et gestion des conflits liés aux ressources naturelles
- ☐ 00133730_1: Projet transfrontalier d'appui au renforcement de la sécurité communautaire à la gestion et la prévention des conflits liés à la transhumance et la gestion des ressources naturelles
- ☐ 00140187_8: Projet relatif à la promotion de la gouvernance transfrontalière inclusive et au renforcement de la résilience des populations en vue d'atténuer les risques sécuritaires dans les espaces frontaliers
- ☐ 00140412_3_4_5: Promoting CSO-led peacebuilding initiatives in the Lake Chad Basin sub-region
- ☐ Other, Specify

Write the 8 digit MPTFO numbers and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document *

EXAMPLE: 00129699/700: Supporting Cross-Border Cooperation for Increased Community Resilience and Social Cohesion in The Gambia and Senegal

Please select the countries where this project is being implemented *

- ☐ Benin
- ☐ Burkina Faso
- ☐ Cote D'Ivoire
- ☐ Gambia
- ☐ Ghana
- ☒ Guinea
- ☐ Guinea-Bissau
- ☐ Liberia
- ☐ Mali
- ☐ Mauritania
- ☐ Niger
- ☐ Nigeria
- ☐ Senegal
- ☒ Sierra Leone
- ☐ Togo
- ☐ Other, Specify

Other, Please specify *

Project Start Date (Date of first transfer) *

2021-11-09

2021-11-09

Project End Date *

2024-05-07

2024-05-07

Has this project received an extension? *

- ☐ YES, Cost Extension
- ☒ YES, No Cost Extension
- ☐ YES, Both Cost and No Cost Extensions
- ☐ NO, No Extensions

Will this project be requesting an extension?

*

- ☐ YES, Cost Extension
- ☐ YES, No Cost Extension
- ☐ YES, Both Cost and No Cost Extensions
- ☒ NO, No Extensions

Is the current project end date within 6 months?

*

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Is funding disbursed either into a national or regional trust fund?

*

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, please select which

*

- ☐ National Trust Fund
- ☐ Regional Trust Fund

Recipients

Is the convening agency a UN agency or a non UN entity? *

- ☒ UN entity
- ☐ Non-UN Entity

Please select the convening agency recipient *

- ☐ UNDP: United Nations Development Programme ☐ IOM: International Organization for Migration
- ☐ UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund
- ☐ OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
- ☐ UNWOMEN: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
- ☐ UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ☐ UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund
- ☐ FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization ☒ WFP: World Food Programme
- ☐ UNHABITAT: United Nations Human Settlements Programme
- ☐ UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- ☐ UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme ☐ ILO: International Labour Organization
- ☐ WHO: World Health Organization ☐ PAHO/WHO
- ☐ UNCDF: United Nations Capital Development Fund ☐ UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- ☐ UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services
- ☐ UNIDO: United Nations Industrial Development Organization ☐ ITC: International Trade Centre
- ☐ UNDPO ☐ Other, Specify

Other, Please specify *

Are there other recipients for this project? *

- ☐ No other recipients
- ☒ Yes, other UN recipients only
- ☐ Yes, other non-UN recipients only
- ☐ Yes, both UN and non-UN recipients

Please select other UN recipients

*

Select all that apply

- ☐ UNDP: United Nations Development Programme ☒ IOM: International Organization for Migration
- ☐ UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund
- ☐ OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
- ☐ UNWOMEN: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
- ☐ UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ☐ UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund
- ☐ FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization ☐ WFP: World Food Programme
- ☐ UNHABITAT: United Nations Human Settlements Programme
- ☐ UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- ☐ UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme ☐ ILO: International Labour Organization
- ☐ WHO: World Health Organization ☐ PAHO/WHO
- ☐ UNCDF: United Nations Capital Development Fund ☐ UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- ☐ UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services
- ☐ UNIDO: United Nations Industrial Development Organization ☐ ITC: International Trade Centre
- ☐ UN Department of Peace Operations ☐ Other, Specify

Other, Please specify

*

Please select other non-UN recipients *

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACTED | <input type="checkbox"/> Action Aid | <input type="checkbox"/> AEDE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agence de Coopération et de Recherche pour le Développement (ACORD) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) | <input type="checkbox"/> Avocats Sans Frontières | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Avocats Sans Frontières Belgium | <input type="checkbox"/> Avocats sans frontières Canada | <input type="checkbox"/> CARE International UK |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Centre d'étude et de coopération internationale (CECI) - BF | <input type="checkbox"/> Christian Aid Ireland | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> COIPRODEN | <input type="checkbox"/> Concern Worldwide | <input type="checkbox"/> Conexion Guatemala |
| <input type="checkbox"/> COOPI - Cooperazione Internazionale | <input type="checkbox"/> CORD Burundi | <input type="checkbox"/> CORDAID |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corporacion Sisma Mujer | <input type="checkbox"/> CRS - Catholic Relief Services | <input type="checkbox"/> DanChurchAid |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fund for Congolese Women | <input type="checkbox"/> Fundacion Estudios Superior (FESU) | <input type="checkbox"/> Fundación Mi Sangre (FMS) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fundación Nacional para el Desarrollo de Honduras (FUNADEH) | <input type="checkbox"/> Fundación para la Libertad de Prensa (FLIP) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation | <input type="checkbox"/> Humanity & Inclusion (HI) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ICTJ (International Center for Transitional Justice) | <input type="checkbox"/> Instituto Holandes para Democracia Multipartidaria (NIMD) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Integrity Watch | <input type="checkbox"/> International Alert | <input type="checkbox"/> International Rescue Committee |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interpeace | <input type="checkbox"/> Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation | <input type="checkbox"/> Life and Peace Institute (LPI) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MDG-EISA - Institut Electoral pour une Démocratie Durable en Afrique (EISA), bureau de Madagascar | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mercy Corps | <input type="checkbox"/> MLAL - ProgettoMondo | <input type="checkbox"/> MSIS-TATAO |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NIMD (Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy) | <input type="checkbox"/> Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ONG Adkoul - ONG Adkoul | <input type="checkbox"/> ONG AZHAR | <input type="checkbox"/> OXFAM |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Peace Direct | <input type="checkbox"/> Plan International | <input type="checkbox"/> PNG UN Country Fund |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Red de Instituciones por los Derechos de la Niñez | <input type="checkbox"/> ROI - Roza Otunbayeva Initiati | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Saferworld | <input type="checkbox"/> Sampan'Asa Momba ny Fampandrosoana (SAF/FJKM) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Save the Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Search for Common Ground (SFCG) | <input type="checkbox"/> SismaMujer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SOS Sahel Sudan | <input type="checkbox"/> Stichting Impunity Watch | <input type="checkbox"/> Tearfund |
| <input type="checkbox"/> The Carter Center, Inc. | <input type="checkbox"/> Trocaire | <input type="checkbox"/> War Child |
| <input type="checkbox"/> World Vision International | <input type="checkbox"/> World Vision Myanmar | <input type="checkbox"/> ZOA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> blank_placeholder | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, Please specify | |

Other, Please specify *

Implementing Partners

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money to date?

4

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each to date

Please select the type of organisation which best describes the type of implementing partner *

- ☐ National youth CSO
- ☐ National women's CSO
- ☐ Other National CSO
- ☐ Subnational youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's CSO
- ☐ Other subnational CSO
- ☐ Regional CSO
- ☐ Regional Organisation
- ☐ International NGO
- ☐ Governmental entity
- ☒ Other

Other, Please specify

National CSO

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Talking Drum Studio Sierra Leone

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner to date during this reporting period *

172259,38

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

TDS Sierra Leone is responsible for implementing Outcome 1 in Sierra Leone. The main activities are:

- **Participatory theatre**
- **Town-hall meetings**
- **Sensitization of the cattle settlement policy in local language at community level**
- **Production and broadcasting of radio programs**
- **Set up and training of cross-border alert teams**

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each to date

Please select the type of organisation which best describes the type of implementing partner *

- ☐ National youth CSO
- ☐ National women's CSO
- ☐ Other National CSO
- ☐ Subnational youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's CSO
- ☐ Other subnational CSO
- ☐ Regional CSO
- ☐ Regional Organisation
- ☐ International NGO
- ☐ Governmental entity
- ☒ Other

Other, Please specify

National CSO

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Talking Drum Studio Guinea

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner to date during this reporting period *

221982

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

TDS Guinea is responsible for implementing Outcome 1 in Guinea. The main activities are:

- **Participatory theatre**
- **Town-hall meetings**
- **Sensitization of the cattle settlement policy in local language at community level**
- **Production and broadcasting of radio programs**
- **Set up and training of cross-border alert teams**
- **Re-dynamization and training of transhumance committees**

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each to date

Please select the type of organisation which best describes the type of implementing partner *

- ☐ National youth CSO
- ☐ National women's CSO
- ☐ Other National CSO
- ☐ Subnational youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's CSO
- ☐ Other subnational CSO
- ☐ Regional CSO
- ☐ Regional Organisation
- ☐ International NGO
- ☐ Governmental entity
- ☒ Other

Other, Please specify

National CSO

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Organisation Guinéenne de Développement Communautaire (OGDC)

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner to date during this reporting period *

118208

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

OGDC is responsible for implementing Outcome 2 in the sub-prefectures of Banian in Guinea. The main activities are:

- **Support to IVS development**
- **Reforestation**
- **Support to IVS fencing**
- **Rice and vegetable culture**
- **Training of farmer-based organizations**
- **Support to farmers and cattle herders in setting up income-generating activities**

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each to date

Please select the type of organisation which best describes the type of implementing partner *

- ☐ National youth CSO
- ☐ National women's CSO
- ☐ Other National CSO
- ☐ Subnational youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's CSO
- ☐ Other subnational CSO
- ☐ Regional CSO
- ☐ Regional Organisation
- ☐ International NGO
- ☐ Governmental entity
- ☒ Other

Other, Please specify

National CSO

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Action pour le Bien-être Familial (ABEF)

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner to date during this reporting period *

208716

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

ABEF is responsible for implementing Outcome 2 in the sub-prefectures of Hérémakonon and Songoyah in Guinea.

The main activities are:

- **Support to IVS development**
- **Reforestation**
- **Support to IVS fencing**
- **Rice and vegetable culture**
- **Training of farmer-based organizations**
- **Support to farmers and cattle herders in setting up income-generating activities**

Financial Reporting

» Delivery by Recipient

Please enter the total amounts in full US dollars allocated to each recipient organization

Please enter the original budget amount, amount transferred to date and estimated expenditure by recipient.

Please make sure you enter the correct amount. All values should be entered in **US Dollars**

For cross-border projects, group the amounts by agency, even if different country offices are involved. You will have the opportunity to share a more detailed budget in the next section.

| Recipients | Total Project Budget (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars</i> | Transfers to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars</i> | Expenditure to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars</i> | Implementati on rate as a percentage of total budget (calculated automatically) |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| WFP: World Food Programme | 3078537* | 3078537* | 3078537* | 100% |
| | * | * | * | % |
| IOM: International Organization for Migration | 1471463* | 1471463* | 1471463* | 100% |
| | * | * | * | % |

[illegible]

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| TOTAL | 4550000 | 4550000 | 4550000 | 100 % |
| | | | | |

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **100%**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the approximate implementation rate as a % *

» Gender-responsive Budgeting

Indicate what **percentage (%)** of the budget contributes to gender equality or women's empowerment (GEWE) as per the project document? *

40

The dollar amount of the budget contributing to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) based on percentage entered above and total project budget is **US \$ 1820000**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

☐ Correct ☒ Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the *budget amount* allocated to GEWE in US Dollars *

1859678

Amount expended to date on efforts contributing to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US \$ 1820000**. Is this correct? *

☐ Correct ☒ Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the *expenditure to date* on GEWE in US dollars *

1859678

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE. *

The templates for the budget are available [here](#)

PBF cross-border project financial report - November 2021-May 2024 FINAL-23_43_45.xlsx



Project Markers

Please select the Gender Marker Associated with this project *

- ☐ Score 1 for projects that contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly (less than 30% of the total budget for GEWE)
- ☒ Score 2 for projects that have gender equality as a significant objective and allocate between 30 and 79% of the total project budget to GEWE
- ☐ Score 3 for projects that have gender equality as a principal objective and allocate at least 80% of the total project budget to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE)

Please select the Risk Marker Associated with this project *

- ☐ Risk marker 0 = low risk to achieving outcomes
- ☒ Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes
- ☐ Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

Please select the PBF Focus Area associated with this project *

- ☐ (1.1) Security Sector Reform
- ☐ (1.2) Rule of Law
- ☐ (1.3) Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration
- ☐ (1.4) Political Dialogue
- ☐ (2.1) National reconciliation
- ☐ (2.2) Democratic Governance
- ☒ (2.3) Conflict prevention/management
- ☐ (3.1) Employment
- ☐ (3.2) Equitable access to social services
- ☐ (4.1) Strengthening of essential national state capacity
- ☐ (4.2) Extension of state authority/Local Administration
- ☐ (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources (including PBF Secretariats)

Is the project part of one or more PBF priority windows? *

Select all that apply

- ☐ Gender promotion initiative
- ☐ Youth promotion initiative
- ☐ Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions
- ☒ Cross-border or regional project
- ☐ None

Steering Committee and Government engagement

Does the project have an active steering committee/ project board? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please indicate how many times the Project Steering Committee has met over the last 6 months?

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The project has an active Technical Committee (TC) in Sierra Leone and Guinea. A (joint) steering committee was established with high-level representatives from line ministries from Guinea and Sierra Leone, UN implementing agencies and local authorities. However, after careful considerations and due to a series of different sensitive events taking place in both countries (new nominations, presidential elections and failed coup attempt in Sierra Leone), the PBF focal points from both countries advised the implementation team to postpone the project steering committee meeting to 2024. On 13 May 2024, the joint steering committee members from Guinea and Sierra Leone met in Freetown. Due to clashing agendas and challenging socio-political contexts in both countries, the project team and PBF focal points agreed to hold a final steering committee meeting to discuss the overall conduct of the project and findings of the endline assessment.

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. *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

At the strategic level, national authorities are taking part in quarterly technical committee meetings where they monitor project progress and ensure that the project is implemented in a timely manner with the required level of quality. The Technical Committee members in Sierra Leone and Guinea met twice in the last 6 months in December 2023 (Sierra Leone TC – 18 January 2024; Guinea TC – 13 December 2023), and March 2024 (Guinea TC – 6 March 2024). In Sierra Leone, representatives from the Ministries of Internal Affairs (leading ministry) and Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) are active members of the TC, whilst outcome 2 activities are implemented in partnership with the MAFS Falaba district office, with regular technical oversight and monitoring by MAFS HQ. In Guinea, representatives from the following ministries are part of the TC: Territorial Administration and Decentralization (leading ministry), Agriculture and Livestock, Environment and Sustainable Development and Security and Civilian Protection. At the implementation level, local authorities (traditional and governmental) are actively engaged and participating in activities in both countries. In Sierra Leone, the implementing partners interact with the Office of National Security, Falaba District Council, Local Unit Commander, representatives from the Immigration Office and paramount chiefs. In Guinea, the project team collaborates with the Faranah prefecture, the sub-prefects, decentralized authorities from the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment and the mayors of rural communes.

In January 2023, a workshop was organized in Conakry where government stakeholders, project partners, and UN agencies discussed project outcomes and strategic planning for 2023. From August 31 to September 1, 2023, IOM Guinea contributed to a workshop crafting legal instruments for border activities, aligning with the African Union Border Program. This included developing a Transhumance Cooperation Framework and supporting Guinea's National Border Commission. Moreover, the Advisor of Guinea's Prime Minister accompanied by the PBF Coordinator visited the project sites in November 2024 as part of the monitoring of PBF projects. In April 2024, IOM facilitated a bilateral meeting in Freetown which highlighted significant progress in coordination between Sierra Leone and Guinea, discussing innovative conflict resolution mechanisms and project achievements.

PART I: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS

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.

Please rate the implementation status of the following preliminary/preparatory activities

Contracting of partners *

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

Staff Recruitment *

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

Collection of baselines *

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

Identification of beneficiaries *

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

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.)

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The following project preliminary activities were completed: recruitment of a Project Coordinator, partnership with Talking Drum Studio (TDS) Guinea and Sierra Leone, official launch of the project in both countries, set up of the technical committee and undertaking the project's baseline. Under outcome 1, TDS Guinea and Sierra Leone conducted a conflict analysis of the communities targeted with livelihood support. Under outcome 2, WFP Sierra Leone recruited a field-based officer and formalized partnership with MAFS, while WFP Guinea recruited a field-based officer and contracted two local NGOs in Faranah prefecture to implement resilience building activities. Under outcome 3, IOM Guinea and Sierra Leone conducted a comprehensive border and migration assessment to capture strategic transhumance related data and evaluate the capacity of border infrastructure.

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.

Is the project on track for the timely completion of outputs as indicated in the workplan? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

If no, please provide an explanation *

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Project progress summary

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

The project team requested a 6-month no-cost extension from PBSO in October 2023. By May 2024, all activities by WFP, IOM, and TDS in Sierra Leone and Guinea were completed.

Outcome 1: Policy and Community Engagement

• Sierra Leone:

o Cattle Settlement Policy: Reviewed, validated by the National Security Council Coordinating Group and MAFS, awaiting endorsement from line ministries and Parliament.

o Chieftom bylaws: Reviewed in January 2023, validated in February 2023, and translated into local languages for community dissemination using megaphones.

o Transhumance Committees: Re-dynamized with improved gender and youth representation, trained in conflict prevention and resolution, and engaged in peer-to-peer learning with Guinea counterparts.

o Media Programming: 70 episodes of "Bush Wahala" aired, addressing social cohesion issues.

• Guinea:

o Pastoral Code: Validated by the National Transition Council, pending government approval.

o Community Engagement: Strengthened understanding of grazing, transhumance, and environmental protection.

o Media Programming: 10 radio shows and several workshops on pastoralism, transhumance, and climate change aired in multiple languages.

o Transhumance Committees: Similar enhancements and training as in Sierra Leone, with active knowledge exchange.

Outcome 2: Agricultural and Economic Development

• Sierra Leone:

o Inland Valley Swamps (IVS): 50.1 ha rehabilitated in 10 communities, benefiting 501 participants with cash-based transfers totaling \$130,761.

o Solar-Powered Irrigation: Implemented at 5 ranches, with training for women in solar maintenance.

o Syntropic Farms: 200 farming and cattle herding households established farms with fenced ranches to reduce conflicts.

• Guinea:

o IVS and Reforestation: 50 ha developed and 15 ha revegetated, with \$172,058.60 transferred to 1,126 households.

o Solar-Powered Irrigation: Implemented at 6 ranches.

o Fodder Production: 120 agro-pastoralists trained, with 60 ha of grazing areas planted with nutritious grasses.

o Collaborative Activities: Training and support for compost pits and syntropic farming, with emphasis on social cohesion.

Outcome 3: Transhumance and Border Management

• Data and Early Warning Systems:

o Mapping: Identified transhumance routes and conflict-prone areas.

o Data Analysis Units: Established in Falaba District Council (Sierra Leone) and Faranah (Guinea), equipped with necessary technology.

• Border Management:

o Border Posts: Three constructed/rehabilitated posts fully operational with trained personnel.

o Cross-Border Cooperation: High-level visits and joint patrols initiated in October 2023.

o Stakeholder Meetings: Four cross-border meetings focused on harmonizing the transhumance calendar and addressing women's challenges in agropastoral and commercial activities.

o High-Level Meetings: Coordinated by IOM, facilitating bilateral cooperation and awareness-raising activities.

Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured by the project to date

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Women represent nearly 50% of border alert team members in Sierra Leone. Community dialogues forums were largely attended by women and youth who now have a platform to share experience and challenges pertaining to their participation in local governance and development as well as in conflict resolution mechanisms. Following training in conflict analysis and management initiated by the IOM and facilitated by TDS, a young leader platform was created in Guinea. This platform called Réseau de Acteurs pour le Développement de Faranah - RADEF is comprised of young people from different youth structures operating in the urban commune of Faranah. RADEF's mission is to promote and popularize the potential of young people and make them agents of development.

From a total of 501 work participants in Sierra Leone, 49% are young women. Out of 1,126 households supported in Guinea, 53% are headed by women. The cash transferred allowed them to initiate income generating activities which gives them greater financial independence. Moreover, twenty women from vulnerable cattle herders and crop farmers households in Sierra Leone were identified and trained in July 2023 on solar pumps management and maintenance in the five cattle ranches selected to receive solar irrigation machines. The training conducted by Barefoot Women allowed the participants to learn new technical skills that will allow them to improve the livelihood of their households and earn the recognition of their communities. Finally, 40% of leadership positions in the farmer-based organizations supported by WFP Sierra Leone are run by women. The Community Youth Contractor scheme is an initiative that engages with skilled, energetic youths selected by their communities to be trained to technically oversee livelihood activities in their communities. They serve as knowledge transfer channels, which increases community ownership and paves the way for long-term sustainability.

To promote gender equality and women's empowerment, the project implementation team facilitated the active involvement and engagement of women in cross-border management and conflict mitigation. Women were encouraged to participate and share their perspectives and experiences through gender-sensitive forums. These meetings aimed to address the challenges faced by women in agropastoral and commercial activities, cooperation, conflict resolution and peacebuilding. In March 2023, IOM organized a training in Faranah for 20 youth stakeholders (including 9 women) in conflict analysis and management. 17 young men and women also benefited from this training in Sierra Leone in May 2023. These trainees have been actively involved in the collection of transhumance-related data in collaboration with the Falaba District Council. The activity allowed the youth to improve their conflict management capabilities and strengthen collaboration with security agents through active listening sessions and conflict analysis exercises within their localities.

Is the project 1+ year in implementation?

☒ Yes

☐ No

FOR PROJECTS 1+ YEAR IN IMPLEMENTATION ONLY:

Is the project demonstrating outcome-level peacebuilding results?

Outcome-level peacebuilding results entail results achieved at the societal or structural level, including changed attitudes, behaviours or institutions.

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please provide concrete examples of such peacebuilding results

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Under outcome 1 – The project effort to provide fairer and more access to natural resources was proven to be successful. The approach of the different project implementing partners to bring together herders and farmers in the different activities – meetings, sensitization and land work created more mutual understanding. By the end of the project, the proportion of respondents that believe that farmers and herders control natural resources equally more than doubled since the baseline, increasing from 32 percent to 67.5 percent - exceeding the project target of 55 percent. The percentage of beneficiaries that think that natural resources are controlled by mostly farmers or mostly herders went down between the baseline and endline.

It was also noticed that conflict between farmers and herders is decreasing. 41 percent of all households had experienced some sort of dispute or conflict between farmers and herders in the year leading up to the survey. Only 8.6 percent said the same at the endline. In Sierra Leone, those beneficiaries reporting a conflict in the last year dropped from 41.4 percent to 6.1 percent, where experiences with conflict among Guinean beneficiaries decreased from 40.7 percent to 11.3 percent.

Thanks to the different capacity building efforts carried to strengthen local conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms and to popularize chieftdom bylaws and transhumance-relation data, beneficiaries are increasingly satisfied with the outcome of their dispute. Endline respondents were satisfied with the outcome of their dispute (over the target of 80 percent); 73.0 percent said they were very satisfied and 27 percent said they were somewhat satisfied. This is up considerably from the baseline, at which time just over two-thirds (68.1 percent) of all respondents, who reported having a conflict resolved with the help an outside party, said they were either very or somewhat satisfied with how their conflict was resolved.

Under outcome 2 – The project fostered cooperation between herders and farmers, bringing them together to work closely and collaboratively in activities such as trainings, Inland Valley Swamp (IVS) development and cultivation and revegetation activities. Qualitative data from the endline indicates that the different project activities conducted collectively by herders and farmers improved social cohesion, in addition to the added value of engaging in mutually beneficial agricultural activities. This in turn helped improve communication and understanding between the two groups. For instance, 67.2% of farmers who responded to the endline agree that herders can be trusted against 63.6% of the baseline respondents.

Moreover, income-generating activities including rice and vegetable cultivation, soap making and food processing lead to not only more collaboration and synergies among cattle herder and farmers households, in particular women, but also contributed to increasing food security. The endline evaluation reported that key impact of the project on farmers' lives was increased food consumption. Participants in communities in Sierra Leone and Guinea both indicated that they either increased the number of meals they are consuming or increased the amount of food they were consuming in each meal.

This collaborative work approach also led to more engagement and dialogue between the two groups to address and resolve their issues directly and swiftly, without the need for involvement from local authorities. Another social cohesion and peacebuilding results came from the Food assistance For Assets (FFA) approach adopted by WFP Sierra Leone and Guinea to address immediate food needs and other necessities through cash-based transfers (CBT). While project beneficiaries indicated in the endline using cash for food and other necessities as intended, in some cases, cash was invested in assets such as cattle, capital for small businesses, and petrol water pumps for vegetable cultivation during the dry season. There were also some notable cases of investment in community infrastructure in Guinea, where communities used CBTs to help construct public amenities. For instance, in Tinterba community CBT was pooled by recipients to build a community structure for meetings and a school (where there are six teachers, five of whom are volunteers from the community). In Djibendo, community members use CBT funds to build a health centre and school.

Under outcome 3 – IOM Guinea and Sierra Leone intervened in areas that was deeply affected by poor infrastructures with border posts that were either non-existent or that lacked facilities and equipment necessary to carry out border patrols and gather intelligence to collect data, measure the impact of transhumance migration to insecurity and report them adequately. The three newly constructed border posts (Guinea - Songovah,

Hérémakonon and Sierra Leone - Koindukura) and the rehabilitation of the Walia border post (Sierra Leone) considerably improved the security situation. The different transhumance mapping exercises generated information that filled a gap in available transhumance movement data. This included successfully collecting data on transhumance flow patterns and routes/corridors between the border area situated along Falaba District and Faranah Prefecture, as well as movement periods, corridors, and the origin, profiles, and destination of transhumance activity. Government agencies improved their capacity to address transhumance issues, and dedicated committees oversaw cross-border consultations.

Project beneficiaries living in border areas noted (in focus groups) that their experiences with border agents had improved. They indicated that instances of being hassled and asked for bribes had decreased and the overall demeanour and conduct of the border staff had become more professional. Regarding the communities' trust in security authorities, 63.4 percent of all endline respondents agree somewhat or a lot that that military are trusted to treat everybody fairly if conflicts arise, above the project target of 55 percent and up from 42.1 percent at the baseline. Likewise, trust in police to treat everybody fairly rose between the baseline and endline, from 40.7 percent to 63.4 percent among all respondents.

If yes, please provide sources or references (including links) as evidence of peacebuilding results, or submit them as additional attachments.

Evidence may be quantitative or qualitative but needs to demonstrate progress against outcome indicators in the project results framework. Sources may include project surveys (such as perception surveys), monitoring reports, government documents, or other knowledge products that have been developed by the project.

Endline evaluation

File attachment

[Click here to upload file. \(< 10MB\)](#)

PART II: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

How many OUTCOMES does this project have *

1 2 **3** 4 5 more than 5.

Please write out the project outcomes as they are in the project results framework found in the project document

Outcome 1:

Border-lying communities in Falaba District and Faranah Prefecture have and use inclusive fora that promote peaceful co-existence and resolve conflict between cattle herders and crop farmers

Outcome 2:

Trust and economic collaboration strengthened within and between Falaba district and Faranah prefecture through climate-smart livelihoods and herder and farmer cooperation

| | |
|---|---|
| Outcome 3: Sierra Leone and Guinea collect and use data to develop evidence-based cross-border policies that mitigate conflicts | * |
| Outcome 4: | * |
| Outcome 5: | * |
| Outcome 6: | * |
| Outcome 7: | * |
| Outcome 8: | * |
| Additional Outcomes <i>If the project has more than 8 outcomes, please enumerate the remaining outcomes here</i> | * |

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 **outcome** and **output** indicators in the table below.

- If the outcome has more than 3 indicators, select the 3 most relevant ones with most relevant progress to highlight.
- If the outcome has more than 5 outputs, please select 5 of the most relevant outputs per outcome, and provide an update on the progress made against 3 most relevant output indicators.
- Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation. Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (500 characters max per entry)

» Outcome 1: Border-lying communities in Falaba District and Faranah Prefecture have and use inclusive fora that promote peaceful co-existence and resolve conflict between cattle herders and crop farmers

| Outcome 1 | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Current Indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) |
|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
| 1.1 | Proportion of farmers/herders who believe that herders and farmers have equal access to natural resources by groups (sex-disaggregated) | <p>32%</p> <p>Gender Female: 35.8%; and male: 29.7%</p> <p>Age Under 20 years: 16.7% 21 to 30 years: 33.5% 31 to 40 years: 38.9% 41 to 50 years: 16.3% 51 years and over: 17.3%</p> | 55% | <p>67.5%</p> <p>Gender Female: 66% Male: 68.9%</p> <p>Age Under 20 years: 51.4% 21 to 30 years: 67.1% 31 to 40 years: 68.5% 41 to 50 years: 58.1% 51 years and over: 61.3%</p> | |
| 1.2 | Proportion of farmers/herders who agree somewhat or a lot that District/Prefecture and Chiefdom-level mechanisms/structures are working for all people equally | <p>Local government: 74.3%; traditional leaders: 96.0%; Transhumance Committees (only in Guinea): 70.4%</p> | 80% | <p>Local government: 79.1%; traditional leaders: 98.9%; transhumance committees (only in Guinea): 98.4%</p> | Cattle settlement committees in Sierra Leone were not existent when the baseline study was conducted. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-----|--|--|
| 1.3 | Proportion of respondents who raised issues where an outside party (community or government structures – e.g., traditional leaders, transhumance committee, police, etc.) helped with their dispute and who were somewhat or very satisfied with outcome of dispute resolution. | 68.1% | 80% | 100% 73% said they were very satisfied and 27% said they were somewhat satisfied. | |
|-----|---|-------|-----|--|--|

How many outputs does outcome 1 have?

1 2 3 **4** 5 more than 5.

Please list up to 5 of most relevant outputs for outcome 1

Output 1.1

Cattle Settlement Policy (Sierra Leone) and Pastoral Code (Guinea) updated, validated, disseminated and implemented at national and district/prefecture level

Output 1.2

District Cattle Committee and Prefecture-level committees are strengthened and more inclusive in their composition

Output 1.3

Chieftdom by-laws strengthened, and community members capacitated to manage, mitigate and resolve conflicts between to cattle herders and crop farmers

Output 1.4

Annual and quarterly events held to strengthen cross-border decision-making and dialogue

Output 1.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 1 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against 3 most relevant output indicators

» Output 1.1

| Output 1.1: Cattle Settleme nt Policy (Sierra Leone) and Pastoral Code (Guinea) updated, validated , dissemin ated and impleme nted at national and district/p refecture level | Perform ance Indicator s <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reportin g period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1.1.1 | Validated Cattle Settlement Policy and Pastoral Code by Government of Sierra Leone and Government of Guinea, respectively | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | <p>Sierra Leone: In the absence of the validated national cattle settlement policy, TDS in collaboration with chiefdom stakeholders of Sulima and Mongo reviewed and validated chiefdom level bylaws. These bylaws have been further translated into local languages (Fula, Kuranko and Yalunka) and are now being disseminated through megaphones across the two project chiefdoms</p> <p>Guinea: Pastoral Code was validated by the Transition National Council. However, the President of Guinea did not yet promulgate the code.</p> |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1.1.2 | Number of district and prefecture-level committee members supported | 0 | 30 district and prefecture-level committee members supported | | Sierra Leone: A total of 40 district and 30 prefecture level committee members received training support from TDS-SL on “Conflict resolution and management”, “Common Ground Approach”, “Early warning signs” and “Role and responsibilities”. These training supports came through, after validation of the chiefdoms by-laws. | |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-----|--|---|--|
| 1.1.3 | Local institutions (police and security actors, district security committee, district cattle settlement committee, local authorities, local courts, etc.) at chiefdom and community level | 0 | 40% | | <p>Sierra Leone: In the absence of a validated CSP, TDS-SL identified and trained 40 cattle settlement peace committee members in Sulima and Mongo chiefdoms (73% male and 27% female). The members of these committees are local authorities, the security apparatus, herders and farmers. They were trained on early warning signs, conflict resolution, common ground approach and their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Guinea: Despite the delay in adopting the adoption of the Pastoral Code, TDS increased herders, farmers and other stakeholders in the understanding of the concepts of grazing, transhumance</p> | <p>The delay in the validation of the cattle settlement policy prompted TDS-SL to engage WFP to repurpose the cattle settlement policy with chiefdom level cattle settlement bylaws.</p> |
|-------|---|---|-----|--|---|--|

and
environmental
protection
through its
various media
and
sensitization
activities.

» Output 1.2

| Output 1.2: District Cattle Committee and Prefecture-level committees are strengthened and more inclusive in their composition | Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1.2.1 | Number of district and prefecture-level committee members supported | 0 | 30 district and prefecture-level committee members supported | | TDS Sierra Leone has supported the re-dynamization of the chiefdom level cattle settlement peace committees | |
| 1.2.2 | Number of border alert teams set up | 0 | 4 | | 5 In total, 5 border alert teams have been set up in both countries: 2 in Sierra Leone and 3 in Guinea | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1.2.3 | Number of episodes of radio drama produced and broadcast | 0 | 80 episodes of radio drama produced and broadcast 16 community participatory theatre tours conducted | | Sierra Leone: 70 episodes of Bush Wahala produced and broadcast 16 participatory theatre performances conducted. Guinea: 20 radio shows produced and broadcast, 2 TV and 2 radio spots 14 participatory theater performances conducted with a total of 2739 participants | |
|-------|--|---|---|--|---|--|

» Output 1.3

| Output 1.3: Chiefdom by-laws strengthened, and community members capacitated to manage, mitigate and resolve conflicts between to cattle herders and crop farmers | Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3.1 | Number of chiefdom by-laws strengthened to manage, mitigate and resolve conflicts (in Sierra Leone) | 0 | 2 (1 per chiefdom) | | Sierra Leone: 4 workshops held in total | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1.3.2 | Number of district and prefecture-level committee members; chiefdom/transhumance committee members, and community members capacitated to manage, mitigate, and resolve conflicts between cattle herders and farmers | 0 | 200 total (60 chiefdom/transhumance committee members and 140 community members) | | <p>Guinea: 75 transhumance committee members (25% women and 47% youth) have been trained on conflict analysis techniques and the common ground approach (conflict resolution approach) A total of 6 trainings were conducted.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: 40 cattle settlement committee members were trained (29 male and 11 female participants between 21 to 25 March 2023)</p> <p>From 7-12 November 2023, TDS-SL provided training to a total of 91 members (male: 64%, female: 36%) Transhumance and cattle settlement committee members from Guinea and Sierra Leone. This activity consisted in a</p> | |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|--|

training and peer-to-peer learning. The committee members shared their experience in the two countries. This was followed up by training on pastoralism conflict management and Common Ground Approach

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1.3.3 | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

» Output 1.4

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| <div>Output 1.4: Annual and quarterly events held to strengthen cross-border decision-making and dialogue</div> | <div>Performance Indicators</div> <div>Describe the indicator</div> | <div>Indicator Baseline</div> <div>State the baseline value of the indicator</div> | <div>End of Project Indicator Target</div> <div>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</div> | <div>Indicator progress for reporting period</div> <div>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</div> | <div>Indicator progress to date</div> <div>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</div> | <div>Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any)</div> <div>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</div> |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1.4.1 | Annual summit planned, held, and attended by key stakeholders | 0 | 2 (1 per year) only in Sierra Leone | | Sierra Leone: 2 (1 in 2023 and 1 in 2024) | |
| | | | | | 10n 23 February 2023 and 2nd March, 2024, TDS Sierra Leone respectively conducted the first and second annual peace summit in Koindukura. The two summits convened a total of 160 participants (male: 71%, female: 29%) from national, district and chiefdom leadership of both Sierra Leone and Guinea. As a result of the summit, 10 measures for the consolidation and sustainability were unanimously agreed by all parties (stakeholders from Guinea and Sierra Leone). | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|----------------|--|--|--|
| 1.4.2 | Quarterly cross-border community dialogues planned, held, and attended by key stakeholders | 0 | 8 (4 per year) | | <p>All 8 cross-border meetings have been organised in September 2022, December 2022, and June 2023. The meeting convened a total of 239 (Male: 170, Female: 69) participants (29% female and 71% male) from both Sierra Leone and Guinea</p> <p>1 special cross-border meeting was organized as part of the celebration of Women's Day gathering 100 women (farmers, traders, herders)</p> | The remaining cross-border dialogue forums will take place in the next reporting period. |
| 1.4.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 1.5

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Output 1.5: | Performance Indicator S Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
| 1.5.1 | | | | | | |
| 1.5.2 | | | | | | |
| 1.5.3 | | | | | | |

» Outcome 2: Trust and economic collaboration strengthened within and between Falaba district and Faranah prefecture through climate-smart livelihoods and herder and farmer cooperation

| Outcome 2 | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Current Indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) |
|-----------|---|---|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 2.1 | Proportion of farmers/herders who say they agree somewhat or a lot that they trust in groups they traditionally have been in conflict with has increased | herders: 76.5% and farmers 63.6% | herders: 85% and farmers: 80% | herders: 78.3% and farmers: 67.2% | |
| 2.2 | Proportion of farmers/herders reporting that representatives of their social group have equal input into local natural resource management (sex- and age-disaggregated) | 31.3% Gender females: 35.7%; and males: 28.8% Age 20 years and under: 16.7% 21 to 30 years: 33.1% 31 to 40 years: 38.5% 41 to 50 years: 15.3% 51 years and over: 13.5%) | 60% | 67.5% Gender Female 66% Male: 68.9% Age 20 years and under: 59.7% 21 to 30 years: 67.2% 31 to 40 years: 68.6% 41 to 50 years: 58.3% 51 years and over: 71.5% | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|-----|--|--|
| 2.3 | Proportion of farmers/herders who agree somewhat or a lot working together satisfies their respective interests (sex- and age-disaggregated) | 76.2% Gender females: 72.9%; and males: 78.1% Age 20 years and under: 89.4% 21 to 30 years: 69.7% 31 to 40 years: 75.5% 41 to 50 years: 90.7% 51 years and over: 84.8% | 90% | 95.1% Gender Female: 95.4% Male: 94.8% Age 20 years and under: 95.8% 21 to 30 years old: 94.7% 31 to 40 years old: 95.3% 41 to 50 years old: 94.3% 51 and over: 96.1% | |
|-----|--|--|-----|--|--|

How many outputs does outcome 2 have?

1 2 **3** 4 5 more than 5.

Please list up to 5 of most relevant outputs for outcome 2

Output 2.1

Establishment of community pastures infrastructure to protect farmland and reduce likelihood of crop destruction and associated community tension

Output 2.2

Establishment of solar-powered irrigation systems to minimise competition over water resources

Output 2.3

Farmers and herders are trained on climate-smart agriculture and breeding practices including post-harvest management and dairy value chain to build social cohesion

Output 2.4

Output 2.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 2 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against 3 most relevant output indicators

» Output 2.1

| Output 2.1: Establishment of community pastures infrastructure to protect farmland and reduce likelihood of crop destruction and associated community tension | Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2.1.1 | Number of households benefiting from community pastures | 0 | 200 herder households in Sierra Leone 100 herder households in Guinea | | <p>Sierra Leone: 501 households</p> <p>Guinea: 1126 households</p> <p>50.1 hectares of inland valley swamps to mitigate conflicts between cattle herders and crop farmers. The fencing of the IVS sites (10 in Sierra Leone and 6 in Guinea) is completed.</p> <p>Revegetation of water catchment areas completed in both countries.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: the provision of fast-growing herbs completed.</p> <p>Guinea: 120 cattle herders have been trained. The nutritious herbs are cultivated on the 60 ha and the first seed production is currently being harvested.</p> | |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| 2.1.2 | Number hectares established as community pastures | 0 | 30 hectares | | <p>Guinea: 60 hectares of communal land were identified and are being fenced by the herders (with their own funding). The forage species sown in 2022 were planted and the first seed production is currently being harvested.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: 5 cluster ranches from five target communities with a combined area of 10 hectares (2 hectares per site) have been selected for the establishment of the syntropic pastoral agroforestry system.</p> | |
|-------|---|---|-------------|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|------------|-------------------|-------|--|--|
| 2.1.3 | Number of illiterate women from vulnerable households on solar pump maintenance | 0 | 20 women | | Sierra Leone: 20 women were identified and trained solar pumps management and maintenance. Guinea : 12 women were trained to solar pump maintenance by the supplier. | Guinea: this activity took place in early 2024. |
|----------------|--|------------|-------------------|-------|--|--|

» Output 2.2

| Output 2.2: Establishment of solar-powered irrigation systems to minimise competition over water resources | Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 2.2.1 | Number of households benefiting from solar-powered irrigation | 0 | 200 herder households in Sierra Leone 100 herder households in Guinea | | | Sierra Leone: 200 households Guinea: 120 cattle herder households |
| 2.2.2 | | | | | | |
| 2.2.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 2.3

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Output 2.3: Farmers and herders are trained on climate-smart agriculture and breeding practices including post-harvest management and dairy value chain to build social cohesion | Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 2.3.1 | Number of farmers/herders trained on climate-smart agriculture and breeding practices (including provision of appropriate supplies) | 0 | 1,000 total (500 Sierra Leone and 500 Guinea) | | Sierra Leone: 501 farmers provided onsite training on improved agronomic practices including climate smart techniques 10 Community Youth contractors & Ministry of Agriculture Extension staff trained on technical package on rice production facilitated by JICA 20 lead farmers (10female/10male) trained by Ministry of Agriculture – Irrigation division on water management practices Guinea : 790 farmers and 120 herders trained on climate-smart agriculture and breeding practices (including provision of appropriate supplies) | |
|-------|---|---|---|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 2.3.2 | Number of farmers/herders trained on climate-smart agriculture and breeding practices (including provision of short-duration seeds and fertilizer, and tools) | 0 | 1,000 total (500 Sierra Leone and 500 Guinea) | | Sierra Leone: 10 community youth contractors trained on improved agronomic practices. In coordination with government counterpart, 501 farmers were trained in the Technical Package for Rice Production and governance on farmer-based organizations. Guinea: 790 farmers received training on improved agriculture practices, short-duration seeds and fertilizer, and tools | |
|-------|---|---|---|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----|------------------------|--|---|--|
| 2.3.3 | Representation of women and youth in composting enterprises (activities) | N/A | 50% women 75% youth | | Sierra Leone: 249 women engaged in composting activities. These women were trained on soap production and food processing. Guinea: 790 farmers, including 50% of women and 75% of young were trained in compost, honey, soap production and vegetable processing | |
|-------|--|-----|------------------------|--|---|--|

» Output 2.4

| Output 2.4: | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Indicator progress for reporting period | Indicator progress to date | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Describe the indicator | State the baseline value of the indicator | State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 2.4.1 | | | | | | |
| 2.4.2 | | | | | | |
| 2.4.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 2.5

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Output 2.5: | Performance Indicator S Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
| 2.5.1 | | | | | | |
| 2.5.2 | | | | | | |
| 2.5.3 | | | | | | |

» Outcome 3: Sierra Leone and Guinea collect and use data to develop evidence-based cross-border policies that mitigate conflicts

| Outcome 3 | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Current Indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) |
|-----------|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 3.1 | Proportion of farmers/herders who agree somewhat or a lot that border officials have adequate capacities | 49% | 80% | 78.2% | |
| 3.2 | Proportion of farmers/herders who agree somewhat or a lot that border officials are trusted to treat everybody fairly in a conflict (sex- and age-disaggregated) | 58% Gender Females: 59.80% Males: 57% Age Under 20 years: 62.5%; 21 to 30 years: 62.2% 31 to 40 years: 57.6% 41 to 50 years: 54.6% 51 years and over: 43.8% | 80% | 82.8% | |
| 3.3 | Proportion of people who agree somewhat or a lot that military and police are trusted to treat everybody fairly in a conflict | Military: 42.1%; Police: 40.7% | Military: 55% Police: 60% | Military: 63.4% Police: 73.4% | |

How many outputs does outcome 3 have?

1 2 **3** 4 5 more than 5.

Please list up to 5 of most relevant outputs for outcome 3

Output 3.1

Migration data including transhumance movement along the Sierra Leone/Guinea borders is collected and analyzed for improved decision/policy making

Output 3.2

Key border check points are rehabilitated and technical and operational capacities of law enforcement agencies are improved

Output 3.3

Cross-border transhumance bilateral consultations and dialogues are enhanced

Output 3.4

Output 3.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 3 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against 3 most relevant output indicators

» Output 3.1

| Output 3.1: Migration data including transhu- mance move- ment along the Sierra Leone/G uinea borders is collected and analyzed for improved decision/ policy making | Perform- ance Indicator <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reportin- g period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 3.1.1 | Empowered data analysis units conducting data recordings and producing reliable transhumance data for evidence-based decision making. | 0 | 6 (3 IOM Sierra Leone, 3 IOM Guinea) | | 2 (1 unit in Sierra Leone and 1 unit in Guinea) | <p>Guinea: Creation of this unit at the prefectural directorate for agriculture and livestock finalized. IOM provided computers, a printer and a projector as well as solar panels for continuous power within the unit.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: IOM has created a data analysis unit at the Falaba District Council and at focal location points for reliable transhumance data generation to enhance evidence-based decision making.</p> |
|-------|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 3.1.2 | Number of security agents trained and knowledgeable to effectively undertake quality data collection, transhumance mapping and accountable for data collection standard. | 0 | 20 (10 in Guinea / 10 in Sierra Leone) | | Guinea: 18 from the ministry of agriculture and 15 community alert agent Sierra Leone: 11 border management personnel and 14 from community alert agents | |
| 3.1.3 | Communities and populations sensitized on transhumance related issues engage in conflict mitigation efforts | 0 in Guinea/ 0 in Sierra Leone | 5 meeting in total reaching a total of 300 community members (150 in Guinea/150 in Sierra Leone) | | 5 meetings organized by IOM Guinea and IOM Sierra Leone reaching a total target of 500 people in Guinea and 150 people in Sierra Leone | |

» Output 3.2

| Output 3.2: Key border check points are rehabilitated and technical and operational capacities of law enforcement agencies are improved | Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2.1 | POEs rehabilitated that support sustainable conflict mitigation process, provide increased protection to border communities | 0 | 4 (2 in Guinea, 2 in Sierra Leone) | | 4 completed | The construction of two (Hérémakonon and Songoyah) border posts in Guinea was completed in August 2022. The construction on the Sierra Leone side was completed in October 2022. The rehabilitation of the Walia border post was completed. |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| 3.2.2 | POEs equipped with standardized equipment that have eased their mobility, communication and information sharing challenge. | 0 | 30 (15 motorbikes for IOM Guinea, 15 motorbikes for IOM Sierra Leone) and 15 VHF radios per each country | | <p>Guinea: 15 VHF radios, and 22 motorbikes (including 3 motorbikes for the transhumance committee for liaison with POEs when conflict happens) delivered.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: 15 motorbikes delivered 15 VHF radios to be delivered</p> | Guinea: The project was able to purchase and donate a larger quantity of radios/motorbikes than originally anticipated. The project benefited from cost savings on the materials enabling them to procure a greater quantity and provide enhanced communication equipment to the border agents. |
| 3.2.3 | Increased knowledge from integrated border management training sessions | 0 | <p>6 including: 3 sessions /50 personnel on the Guinea side</p> <p>3 training/ 50-personnel on the Sierra Leone side</p> | | <p>IOM Guinea: 3 training/68 border agents (8 women)</p> <p>IOM Sierra Leone: 2 training/50 border agents</p> | |

» Output 3.3

| Output 3.3: Cross-border transhumance bilateral consultations and dialogues are enhanced | Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i> | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 3.3.1 | Number of cross-border meetings organized channeled through cross-border cooperation mechanism | 0 | 4 (2 in Sierra Leone, 2 in Guinea) | | 4 completed | |
| 3.3.2 | High-level consultative meetings between Sierra Leone and Guinea resulting in evidence driven policy solutions on transhumance issues | 0 | 2 (1 in Guinea, 1 in Sierra Leone) | | 2 meetings completed | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 3.3.3 | Local solutions provided by districts council after monitoring and evaluation missions | 0 | 4 (2 in Sierra Leone, 2 in Guinea) | | 2 joint monitoring evaluation between IOM Guinea and IOM Sierra Leone took place in October 2022 and September 2023 | |
|-------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|

» Output 3.4

| Output 3.4: | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Indicator progress for reporting period | Indicator progress to date | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Describe the indicator | State the baseline value of the indicator | State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 3.4.1 | | | | | | |
| 3.4.2 | | | | | | |
| 3.4.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 3.5

| Output 3.5: | Performance Indicators Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i> | End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i> | Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i> | Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i> | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i> |
|----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 3.5.1 | | | | | | |
| 3.5.2 | | | | | | |
| 3.5.3 | | | | | | |

» Outcome 4:

| Outcome 4 | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Current Indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| 4.1 | | | | | |
| 4.2 | | | | | |
| 4.3 | | | | | |

How many outputs does outcome 4 have?

1 2 3 4 5 more than 5.

Please list up to 5 of most relevant outputs for outcome 4

Output 4.1

Output 4.2

Output 4.3

Output 4.4

Output 4.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 4 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against 3 most relevant output indicators

» Output 4.1

| Output 4.1: | Performance Indicator S Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline State the baseline value of the indicator | End of Project Indicator Target State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | Indicator progress for reporting period State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | Indicator progress to date State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
|----------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 4.1.1 | | | | | | |
| 4.1.2 | | | | | | |
| 4.1.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 4.2

| Output 4.2: | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Indicator progress for reporting period | Indicator progress to date | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Describe the indicator | State the baseline value of the indicator | State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 4.2.1 | | | | | | |
| 4.2.2 | | | | | | |
| 4.2.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 4.3

| Output 4.3: | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Indicator progress for reporting period | Indicator progress to date | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Describe the indicator | State the baseline value of the indicator | State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 4.3.1 | | | | | | |
| 4.3.2 | | | | | | |
| 4.3.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 4.4

| Output 4.4: | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Indicator progress for reporting period | Indicator progress to date | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) |
|----------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Describe the indicator | State the baseline value of the indicator | State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 4.4.1 | | | | | | |
| 4.4.2 | | | | | | |
| 4.4.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 4.5

| Output 4.5: | Performance Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Indicator progress for reporting period | Indicator progress to date | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Describe the indicator | State the baseline value of the indicator | State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 4.5.1 | | | | | | |
| 4.5.2 | | | | | | |
| 4.5.3 | | | | | | |

If the project has more than 4 outcomes, use this space to describe progress on progress on indicators for the remaining outcomes

*

PART III: Cross-Cutting Issues

Is the project planning any significant events in the next six months? (eg. national dialogues, youth congresses, film screenings, etc.)

| 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 (900 characters) |
|---|-------------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| Event 1 | | | | | |
| Event 2 | | | | | |
| Event 3 | | | | | |

Event 4**Human Impact**

This section is about the human impact of the project. Please state the number of key stakeholders (including but not limited to: Civil Society Organizations, Beneficiaries, etc.) of the project, and for each, please briefly describe:

- i. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implementation
- ii. The impact of the project in their lives
- iii. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group

This is an optional question. You may leave it unanswered if not relevant

Human Impact**Type of stakeholder****What has been the impact of the project on their lives?****Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from the stakeholder**

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| <p>1</p> | <p>Outcome 1: Transhumance committees (Guinea) Cattle settlement committees (Sierra Leone</p> | <p>Thanks to the intervention of TDS, the committees were re-dynamized through the inclusion of women and youth. Members of the newly reconstituted committees were trained on conflict analysis, prevention and resolution to ensure more participation in the resolution of disputes in their communities.</p> | <p>The President of the Hérémakonon transhumance committee said the following: “Thanks to this workshop, we understood that we have a role beyond what we thought before today. We are called to establish a climate of peace and cohabitation between breeders and farmers. [...].” On the complementarity between transhumance committee and community relay and the recognition of the role of women and young people, the President of the Songoyah transhumance committee said: “Thanks to this training, we learned that we members of the transhumance committee have a very important role to play in the prevention and resolution of conflicts between farmers and breeders and to achieve this we must work with community relays who will send us alert messages. In addition to this, include women and young people in the process while giving them a leading role in transforming conflicts between breeders and farmers.”</p> |
|-----------------|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|----------|---|--|---|
| <p>2</p> | <p>Outcome 2: Crop farmers Cattle herders</p> | <p>The availability of agricultural machinery, such as power tillers, has played a vital role in supporting both groups and individual farmers to enhance their rice production. By utilizing power tillers, farmers can effectively prepare the land, till the soil, and carry out various agricultural tasks more efficiently. This has significantly reduced the labour and time required for these activities, particularly alleviating the labour burden among women. As a result, farmers can cultivate larger areas of land and increase their overall production capacity. The use of agricultural machinery has proven to be a valuable resource, empowering especially female farmers to optimize their farming operations and achieve higher yields in rice cultivation. The project has fostered cooperation between herders and farmers, bringing them together to work closely and collaboratively in the IVS and revegetation activities. This close partnership has resulted in the ability to address and resolve their issues directly and swiftly, without the need for involvement from local authorities. As a result, tensions in the project sites between these two groups have significantly reduced.</p> | <p>“This year has been a game-changer for me as a farmer in Messendinkuday. Unlike previous years where I couldn't cultivate my entire farm, I've already hired the group's power tiller twice to plough the entire land, maximizing my cultivation area. After harvesting, I plan to hire the group's thresher, supply by WFP to efficiently separate the rice grains from the stalks. What's truly exciting is that the money I pay for these services goes directly to my farming group, of which I am a member. This collaborative effort and investment not only benefit me but also contribute to the growth and development of our group. It's a transformative time to be a farmer in Messendinkuday, embracing modern farming techniques and experiencing the positive impact of mechanization on our productivity and unity as a community.” Adama Samura, Messendinkuday, Sulima chieftdom, Falaba district.</p> |
|----------|---|--|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 3 | Outcome 3: Songoyah/Walia border communities | <p>To tackle these challenges, the project prioritized the implementation of more effective border control and security measures, resulting in a safer and more secure border environment. Critical border infrastructure, such as checkpoints and border posts, were both constructed and rehabilitated. These physical structures provided a foundation for monitoring and regulating border movements. Consequently, it became increasingly difficult for unauthorized individuals to cross the border unnoticed, significantly bolstering regional security. Furthermore, the project placed a strong emphasis on enhancing the capabilities of border agents and law enforcement agencies. This involved equipping them with essential tools and equipment to enhance mobility, communication, and information exchange. This empowerment enabled border agents to perform their duties more effectively, conducting regular patrols, enforcing border regulations, and responding promptly to security incidents. The heightened technical and operational capacities of these agents played a crucial role in improving border management and control, ultimately reducing security risks and ensuring the safety of border communities. The project's efforts in promoting efficient border control and security</p> | <p>The project's initiatives in enhancing border infrastructure, fortifying border control measures, and empowering border agents have markedly enhanced the safety and security of the Songoyah border region, fostering smoother cross-border trade, and bolstering socio-economic progress in the border areas. Mr. Konaté from Hérémakonon village testifies: " With this newfound sense of security, I am eager to invest in our community's future. I believe it's the perfect time to build more infrastructure, including houses and shops, right here at the border post. This will not only benefit us, the local residents, but also encourage more cross-border trade and economic activity, ultimately leading to greater prosperity for everyone in the area. In Walia, a community member Madam Sundu Kamara said that, with the presence of the border post and border personnel, their movements would be more guaranteed unlike in the past. The police and customs officers assigned to the Songoyah/Walia/Koindukura border post are delighted to see that their presence reassures the citizens and encourages them to settle down and develop their activities in the area. A police officer Mansaré at Songoyah post said that: "As a police officer stationed at the Songoyah border post, it's incredibly rewarding to see how our presence has made a</p> |
|---|---|--|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>measures had a positive and tangible impact on the border communities. The heightened security environment instilled a sense of safety and stability, directly benefiting residents by improving personal safety and minimizing the risks associated with unauthorized border crossings. Additionally, this conducive setting facilitated legal and regulated cross-border activities, encouraging economic exchanges and stimulating socio-economic development in the region.</p> | <p>positive difference in the community. The increased security measures have not only made the border safer, but they've also provided a sense of reassurance to the local residents. One of the most fulfilling parts of our job is being able to help resolve conflicts related to transhumance. Knowing that the community feels more secure allows them to approach these issues with a calmer and more cooperative attitude. It's heartening to witness how our presence has contributed to resolving conflicts and promoting harmony in this border area. I'm proud to be part of a team that's had a tangible impact on the lives of these citizens, creating a safer and more peaceful environment for everyone. It's a testament to the positive outcomes that come from effective policing and engaging with the community."</p> |
|--|---|

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 4 | | | |
|---|--|--|--|

In addition to the stakeholder specific impact described above, please use this space to describe any additional human impact that the project has had.

Please limit your response to 4000 characters.

Under outcome 1, the participatory theater performances organized by TDS Sierra Leone and Guinea have proven to be useful in evoking transhumance-related issues at community level. This creative approach to foster perception, attitude and behavioural change was particularly appreciated by communities who now understand the importance of peaceful cohabitation and resolution of conflicts. The following example is an illustration of the positive impact of this activity on attitudes and behaviours and how community members after understanding the importance of peace and social cohesion can positively influence their peers and become “change agents” in their environment. In Songoyah, a participant in the participatory theater performance explained to the project team that one day her husband got into conflict with a herder whose cattle devastated his field. The husband wanted to seek justice by taking revenge, but his wife, who participated in the theater performance dissuaded him to take action and explained the role of the transhumance committee in resolving this type of issue. She raised awareness with her husband who was convinced to go to the transhumance office. The transhumance committee handled the case and solved it amicably to everyone’s satisfaction.

Under outcome 2, In many cases, it was observed that CBT was fostering local development and social cohesion. Here are some examples: Sierra Leone – Cash transfers represented an opportunity for financial autonomy especially for female participants. In some sites, the CBT beneficiaries used this money to engage in petty trade as an additional source of income. Other FBOs opened a bank account and saved the money received by the members. Some FBO members provided loans to other members. Furthermore, the Koindukura, Yendeya, Messendikuday and Kambaya FBOs purchased other agricultural machines such as motor pumps to irrigate their IVS sites and other lands used for vegetable growing. The purchases of these different machines would support the continuation of activities beyond the project duration. Guinea – Beneficiaries bought food but the cash was also used to contribute to the development of their villages. For example, the community of Manikolia (Banian sub-prefecture) built a school and covers the salary of the teacher. Located 500 metres from the village, the Manikolia elementary school has 2 classrooms and accommodates 52 pupils (including 23 girls), is the fruit of a synergy between farmers and breeders. It was built thanks to a cash transfer received.

The community of Tinterba (Songoyah sub-prefecture) built a youth centre and expanded the village school with 3 classrooms due to the increased number of students since the introduction of the school feeding program in the village. The community also supported the construction of a canteen. In Djibendo (Banian sub-prefecture), the community rehabilitated a health centre and cover the remuneration of a community health worker. In Kémaya (Hérémakonon sub-prefecture), Tinterba and Djibendo, CBT was also used to purchase motor pumps to irrigate lands.

Under outcome 3, the intervention has led to an increase in cross-border cooperation, fostering stronger ties between communities on either side. This newfound collaboration has not only enhanced security thanks to the organization of joint patrols along the border (since October 2023). This collective effort has proven instrumental in maintaining a safer and more secure environment in border areas. The joint patrols deter unauthorized border crossings but also create a sense of unity and shared responsibility between border agents from both countries. This collaborative effort stands as a testament to the positive ripple effects that can be achieved through strategic initiatives and cooperative efforts.

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

OPTIONAL

File 1

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 2

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 3

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

You can also add upto 3 links to online resources which illustrate the human impact of the project

OPTIONAL

Link 1

OPTIONAL

<https://share.wochit.com/654ccfc54dfbf92b69578856>

Link 2

OPTIONAL

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zky8y7f-ZXc>

Link 3

OPTIONAL

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EGO1BVkijBA&t=43s>

Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative.

How we worked:

*

Please select up to 3.

- ☐ Enhanced digitization
- ☒ Innovative ways of working
- ☐ Mobilized additional resources
- ☐ Improved or initiated policy frameworks
- ☒ Strengthened capacities
- ☐ Partnered with with local/grassroots Civil Society Organizations
- ☐ Expanding coalitions & galvanizing political will
- ☐ Strengthened partnerships with IFIs
- ☒ Strengthened partnerships with UN Agencies

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

This project was developed and implemented using an integrated approach to tackle conflicts between herders and cattle farmers through capacity strengthening on conflict analysis, management and resolution, climate-smart agriculture, data analysis and border management

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Capacity strengthening was one of the main intervention strategies under the different outcomes of the project. Several stakeholders received trainings: farmers, herders, border personel, border alert teams, transhumance committee members, cattle settlement committees.

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

WFP Sierra Leone and Guinea partnered with the national organization Talking Drum Studio for the implementation of the peacebuilding activities. In Guinea, WFP partnered with two local organizations - Organisation Guinéenne de Développement Communautaire (OGDC) and Action pour le Bien-être Familial (ABEF) for the implementation of its livelihood activities in Faranah prefecture. Following an activity facilitated by TDS with youths, a new young leader platform was created. This platform called Réseau de Acteurs pour le Développement de Faranah - RADEF (in english Network of Actors for the Development of Faranah

Who are we working with (in addition to the implementing partners) *

- ☐ Strengthened partnerships with IFIs
- ☒ Strengthened partnerships within UN Agencies
- ☒ Partnered with local civil society organizations
- ☐ Partnered with local academia
- ☐ Partnered with sub-national entities
- ☐ Partnered with national entities
- ☐ Partnered with local volunteers

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Leave No one Behind

Select all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative *

Mandatory

- ☐ Unemployed persons
- ☐ Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.)
- ☒ Indigenous communities
- ☐ Persons with Disabilities
- ☐ Persons affected by violence (e.g. GBV)
- ☒ Women
- ☒ Youth
- ☐ Children
- ☐ Minorities related to sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression
- ☒ People living in and around border areas
- ☐ Persons affected by natural disasters
- ☐ Persons affected by armed conflicts
- ☐ Internally displaced persons, refugees or migrants

PART IV: Monitoring, Evaluation and Compliance

» Monitoring

Please list key monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Implementation of project activities have been closely monitored by WFP and IOM teams, MoA and CSOs. WFP's dedicated Beneficiary Feedback Mechanism (BFM) also enables beneficiaries to provide feedback directly to WFP, thus empowering beneficiaries to report on project activities. Project monitoring has been implemented through monthly field-based monitoring by WFP and IOM and systematically documented in back to office reports, daily monitoring of livelihood activities (outcome 2) by district-level MoA technical staff and WFP's field-based Programme Associate. To enhance field monitoring of livelihood activities, WFP established a dedicated WhatsApp group comprised of WFP and MoA staff where photographs of project progress can be shared, challenges communicated and way forward established.

In December 2022, the PBF Secretariat in Guinea undertook a monitoring mission in Faranah with the objective to:

- Exchange with beneficiaries and other implementing actors to gather their opinion and their degree of satisfaction with the quality of the services rendered and their expectations;
- Observe the immediate effects of the project;
- Make recommendations to strengthen the implementation of the and take corrective measures if necessary.

In January 2023, TDS, WFP and IOM in Guinea organized a midterm monitoring and evaluation mission to assess the level of implementation. In Sierra Leone, the implementation team also carried this activity in February 2023.

Between 24 and 27 October 2023, the Guinea project team facilitated an inter-ministerial monitoring mission in Faranah prefecture. The participants consisted of TC members (national level) and their counterparts at the prefecture level. The objective of this field-visit was to assess the overall project implementation level, changes brought by the intervention but also identify challenges, lessons learned and good practices. The results of the visit were presented to a selection of key stakeholders (mayors, transhumance committee members, security forces, community relays, youth organization etc.) on 30 October in Faranah.

Between 20 and 22 November 2023, the PBF Coordinator and the Prime Minister's adviser visited the prefecture of Faranah to monitor and assess the project activities in the sub-prefectures of Hérémakonon, Songoyah and Banian. A radio interview was also organized to explain the role of the PBF and the project' results.

Do outcome indicators have baselines?

If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select 'yes'

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available.

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

WFP SL contracted an independent international consultant to conduct the project's baseline. The consultant worked in close collaboration with the project technical teams across Sierra Leone and Guinea to benefit from their specialised knowledge and ensure that data collected meets the needs of the project. The baseline relied on a mixed methods approach, setting quantitative baseline indicators and informing targets, as well as qualitatively examining the causes of conflict between herders and farmers, the presence and effectiveness of mechanisms put in place to prevent and address conflicts, the remaining challenges to promoting peace, etc. Quantitative surveys were administered to project beneficiaries by trained enumerators while key informant interviews and focus group discussions were carried out by the consultant. Data collection took place throughout the month of May 2022.

Elaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon request)

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The sources of evidence come from monitoring and data collection visits. Reports available upon request

Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The project's baseline used a quantitative survey that targeted direct beneficiaries from the project – 500 farmers in each country, and 200 herders in Sierra Leone and 100 herders from Guinea. The survey sought to define baseline values for outcome level indicators for each of the three outcomes, as well as to deepen understanding of underlying conflict dynamics that could be prevented and addressed in project areas. A perception survey was also carried in Guinea during the midterm M&E mission in January 2023 as well as during the endline evaluation in March and April 2024.

Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Implementation of project activities were closely monitored by WFP and IOM teams, MAFS and CSOs. WFP's dedicated Beneficiary Feedback Mechanism (BFM) also enabled beneficiaries to provide feedback directly to WFP in a transparent and confidential manner, thus empowering beneficiaries to report on project activities. Border alert teams also played a role in channelling information and escalating any issues or challenges observed at community-level.

» Evaluation

Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation?

*

☒

 Yes

☐

 No

☐

 Not Applicable

Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget:

*

Response required

180000

If project will end in next six months, and the overall project budget is above USD 1.5 million, is your upcoming evaluation on track?

☒

 Yes

☐

 No

☐

 Not Applicable

Please describe the preparations

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

WFP Sierra Leone initiated the recruitment process of the independent consultant that will be in charge of conducting the endline evaluation in Guinea and Sierra Leone. This activity took place between March and April 2024. The report was submitted to PBSO and PBF focal points in Sierra Leone and Guinea for their input. Moreover, it is worth mentioning the conduct of an independent impact evaluation by two research organizations (3ie and ISDC) in collaboration with PBSO. The research team organized a scoping mission on 27 November 2023 in Sierra Leone and on 4 December 2023 in Guinea. The objective of the mission is to acquire more information from counterparts at WFP, IOM, and TDS on the details of project implementation. The meetings confirmed the value and feasibility of an impact evaluation and allow the researchers to seek input from WFP, IOM, and TDS counterparts on the scope of the evaluation exercises, e.g., the sites to be included, sample sizes corresponding to each approach, and actors to include. Between 27 May and 7 June 2024, the research team conducted data collection mission in Faranah prefecture and Falaba district.

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|--------------|-----------|-------|
| Contact information | Name | Organization | Job title | Email |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Please mention the focal person responsible for sharing the final evaluation report with the PBF: | William Hopkins | World Food Programme | Head of Programme | william.hopkins@wfp.org |
| | | | | |

» Catalytic Effect

| | |
|--|---|
| Catalytic Effect (financial): Has the project mobilized additional non-PBF financial resources to date? | * |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | |
| How many funders has the project received additional non-PBF funding from? | * |
| 4 | 1 |
| Indicate name of funder and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project since it started. <i>Please enter each funding agent and their contributions separately</i> | |
| Name of Funder | * |
| USAID | |
| Amount in USD | * |
| 40000 | 2 |
| Indicate name of funder and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project since it started. <i>Please enter each funding agent and their contributions separately</i> | |
| Name of Funder | * |
| IMF | |
| Amount in USD | * |
| 59479 | |

Indicate name of funder and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project since it started.

Please enter each funding agent and their contributions separately

Name of Funder

USAID

Amount in USD

11110

Indicate name of funder and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project since it started.

Please enter each funding agent and their contributions separately

Name of Funder

Republic of Korea

Amount in USD

9350

Catalytic Effect (non-financial): Has the project enabled or created a larger or longer-term peacebuilding change to occur, in addition to the direct project changes?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please select the relevant option below:

☐ Some catalytic effect

☒ Significant catalytic effect

If relevant, please describe how the project has had a (non-financial) catalytic effect, i.e. removed barriers to unblock stalled political, institutional or other peacebuilding processes at different levels in a country, and/or created the conditions to establish new processes to do so

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Outcome 1 and 3 - Following training in conflict analysis and management initiated by the IOM and facilitated by TDS a young leader platform was created in Guinea. This platform called Réseau de Acteurs pour le Développement de Faranah - RADEF (in english Network of Actors for the Development of Faranah) is comprised of young people from different youth structures operating in the urban commune of Faranah. Its motto is fraternity-solidarity-innovation and its vision is to promote the development and coalition of young people in the city of Faranah. RADEF's mission is to promote and popularize the potential of young people and make them agents of development. TDS ensures a continuous support in building the capacities of the organization that is now organizing its own activities.

Outcome 2 - The system of workers groupement (farmers and herders) strengthened trust between people and social cohesion. The establishment of community savings and credit groups contributed to the social development of some of the project sites. For example, the inhabitants of Djibendo (Songoyah sub-prefecture) built a school and a health post on their own that the community manages autonomously. Other schools and youth center were built in Manikolea (Banian sub-prefecture) and Tinterba (Songoyah sub-prefecture) as a result of cash-based transfers and village savings schemes.

Sustainability

Does the project have an explicit exit strategy?

Please describe any steps that have been taken to ensure the sustainability of peacebuilding gains, including any mechanisms, platforms, networks and socio-economic initiatives supported, beyond the duration of the project

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

On 31 October 2023, the Guinea project team organized a capitalization workshop in Faranah. This participatory activity brought key project stakeholders. This participatory brainstorming highlighted the necessity to strengthen the capacities of transhumance committees and community relays to ensure more autonomy; technical services for a better support and monitoring of activities beyond the project; security services in training new personnel (training of trainers). Moreover, the mayors of the communes of Hérémakonon and Songoyah asked the project team to support their initiative to create a joint cross-border cooperation committees in Hérémakonon (Guinea) - Koindukura (Sierra Leone) and Songoyah (Guinea) - Walia (Sierra Leone). A similar exercise will be conducted in Sierra Leone in the next reporting period.

Under outcome 1, TDS Guinea and Sierra Leone strengthened community-based dialogues and conflict prevention and management mechanisms using community engagement activities. The establishment and training of cross-border alert teams to document and report transhumance activities between the two countries will continue to provide information on potential conflict triggers to the respective government and security institutions beyond the project duration. TDS in both countries are currently organizing a "peer-to-peer" learning exchange session between some members of the Guinean transhumance committees and the cattle settlement peace committees. They will also support the cross-border cooperation committees.

Under outcome 2, WFP Sierra Leone worked closely with the MAFS for continuity of support beyond the project. The establishment and training of community youth contractors in supported communities will serve as a knowledge transfer channel and support the retention of improved agricultural practices at the community level. WFP is also strengthening the capacities of farmer-based organisations by strengthening their governance and business management capacities.

Under outcome 3, IOM is building the commitment of communities and local and national government. The organisation in both countries gradually reduced its involvement and presence in the next months to guarantee more agency from government authorities. For instance, border post maintenance will be assured by the respective governments of Sierra Leone and Guinea. Moreover, following the joint border assessment undertaken by IOM Guinea and Sierra Leone in September 2023, the local authorities of both countries involved during the assessment decided to replicate this exercise on a quarterly basis to identify illegal crossing points and analyze the flux of people and merchandise in these points. This government-led initiative, supported by IOM, is an illustration of the ownership of the authorities to strengthen cross-border cooperation. In April 2024, IOM supported the launch of a mixed cross-border committee between the two countries, ensuring a better coordination between the two countries in the management of conflicts and sustainable development in border areas.

Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations?

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

As part of the project, TDS Guinea and Sierra Leone re-dynamized transhumance committees. These committees are responsible for the prevention and resolution of conflicts between cattle herders and farmers and community sensitizations. In the last monitoring visit of the Guinea PBF secretariate in December 2022, recommendations were made to establish income-generating activities as a mean to ensure their financial empowerment. However, no budget lines were designed for such support.

The creation of mixed cross-border cooperation committees between the two countries involves several capacity-building needs, which were not anticipated in the project budget. Firstly, training programs should be implemented to equip committee members with skills in effective collaboration, conflict resolution, and facilitation of dialogue among diverse stakeholders. Additionally, capacity-building initiatives should focus on enhancing their knowledge of cross-border issues, legal frameworks, and best practices in peacebuilding efforts. Training in project management and organizational skills will be crucial for efficient operations. Furthermore, workshops on data collection, analysis, and reporting would strengthen their ability to monitor progress and assess the impact of their initiatives. Lastly, communication and negotiation skills training will be essential for effectively engaging with government agencies, community leaders, and international partners. These capacity-building efforts will strengthen the committees' effectiveness in promoting sustained peacebuilding efforts in the border areas.

Monitoring and Oversight Activities

Please describe any key event related to monitoring and oversight. Please click next if no activities have yet taken place.

Events include Steering Committee meetings, Monitoring visits, Third party monitoring, Community based monitoring, any data collection, Perception or other survey findings, evaluation reports, audit or investigations.

| Monitoring and oversight activities | Name of the Event | Summary | Key Findings |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------|
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------|

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| Event 1 | PBF field-visit in Faranah prefecture (Guinea) 12-22 December 2022 | <p>As part of its monitoring missions to ensure the quality of the implementation of these projects, the PBF secretariat organized a field monitoring mission from December 12 to 22, 2022. Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss with beneficiaries and other implementation stakeholders to gather their opinions and their degree of satisfaction with the quality of the services provided and their expectations • Observe the immediate effects of the project • Make recommendations to strengthen the implementation of projects and take corrective measures if necessary | <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the Banian committee with a motorcycle, as has been done in other sub-prefectures to avoid frustration • Continue to build the capacity of members of transhumance committees and support them in raising awareness and providing feedback at the level of the villages concerned. • Equip border posts • Continue the dynamic committed and focused on Peacebuilding actions • Consider Income Generating Activities (IGAs) for transhumance committees to provide them with the means to better play their role in conflict management and strengthen their sustainability, which seems quite fragile. • Encourage implementation partners (OGDC, ABEF) to emphasize peacebuilding issues during IGAs and encourage beneficiaries to make the link between their IGA and these issues of conflict management and prevention |
|----------------|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| Event 2 | Mid-term evaluation mission January 2023 in Guinea and February 2023 in Sierra Leone | Objectives: • Determine the level of performance of the project, to identify constraints • Draw lessons learned • Formulate recommendations to facilitate the achievement of the expected results | Findings: • The project has had an immeasurable impact on the management of conflicts between farmers and breeders: the use of gendarmerie services has decreased completely, amicable settlements involving sector heads and members of transhumance offices are now the rule that promotes. These results are felt even outside the project areas. • Raising awareness about equal rights between men and women, especially in transhumance committees, seems to have had positive results. Indeed, the results of the joint mission show a substantial positive improvement in social cohesion. • However, the beneficiaries of the project say they are satisfied with the support received because it would have contributed to the strengthening of peace and social cohesion in the project area extended to all the villages of the targeted sub-prefectures. The majority of them believe that this support responded to their needs/concerns. However, they consider this support insufficient given the importance of the project and the majority believe they are requesting an extension. • Local authorities in the project area are delighted with the positive impacts. Among the positive outcomes of the project, the village leaders/transhumance committee cited in particular the |
|----------------|---|--|--|

strengthening of peace and social cohesion, the improvement of the living conditions of the beneficiaries and the learning of new farming techniques. • Conflicts between herders and farmers have reduced considerably thanks to the implementation of project activities. The merit goes to the alert and transhumance committees revitalized in the different localities which do work appreciated by the authorities and the communities. The members of these committees are accepted and recognized by community members as being real peace actors, even if the latter say they need more resources to increase their efficiency (motorcycles, coats, boots, operating costs, etc.) • Participatory theaters and Popular Expressions Tribunes (TEP) have made it possible to strengthen ties in communities and strengthen living together. What is also important to note is that thanks to these project activities, key actors from other districts and villages who are not initially target localities of the project were affected by the awareness raising which contributed to improve conflict management and relations between farmers and breeders, as well as between communities and authorities in these localities • Cross-border meetings and the establishment of border posts have made it

possible to strengthen fraternal ties between the Guinean and Leonese communities who maintain better relations and better manage their conflicts. • Thanks to TEPs, communities better understand the law on land and better manage conflicts linked to the acquisition and transfer of land. Women's rights regarding land are increasingly recognized by communities • The programs produced are not listened to by the vast majority of the communities for which they are intended because they do not have enough listening time during broadcast hours and the majority do not have radio sets. However, in urban areas, the broadcasts are listened to and appreciated even in certain localities of Dabola and Dinguiraye which experience practically the same realities as Faranah.

Recommendations: • Develop/establish conflict resolution principles for all transhumance committees in the different project intervention areas. For example, the same types of conflicts must have the same resolution methods in the project intervention areas. • Establish and make functional spaces for sharing and formal exchanges between the different actors involved in implementing and coordinating the project. These spaces would make it possible to share the difficulties encountered and to propose consensual solutions to the difficulties

encountered. • Establish cross-border transhumance committees to streamline the management of conflicts involving people from both countries. • Improve the frequency of meetings with the various project stakeholders (the transhumance committees must work in advance before the season to take precautions to avoid conflicts) and increase contacts with farmers and breeders to reduce reluctance. • Develop inclusive income-generating activities between farmers and breeders. • Develop exchanges between farmers and breeders (harvest residues for organic fertilizer) • Raise awareness of the risks and threats posed by bush fires, which are still recurring in the area and a source of conflict.

.....

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| Event 3 | First annual peace summit 23 February 2023 | <p>In February 2023, an annual peace summit was held in Koindukura convening 50 stakeholders from Sierra Leone and Guinea to discuss issues raised in the different cross-border community dialogue forums, participatory theater performances and sign a peace agreement for a more cohesive and peaceful co-existence at the border.</p> | <p>The following 10 peace initiatives were highlighted: 1. Strengthen and enforce the implementation of the chiefdom bylaws 2. Leaders and or cattle settlement committees must always practice fair judgment of cattle related cases between cattle herders and crop farmers. 3. Cattle ranches also known as ‘warrehs’ should not be constructed near to any farmland(s), they must be situated miles away from farmlands, approximately 2- 3 miles off. 4. Rice farmers are encouraged to cultivate short duration (3- 4 months rice) instead of the long duration (6-9 months rice to avoid crops being destroyed by cattle when they are released from the ranches/warrehs around January 10, according to the bylaws. 5. All town chiefs are strongly advised to always inform citizens and their respective section chiefs about new settler(s) or cattle owner(s) in their respective villages and towns. 6. June 10th— January 10th cattle containment period to be reviewed based on the effect of climate changes (a period that will suit both farmers and herders). 7. Barbed wires for fencing cattle ranches and or farmlands should be made available at an affordable cost for farmers and cattle herders to buy in their respective communities. 8. Short duration/early variety seed rice to be made available for farmers to purchase and cultivate</p> |
|----------------|---|--|---|

in their respective communities instead of the long duration rice. 9. Sulima and Mongo Chiefdoms should form joint crop farmers-herders cattle settlement committees respectively to address conflicts/cases between cattle herders and crop farmers. 10. That anyone person(s) intending to farm in any particular area must always communicate in advance the proposed farm site(s) to the chiefdom authorities before start of work. This is applicable to all person(s) (Sierra Leoneans and Guineans) intending to farm along or across the border regions.

.....

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| Event 4 | Joint border assessment (IOM Sierra Leone and Guinea) 21-25 September 2023 | <p>The overall objective of the joint assessment of entry points between Guinea and Sierra Leone is to strengthen cross-border cooperation and contribute to economic development, health security and security stability in the region by improving efficiency, security and management capacity of entry points between the two countries.</p> | <p>Findings: • Strong involvement of the authorities • Very strong mobilization of participants • Sharing of experience between participants • Strengthening ties of cooperation between participants • Enthusiasm and perfect commitment of the participants during this activity • Very good appreciation from the participants on the initiative taken by the IOM</p> <p>• Low knowledge of participants and the community about data collection</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the capacity of agents to collect data • Increase the number of days for entry point assessments • Jointly raise awareness among cross-border communities in Guinea and the Sierra Leone on the benefits of cross-border collaboration • Build a joint police-customs and equipped post at the Kaliyereh entry point |
|----------------|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| Event 5 | Inter-ministerial field visit in Faranah prefecture (Guinea) 24-27 October 2023 | <p>As part of its support program for the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralization, Ministry of Security and Civil Protection, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, the technical committee members organized an inter-ministerial mission to monitor and evaluate the activities carried out since the project inception. The participants of the field visit included representatives of the Ministries mentioned above and the decentralized services of the said Ministries at the prefectural level.</p> <p>Objectives: • Evaluate the quality of the project implementation • Observe any changes brought by the project intervention • Provide recommendations to improve the implementation • Identify challenges, lessons learned and good practices</p> | <p>Recommendations: • Continue joint awareness raising among populations, administrative and cross-border security authorities on peaceful cohabitation and cross-border cooperation • Build and equip joint police-customs posts at the formal entry points of Banian and Sandenia • Deploy agents in sufficient quantities at border crossings • Strengthen continuing training for police/customs officers • Expand the communication radius of radio stations • Build housing for customs and police personnel in Hérémakonon and Songoyah • Strengthen the capacity of technical services (Directorate of Microprojects, Environment and Sustainable Development) • Provide police and customs personnel with fraud detection equipment • Provide the immigration section of the Faranah Central Police Station with computer equipment • Expand project activities in the CRs of Banian and Sandénia • Expand the project to other border sub-prefectures (Marella, Bambaya, Tiro and Kobikoro) • Involve other technical services (Health, Commerce and Fisheries) in project activities • Train and support women and youth groups for the creation of Income Generating Activities in the project areas • Support the continuing training of community relays and transhumance committees • Increase the number of</p> |
|----------------|---|--|---|

motorcycles for transhumance committees and support their operation • Provide farmers and breeders with barbed wire and fences • Establish and support the Guinea-Sierra Leone joint coordination committee • Build common infrastructure (market, health center and schools) in the borders • Increase nurseries and sites to be reforested • Improve cultivation techniques for forage crop varieties, especially for Panicum maximum • Materialize and mark transhumance corridors • Support border communities in obtaining identity documents • Involve the focal points at the central level in the development of the terms of reference (TOR) of the activities

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Event 6 | | | |
| Event 7 | | | |
| Event 8 | | | |

Final Steps

- Please save a pdf copy of the form by clicking on the *Printer* icon on the top right corner of the page.
- A dialogue box will appear: Please select the A4 size and portrait orientation.
- Click "prepare" and save the document as a PDF
- (If on first attempt, the generated page is not readable, close the pop up page and go back to the first page of the online form using the "Return to Beginning" option and try to print the PDF version from there)
- After printing the PDF version, please submit the report in the last page of the form. You can use the "Go to End" button in the bottom right corner.
- **Please upload the pdf version of the report as well as your financial report in excel format on the MPTF-O gateway.**

If you encounter any difficulty in filling the form or generating the print-out for MPTFO gateway, please contact Gabriel Velastegui gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org

Thank You. You have finished the report. Please Click on the SUBMIT button below. When the report is submitted, a confirmation note will appear on a yellow banner on top of the page. This can take a few seconds.