PBF November 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. 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   *

- ( ) Semi-annual
- (•) Annual
- ( ) Final
- ( ) Other

Date of submission of report   *

2024-11-15

2024-11-15

Name and Title of Person submitting the report   *

Aideen Conway, Knowledge Management and Comms Officer

E-mail of Person submitting the report   *

aideen.conway@undp.org

Name and Title of Person who approved the report   *

Elvi Agunda, Project Manager

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

(●) Yes

( ) No

Did PBF Secretariat or RCO focal point review the report? *

You should normally ensure that the PBF Secretariat or the PBF focal point 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

( ) Asia and the Pacific   ( ) Central & Southern Africa   (●) East Africa

( ) Europe and Central Asia   ( ) Global   ( ) Latin America and the Caribean

( ) Middle East and North Africa ( ) West Africa

Country of project implementation *

( ) Ethiopia   (●) Kenya   ( ) Madagascar

( ) Somalia   ( ) South Sudan   ( ) Sudan

( ) Other, Specify

Other, please specify *

Project Title *

(●) 00140292: Promoting Peace and Inclusive Development in Borderlands Counties in North-Eastern Kenya

( ) Other, Specify

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

- [ ] Asia and the Pacific
- [ ] Central & Southern Africa
- [ ] East Africa
- [ ] Europe and Central Asia
- [ ] Global
- [ ] Latin America and the Caribean
- [ ] Middle East and North Africa
- [ ] West Africa

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

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 *

Other, Please specify *

Project Start Date (Date of first transfer) *

2023-08-24

2023-08-24

Project End Date *

2025-08-21

2025-08-21

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

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

*

Other, Please specify

....

Implementing Partners

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money *during this reporting period* (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration)?

8

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

International Peace Support Training Centre (IPSTC)

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

160000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

IPSTC completed Training Needs Assessments (TNA) in Mandera Wajir, and Garissa in early March. Following the completion of the assessments, tailored training packages for both strategic and county-level courses were developed in June. The first training was rolled out at the strategic level in Nairobi at the IPSTC headquarters from 29 July to 2 August and participants included representatives from county government representatives, military personnel and police. The course was well received with positive feedback from all participants. Following the completion of the strategic level training, county level trainings were rolled out in Mandera (26–30 August), Wajir (9–13 September), and Garissa (23–27 September). These trainings were well-received, leading to the establishment of Civilian Security Coordination (CISEC) mechanisms in all three counties. The newly established CISEC mechanisms have improved trust between citizens and security agencies, fostering a more secure environment for community engagement.

2

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

Human rights focused

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

HAKI Africa

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

72000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

HAKI Africa was issued a grant to facilitate community engagement dialogues sessions to inform and support efforts to strengthen trust and enhance communities' understandings and engagement of security and human rights matters.

In August, they conducted community dialogues in each of the three counties and they have a second round planned for November. Issues that emerged include mistrust between security actors and communities, cross border smuggling and radicalization.

3

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner   *

Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR)

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

48000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

KNCHR was contracted to a human rights baseline assessment and regular human rights monitoring and analysis in tour three project counties with the aim of feeding into ongoing human rights risk assessments, due diligence and identification of mitigation measures. Due to delays in issuing of the grant, this has not yet commenced. As of early November, the commission is in the process of hiring a data analyst and two human rights defenders in each of the three counties. It is expected that the baseline will be conducted before the end of the year.

4

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Semi Arid Resilience Network

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

15000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

SARN's main activities include organizing inception meetings to secure stakeholder buy-in, formulating questionnaires to assess community understanding, and conducting data collection through focus group discussions and key informant interviews. The organization also develops a community feedback mechanism, facilitates conflict-sensitive dialogues and trust-building activities, and disseminates learning materials. These activities aim to improve collaboration between communities and development stakeholders in conflict-prone areas, particularly in Lagdera and Garissa Township, with a focus on enhancing peace and security through community engagement. Beneficiaries, including women, youth, and PWDs, are selected through consultations with local leaders and peace committees.

5

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner   *

Worthy Vision

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

22000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Worthy Vision's main activities for the project include conducting inception meetings with stakeholders to ensure buy-in, facilitating design workshops to define goals and information needs related to peace, security, and development, and gathering data to assess the quality of interventions and relationships. The organization will analyze this data, with the support of a consultant, and present the findings in an accessible format. Community engagement dialogues will be held in Lafey and Mandera South sub-counties to gather feedback on the findings and suggest program adjustments. Additionally, advocacy and awareness campaigns will be launched based on the assessment results, targeting both duty bearers and rights holders. Beneficiaries, including women, youth, and PWDs, will be selected through local mobilizers, who will work with community leaders to ensure diversity and inclusivity in the selection process.

6

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner   *

Women Rights Advocacy Initiative (WORAI)

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

22000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

WRAI's main activities for the project include conducting community-level workshops to develop engagement strategies and identify key project questions, followed by interviews and focus group discussions to gather insights into community needs and concerns. WRAI will also organize community dialogues to share project findings, collect feedback, and advocate for policy changes based on community input. Additionally, the organization will run advocacy campaigns to influence policy actions and improve community engagement in peace and development initiatives. Beneficiaries, including women, youth, elders, and marginalized groups, will be selected through consultations with local leaders and civil society organizations, ensuring representation and active participation throughout the project.

7

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Relief Reconstruction and Development Organisation (RRDO)

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

293686.78

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner *
Please limit your response to 1500 characters

RRDO was contracted to support implementation of the peace dividends projects in Garissa. To date, they have conducted four inter-community dialogues in Garissa, bringing together government, peace committees, security agencies, among others. A site monitoring and feasibility visit was conducted at a proposed site for peace dividends projects.

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each *during this reporting period*

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner   *

Vision Corps Initiative (VCI)

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

601291.92

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner   *
Please limit your response to 1500 characters

VCI was contracted to support implementation of peace dividends projects in Mandera and Wajir. To date, VCI has conducted a baseline assessment for identified locations, implemented a peace dividends project in Barogothey, Wajir West and conducted a site assessment visit in Banisa, Mandera.

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 $) *Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars*	Transfers to date (in full US $) *Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars*	Expenditure to date (in full US $) *Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars*	Implementation rate as a percentage of total budget *(calculated automatically)*
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme	* 2000000	* 700000	* 654247.96	32.71%
	*	*	*	%
OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	* 500000	* 350000	* 399017.19	79.8%

WFP: World Food Programme	1500000 *	525000 *	948283.93 *	63.22%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%

TOTAL	4000000	1575000	2001549.08	**50.0 4%**

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **50.04%**. 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? *

32.47

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 $ 1298800**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

(●) Correct   ( ) Incorrect

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

Amount expended to date on efforts contributiong to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US $ 649902.99**. Is this correct? *

(●) Correct   ( ) Incorrect

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

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE. The templates for the budget are available [here](#) *

Copy of PBF Financial Report November 2024-10_39_55.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 Steering Committee (PSC) convenes quarterly to review progress, discuss challenges, and strategize solutions. Since the project began, three PSC meetings have been held, all chaired by UN Resident Coordinator Dr. Stephen Jackson. The most recent meeting was held on 6 August 2024, with a final PSC meeting, for the year 2024, scheduled for 20 November 2024.

These meetings have seen broad and diverse representation from stakeholders, including key government agencies, implementing partners, and civil society representatives. Each Responsible UN Organization (RUNO), alongside the Office of the Deputy President (ODP), has provided updates on their respective areas, shared achievements, and flagged critical challenges. Discussions have focused particularly on issues such as coordination difficulties among partners, capacity limitations, and alignment of interventions.

As a response, the committee has proposed and implemented practical measures, such as regular coordination meetings between partners and increased communication channels, to improve coherence in project execution. By addressing these issues proactively, the PSC is working to foster a collaborative environment that ensures project goals remain on track and that each partner's efforts contribute effectively to overall project outcomes.

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

County government
Throughout the year, the project has had significant engagements with county government in the three counties. As of August 2024, consultations have been held with county government in all counties. Representatives form county government have been engaged in key activities for the project including data components to develop a data sharing strategy, CISEC trainings at strategic and county level and digital peacebuilding training in Wajir. In late May, the project supported the Wajir County Assembly in conducting community consultations on the Wajir County Peacebuilding and Conflict Management Bill, 2023. These consultations paved the way for the bill's finalization and subsequent signing by the Governor. The newly adopted Act was launched at the October Peace Actor's Forum in Wajir, with thanks given to the Promoting Peace project for support. The next steps are to operationalize the Act in particular to support county level peace structures as part of ensuring increased community voices in decision making in peace and security interventions in the county. As part of the digital peacebuilding training, 18% of the trained participants were part of the county government from the level of Chief Officers and Directors.
National government
The Office of the Deputy President (ODP) is the national implementing partner for the project. Our efforts have been focused on identifying capacity gaps and opportunities within the ODP, aligning with its mandate under Executive Order No. 1 of 2023, which includes coordinating Development Partners' programmes in Kenya. In June, an Individual Consultant was contracted by UNDP but based at the ODP and has been supporting us with implementation of activities. The consultant has attended key meetings for the project, including consultations in Mandera in August and data related workshops in July and October.

The Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) was engaged during the drafting of the project's data sharing strategy. Given the project's commitment to strengthening inclusive data, KNBS is an integral partner and it is envisaged that this relationship will be fostered throughout the lifetime of the project. It will also ensure that data from the project feeds into national level data mechanisms in a bid to influence policy and actions making the context specific.

The project has actively engaged with the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR), the state's independent National Human Rights Institution. Despite some delays, the commission has commenced the baseline human rights assessment and a report is expected by early December.

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

Contracting of Implementing Partners:
The Office of the Deputy President (ODP) is the national implementing partner for the project and has been engaged since its inception. UNDP has contracted six civil society organizations (CSOs) to support activity implementation: Worthy Vision, Semi-Arid Resilience Network (SARN), Women Rights Advocacy Initiative (WORAI), AID-Africa, Generations for Change and Growth, and Agency for Peace and Inclusive Development (APID). These grants focus on strengthening community engagement mechanisms, especially for women, youth, and local peace structures, ensuring active participation in peace, security, and development.

UNDP initially planned to issue six grants by the end of the year, but due to liquidity challenges, only three organizations—SARN, WORAI, and Worthy Vision—have received grants. The remaining three CSOs signed Low Value Grants in August 2024, but disbursement has not occurred yet.

OHCHR has granted funds to the International Peace Support Training Centre (IPSTC), the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR), and HAKI Africa.

In June, WFP onboarded two partners to implement the CISEC peace dividends project: Relief Reconstruction and Development Organisation (RRDO) and Vision Corps Initiative (VCI).

Staff Recruitment:
As of 13 May 2024, the project management unit (PMU) was fully staffed, including a Project Manager, three County Project Officers, a Project Associate, a Knowledge Management and Communications Officer, a Data and Innovation Specialist, and a Human Rights Officer. Additionally, a Digital Peacebuilding Officer was hired to support the Digital Peacebuilding component. An individual consultant was contracted in June to assist ODP, and an intern joined the team in August to help with knowledge management and communications.

Collection of Baselines:
On 30 May, the project contracted Rufmo Consulting to conduct a baseline assessment and three perception surveys among 'Leave No One Behind' (LNOB) groups. In October, the firm shared a reviewed results matrix with baseline data to guide the monitoring and evaluation. Rufmo's first draft report provided critical information for project monitoring, with the final draft expected by 11 November. Baseline data has been collected through interviews with key stakeholders and focus group discussions. Targets have been set based on this

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

The project is not on track due to three main challenges:

1. Liquidity Issues
The PBF is experiencing liquidity challenges that have resulted in delays in transferring the second tranche of funds to our project. As of September, we submitted our request for these funds, but we have yet to receive confirmation on when the transfer will occur. The delay has forced us to place many key activities on hold, disrupting our planned timelines and affecting our credibility in the counties where we operate. Given the importance of sequencing in this project, these financial constraints not only hinder our immediate activities but also pose a risk to our overall strategy and impact. If the delays persist, we may need to request a no-cost extension, which could exacerbate the situation by depleting funds allocated for salaries.

2. Political Challenges
In late June and July, Kenya saw widespread protests against the Finance Bill, 2024, due to increased or new taxes and levies. Despite the President announcing the withdrawal of the Bill on 25 June, protests continued to express discontent on corruption, excessive use of force by police, deaths and abductions. A peaceful protest took place in Garissa on 25 June and no protests took place in Mandera and Wajir. While the protests have not significantly affected the project counties, it has slowed progress in Nairobi, particularly with the Office of the Deputy President and implementing partners such as KNCHR and HAKI Africa.

On 17 October, the Senate voted to impeach Deputy President Rigathi Gachagua on five out of eleven charges, including gross violations of the constitution and incitement of ethnic strife. On 18 October, over 100 staff members at the Office of the Deputy President (ODP), including key focal points for our project, were placed on compulsory leave. Consequently, essential activities involving the ODP have stalled, further impeding our project's momentum. Since the swearing in of the new DP, Prof. Kindiki, some of the staff has since been recalled. However, the ODP focal point have requested the project to hold off the activities until a new Chief of Staff is appointed. This would also result to a delay in implementation of ODP's activities.

3. Onboarding of Implementing Partners
Delays have also occurred in the onboarding process for our implementing partners. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights faced setbacks in disbursing grants, which has affected the sequencing of activities. While the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights has received their grant as of October, the delay has impeded timely execution of planned activities. Furthermore, the human rights baseline assessment, a critical component of our project, has not yet been shared as of this writing.

Mitigating Actions
To address these challenges, the PMU is taking several proactive steps. Discussions are underway with RUNOs to assess if they can loan funds to the project; however, this will depend on guidance from the PBF regarding the timing of fund disbursement. Additionally, the PMU holds regular meetings to prioritize activities and develop acceleration plans in preparation for the disbursement of the second tranche.

Project progress summary

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Consultative Dialogues
The project held county-level consultations in Garissa (Feb 6–7), Wajir (Feb 27–28), and Mandera (Sept 19–20), in collaboration with the ODP. These consultations involved county government officials, including the county commissioner and governor, civil society, religious organizations, women's groups, youth, and elders. The consultations expanded the project's engagement and built relationships critical for successful implementation.

Human Rights and Civil Security Coordination (CISEC) Training
IPSTC completed Training Needs Assessments in early March. The first training was rolled out at the strategic level in Nairobi at IPSTC headquarters from 29 July to 2 August, with participants from county government, the military, and police. County-level trainings followed in Mandera (Aug 26–30), Wajir (Sept 9–13), and Garissa (Sept 23–27). The trainings were well-received and led to the establishment of CISEC mechanisms in all three counties, improving trust between citizens and security agencies and fostering a more secure environment for community engagement.

Community Dialogues
HAKI Africa conducted community dialogues in the three counties in August, identifying key security and human rights issues such as clan conflicts, mistrust between communities and security actors, cross-border smuggling, youth radicalization, and limited government service access. These dialogues have provided valuable insights into community challenges and will inform the human rights baseline assessment, which is set to begin this month.

Baseline Assessment and Perception Survey
Rufmo Consulting was contracted to conduct a baseline assessment and three perception surveys. The surveys measure and understand the views of women, youth, and persons with disabilities (PWDs) on peace, security, and development. The first perception survey involved 2,149 respondents, providing a representative sample from diverse demographic groups. The draft report will guide project strategies and interventions, ensuring alignment with community needs and priorities.

Strengthening Community Feedback Mechanisms
In April, UNDP issued a call for proposals for Low Value Grants (LVGs) aimed at enhancing community feedback mechanisms through grassroots CSOs. Six CSOs were selected, each receiving KES 3,000,000. As of the latest report, three CSOs have received funds and begun activities. An induction workshop in Nairobi in August prepared the CSOs to engage with communities, manage funds, and report on progress.

Data Landscape Mapping and Strategy Development
In July, WFP led a data landscape mapping workshop to develop a comprehensive data strategy for improving access to reliable knowledge. The workshop involved county governments, the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, ODP, and implementing partners. This foundational work contributed to Output 2.1. A follow-up workshop in October refined the data-sharing framework, which was finalized on 18 October, with additional feedback requested by 25 November. The strategy outlines clear protocols for data collection, sharing, and use. Additionally, a Terms of Reference (TOR) was prepared for a data portal to support the strategy. A firm was selected in August, though contract issuance has been delayed due to resource constraints.

Peace Dividends Projects
In June, WFP partnered with RRDO in Garissa and VCI in Mandera and Wajir to implement peace dividend projects. These partners engaged local stakeholders to design and implement projects, starting with community consultations to identify priorities. They conducted feasibility assessments and facilitated participatory dialogues through CISEC structures to guide project selection. In October, RRDO and VCI completed baseline surveys assessing community engagement, demographics, conflict levels, and local conflict resolution mechanisms. In Garissa, RRDO facilitated four inter-community dialogues with peace committees, government representatives, and security agencies. These dialogues led to a peace dividend project in Eldere, which is now ready for implementation. In Wajir, VCI implemented a peace dividend project in Barogothey, establishing a water pan to serve the community, animals, a local school, and the police station. In Mandera, VCI facilitated an inter-community meeting between the Degodia and Garre communities, identifying additional peace dividend priorities in Banisa Sub-County.

Digital Peacebuilding Training
In October, UNDP organized a 2-day digital peacebuilding training session in Wajir. Participants, selected through the Peace Actors Forum, included both state and non-state actors engaged in peacebuilding. A pre-training survey revealed that 89% of participants were already involved in peacebuilding efforts, with 42% familiar with digital

revealed that 89% of participants were already involved in peacebuilding efforts, with 42% familiar with digital peacebuilding, but none had received structured training in this area. Despite this, 32% of organizations used digital peacebuilding methods, and 42% had prior experience with related initiatives. The training covered topics like information disorder and fact-checking, with participants practicing these skills using real-world examples.

This training is part of a larger program, which includes eight online sessions and two in-person training events, focusing on digital tools for early warning, digital peace campaigns, and social media monitoring in conflict-prone regions. The Wajir training was well-received, and participants have already begun applying what they learned. The Peace Actors Forum has expressed interest in expanding the training. Plans to extend it to Garissa and Mandera were postponed due to resource constraints.

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

In 2024, the project has worked to ensure that gender equality, women's empowerment, and youth inclusion are key priorities embedded across all activities. However, achieving these goals has proven challenging, especially when it comes to representation. While efforts were made to ensure at least one-third of participants were women, this target has been missed in several instances. For example, during the IPSTC trainings, our goal for female participation was difficult to meet since all military personnel and most county government officials present were male. As a result, the few women who attended were often community representatives rather than officials with decision-making power. This dynamic not only impacted their level of confidence to speak but also highlights the larger, patriarchal structures in Northeastern Kenya over which the project has limited influence.

In areas where we have greater control, we have worked to ensure that women and youth are actively represented. In conducting our baseline assessment and perception survey, for instance, we contracted a firm that includes a gender expert as a core team member, ensuring that gender considerations are prioritized throughout the research process. By disaggregating all collected data by gender, age, and disability status, we aim to deepen our understanding of the unique impacts of our interventions on men, women, and youth.

We have emphasized Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) considerations across all project activities. The firm leading our data collection is committed to GESI-sensitive practices, and enumerators have received training to ensure their interactions with communities are inclusive and respectful. Additionally, efforts are underway to balance gender among enumerators for the perception surveys, which helps gather more comprehensive perspectives from respondents and reinforces our commitment to gender equality.

GESI considerations also guide the broader project framework. By taking a holistic approach, we aim to identify and address any existing gaps or biases, ensuring that the needs and perspectives of all segments of the population are recognized and integrated into the project. These ongoing efforts reflect both our achievements and our awareness of the gaps that remain, helping us take actionable steps toward a more inclusive and equitable project environment.

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

At this stage, the project has not yet demonstrated significant outcome-level peacebuilding results. Although we are one year into implementation, delays in activity rollout have impacted our ability to measure substantial changes in attitudes, behaviors, or institutions. We have recently completed baseline data collection, which will serve as the foundation for assessing progress. By the next bi-annual report, we expect to complete a second perception survey, which will help measure changes and provide a clearer understanding of the impact of our activities. This data will better position us to evaluate and report on outcome-level results, particularly in relation to shifts in community perceptions and institutional responsiveness.

Examples of Peacebuilding Activities Contributing to Outcomes:

1. Digital Peacebuilding Training:
The training has enhanced the capacity of peace actors to utilize digital technologies such as social media for early conflict warnings, online conflict responses, and identifying harmful digital practices like disinformation. Participants also gained skills in virtual mediation and running effective online campaigns for peacebuilding and countering polarizing narratives.

2. CISEC Training:
County governments have shown strong interest in CISEC training, recognizing its potential to strengthen community-security cooperation. For example, Garissa County visited IPSTC for capacity-building discussions, with the County Commissioner pledging funds for national government capacity-building. Wajir County has also requested local collaboration with IPSTC to promote peace and cohesion.

3. Consultative Dialogues with ODP:
In Mandera and Garissa, community feedback on exclusion from infrastructure discussions led to national-level actions. The ODP engaged the National Land Commission and Kenya National Highways Authority to expedite land compensation, with implementation expected by 15 December.

4. CISEC/Peace Dividend Projects:
CISEC and peace dividend projects have contributed to trust-building between communities and security forces. Through VCI and RRDO, communities and security actors have jointly identified trust barriers and projects to improve relationships. For example, on 19 October, VCI supported the establishment of a community asset in Baregothey, Wajir County, where a water pan was constructed to serve local animals, a school, the community, and a police station.

5. Data Sharing Framework:
In August, WFP developed a Data Sharing Framework to standardize data sharing and address concerns regarding security and sustainability within the project. This framework, designed to support the forthcoming digital data portal, was formally adopted in October after a stakeholder workshop where consensus was reached. The framework will guide data sharing and improve coordinated, data-driven decision-making throughout the project.

While the project has not yet fully demonstrated outcome-level results, it is making progress. The data collection and ongoing activities are setting the stage for tracking and measuring the changes in community dynamics and institutional responses in future reports.

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.

File attachment

Digital Peacebuilding Pre-Training Survey(1-19)-12_6_11.xlsx   📥

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:   *

Strengthened trust and cooperation between security agencies and communities to create a conducive and collaborative environment for human security, social cohesion and sustainable development.

Outcome 2:   *

Institutional including (donor) coordination capacities of county and national governments strengthened to contribute to a people-centred approach to promoting peace and sustainable development.

Outcome 3:   *

Outcome 4:   *

Outcome 5:   *

Outcome 6:   *

Outcome 7:   *

Outcome 8: *

Additional Outcomes *

If the project has more than 8 outcomes, please enumerate the remaining outcomes here

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: Strengthened trust and cooperation between security agencies and communities to create a conducive and collaborative environment for human security, social cohesion and sustainable development.

Outcome 1	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Current Indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
1.1	**Proportion of people indicating improved security and community relations**	**Females 17% Males = 18% Youth = 16% Adults = 19% PWDs=24% Somalis= 18% Non-Somalis = 20%** **Total population = 17%**	**5% improvement**	**N/A**	**Baseline assessment just concluded. Changes will be measured in our second and third perception surveys.**
1.2	**Proportion of people indicating reduction in human rights violations by security agencies disaggregated by gender, age, disability, clan, location, and county**	**Reduction in human rights violations by security agencies Females = 26% Males = 26% Youth = 26% Adults = 27% PWDs=26% Somalis= 26% Non-Somalis = 30% Total population = 26%**	**5-10% improvement**	**N/A**	**Baseline assessment just concluded. Changes will be measured in our second and third perception surveys.** **Human rights baseline assessment yet to commence.**
1.3	**Proportion of people indicating sustained engagements between clans to resolve emerging conflicts disaggregated by gender, age, disability, clan, location, and county**	**Females = 57% Males = 59% Youth = 57% Adults = 60% PWDs=60% Somalis= 58% Non-Somalis = 74% Total population = 58%**	**5% improvement**	**N/A**	**Baseline assessment just concluded. Changes will be measured in our second and third perception surveys.** **Human rights baseline assessment yet to commence.**

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

Enhanced civil-military coordination through training, dialogue and establishment of CIMIC structures, including women, youth and marginalised groups in the target counties, to foster dialogue and cooperation between communities and security agencies to address human security challenges.

Output 1.2

Inclusive assessment and analysis of security and human rights issues to inform project initiatives, risk mitigation and joint exploration of possible solutions to address identified issues

---

Output 1.3

Output 1.4

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: Enhanced civil-military coordination through training, dialogue and establishment of CIMIC structures, including women, youth and marginalised groups in the target counties, to foster dialogue and cooperation between communities and security agencies to address human security challenges.	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*

1.1.1	The number of CIMIC structures established and operationalized	0	3	3	3	CISEC structures established after trainings
1.1.2	Number of people trained on CISEC and human rights, disaggregated by gender, age, disability, clan, location, and county	0	70	152 (114 male; 28 female)	118	High interest at county level meant that larger numbers were included
1.1.3	Number of CISEC projects identified and implemented	0	3	1	1	The remaining projects will be implemented in the first half of 2025

» Output 1.2

Output 1.2: Inclusive assessment and analysis of security and human rights issues to inform project initiatives, risk mitigation and joint exploration of possible solutions to address identified issues	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
1.2.1	**Number of human rights risk assessments and analysis reports developed and disbursed for consumption by project partners/structures**	0	4	0	0	**Delays in disbursement of grant to KNCHR**

| 1.2.2 | Number of people trained on digital peacebuilding disaggregated by gender, age, disability, clan, location, and county | 0 | 45 | 25 (9 women and 16 men) | 25 (9 women and 16 men) | Trainings in Garissa and Mandera were postponed due to delays in funding |
| 1.2.3 | Percentage of participants who report increased capacity to use online tools for peacebuilding | 42% reported basic awareness of digital peacebuilding in Wajir | 100% | 0 | 0 | This will be measured at the end of the training block |

» Output 1.3

Output 1.3:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
1.3.1						
1.3.2						
1.3.3						

» Output 1.4

Output 1.4:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
1.4.1						
1.4.2						
1.4.3						

» Output 1.5

Output 1.5:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
1.5.1						
1.5.2						
1.5.3						

» Outcome 2: Institutional including (donor) coordination capacities of county and national governments strengthened to contribute to a people-centred approach to promoting peace and sustainable development.

Outcome 2	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Current Indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
2.1	Evidence of enhanced coordination capacities and active implementation of people-centered approaches by county and national governmental and non-governmental institutions to promote peace and sustainable development	Currently, there is a lack of effective coordination between development initiatives and communities in NE Kenya.	By the end of the project, peacebuilding and development initiatives in northeastern Kenya will demonstrate enhanced coordination and active implementation of people-centered approaches, with improved collaboration between county and national government agencies, NGOs, and local communities.	Baseline data collection has been completed, forming the foundation for future assessments. A second perception survey is expected to take place soon, which will help measure changes in attitudes, behaviors, and institutional dynamics.	
2.2	Proportion of population indicating improved coordination of development interventions disaggregated by gender, age, disability, clan, location, and county	Very Effective Females =37% Males = 40% Youth = 37% Adults = 40% PWD=34% Somalis= 38% Non-Somalis = 39% Total population = 38%	5-10% improvement	N/A	Baseline assessment just concluded. Changes will be measured in our second and third perception surveys.
2.3					

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

Improved access, by governments/donors, to knowledge and relevant perspectives to incorporate innovative integrated development that addresses the needs and priorities of the communities

Output 2.2

Functional cooperation mechanisms that link national, county and ward level to maximize synergies and enhance cooperation between the different levels

Output 2.3

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: Improved access, by governments/donors, to knowledge and relevant perspectives to incorporate innovative integrated development that addresses the needs and priorities of the communities	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*

| 2.1.1 | **Degree of improvement in inclusive data collection and management systems, focusing on Leave No One Behind (LNOB) groups, as evidenced by stakeholder feedback, system audits** | **Current data systems exhibit significant limitations, including limited availability of disaggregated data, fragmented and inaccessible data sources due to the absence of a central repository.** | **Data collection and management systems will be improved to ensure the availability of disaggregated data, with a central repository established for greater accessibility, particularly focusing on LNOB groups.** | **Data Sharing Framework has been initiated, and stakeholder consultations have informed the design of a more inclusive data system. A central digital data portal is in the process of being established to address fragmentation, and baseline data collection has been completed. Further stakeholder feedback and audits are expected to assess system effectiveness and inclusivity in the coming months.** | **Data Sharing Framework has been initiated, and stakeholder consultations have informed the design of a more inclusive data system. A central digital data portal is in the process of being established to address fragmentation, and baseline data collection has been completed. Further stakeholder feedback and audits are expected to assess system effectiveness and inclusivity in the coming months.** | .... |
| 2.1.2 | **Proportion of population indicating improved public participation and inclusion of community priority needs into the project implementation disaggregated by gender, age, disability, clan, location, and county** | **Ever participated Females = 45% Males = 52% Youth = 49% Adults = 48% PWDs=45% Somalis= 48% Non-Somalis = 65% Total population = 49%** | **5-10% improvement5** | **N/A** | **N/A** | **Baseline assessment just concluded. Changes will be measured in our second and third perception surveys.** |

2.1.3	2.1.4 Number of perception survey reports published and disseminated to the public, government and local partners	0	3	1	1	First perception is being finalised and will be disseminated shortly

» Output 2.2

Output 2.2: Functional cooperation mechanisms that link national, county and ward level to maximize synergies and enhance cooperation between the different levels	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
2.2.1	Level of efficiency of coordination mechanisms linking ward, subcounty, county and national levels across the peacebuilding and development spectrums	There are strong coordination mechanisms at county level, but the information is not feeding upwards to national level	Improved information sharing and coordination between county and national level		Efforts are underway to enhance coordination between the county and national levels. Consultations took place earlier this year and peace actors forums in the three counties are meeting regularly.	

| 2.2.2 | **Digital Data Portal is created and key stakeholders (including NEDI GoK and CSOs) actively using the digital data platform for accessing and analyzing disaggregated data related to the Humanitarian-Development-Peace (HDP) nexus in target counties.** | 0 | **1 - Data portal is created as acts as a central repository for accessing data related to the HDP and development initiatives in NE Kenya** | **A firm has been identified but a contract has not been issued due to resource constraints** | **A firm has been identified but a contract has not been issued due to resource constraints** | **A firm has been identified but a contract has not been issued due to resource constraints** |

| 2.2.3 | Level of engagement of the office of the DP in coordinating development activities in Northeastern Kenya | The ODP currently lacks the capacity, information, and established trust necessary for effective coordination with communities, county governments, and international development partners | ODP will enhance its capacity to coordinate development activities by establishing a trusted communication and coordination mechanism with county governments, communities, and international development partners. | Efforts have been made to engage with local and national stakeholders, including consultations with county governments and key partners, to build trust and foster collaboration. However, challenges remain in developing a fully operational coordination mechanism. The upcoming data from perception surveys and stakeholder feedback will provide further insights into the progress and areas for improvement. | Efforts have been made to engage with local and national stakeholders, including consultations with county governments and key partners, to build trust and foster collaboration. However, challenges remain in developing a fully operational coordination mechanism. The upcoming data from perception surveys and stakeholder feedback will provide further insights into the progress and areas for improvement. | |

» Output 2.3

Output 2.3:	Perform ance 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 reportin g period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress to date *State the current cummulative 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* ....
2.3.1	....	....	....	....	....	....
2.3.2	....	....	....	....	....	....
2.3.3	....	....	....	....	....	....

» Output 2.4

Output 2.4:	Perform ance 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 reportin g period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress to date *State the current cummulative 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* ....
2.4.1	....	....	....	....	....	....
2.4.2	....	....	....	....	....	....
2.4.3	....	....	....	....	....	....

» Output 2.5

Output 2.5:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
2.5.1						
2.5.2						
2.5.3						

» Outcome 3:

Outcome 3	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Current Indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
3.1					
3.2					
3.3					

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
....

Output 3.2
....

Output 3.3
....

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:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
3.1.1						
3.1.2						
3.1.3						

» Output 3.2

Output 3.2:	Performance Indicators *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 project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress to date *State the current cummulative 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* ....
3.2.1	....	....	....	....	....	....
3.2.2	....	....	....	....	....	....
3.2.3	....	....	....	....	....	....

» Output 3.3

Output 3.3:	Performance Indicators *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 project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress to date *State the current cummulative 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* ....
3.3.1	....	....	....	....	....	....
3.3.2	....	....	....	....	....	....
3.3.3	....	....	....	....	....	....

» Output 3.4

Output 3.4:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
3.4.1						
3.4.2						
3.4.3						

» Output 3.5

Output 3.5:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
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 Indicators *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 cummulative 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 *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 cummulative 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*
4.2.1						
4.2.2						
4.2.3						

» Output 4.3

Output 4.3:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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* ....
4.3.1	....	....	....	....	....	....
4.3.2	....	....	....	....	....	....
4.3.3	....	....	....	....	....	....

» Output 4.4

Output 4.4:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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* ....
4.4.1	....	....	....	....	....	....
4.4.2	....	....	....	....	....	....
4.4.3	....	....	....	....	....	....

» Output 4.5

Output 4.5:	Performance Indicators *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 cummulative 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*
4.5.1						
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 | Digital Peacebuilding trainings | January/February 2025 (depended on availability of funds) | Garissa, Mandera | Members who are actively involved in peacebuilding from Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), local peace committee structures and county and sub-county security committees. | Train and capacity build members involved in peacebuilding using open-source digital tools on: 1. Identifying Information Manipulation and Interference (IMI), such as mis/disinformation relating to peacebuilding on digital media and social media. 2. Opportunities in digital peacebuilding using social media and digital media. 3. Establishing sustainable digital peacebuilding approaches through creation of community of practice (COP) in digital peacebuilding in the three counties. |
| Event 2 | Development Partners Meeting | February 2025 | Nairobi | World Bank, IGAD, USAID, UN and other partners having programmes in Mandera, Garissa and Wajir | Information and experience sharing with the aim of strengthening the coordination of programmes in the Northeast region as well as exploring synergies |

Event 3	Peace dividends projects	January to March 2025	Garissa and Mandera	Communities	Following community consultations and feasibility assessments, peace dividend projects will be implemented in Mandera and Garissa.
Event 4	Launch of the First Perception survey	January 2025	Nairobi/virtual	County government, national government, UN agencies, donors, etc.	Once finalised, the first perception survey will be edited, formatted, and shared externally.

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 Organziations, Beneficiaries, etc.) of the project, and for each, please briefly describe:

i. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implemantation
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

| 1 | Ms Maryan Ahmed, Raia Development Initiative (RDI) | Before the digital peacebuilding training, Ms. Ahmed observed that Wajir's youth had limited avenues for engaging in peace advocacy, and online platforms were often underutilized or even misused, contributing to misinformation and conflict rather than constructive dialogue. This gap left young people without effective tools or guidance to counter online disinformation, which exacerbates local tensions and hinders peace efforts. In October, Ms. Ahmed completed the digital peacebuilding training in Wajir, which focused on how communities can leverage online platforms to promote peace. The training empowered her and equipped her with strategies to engage youth as advocates for peace. Through this initiative, Ms. Ahmed envisions transforming local youth into proactive peace ambassadors who can share constructive messages and address conflict issues online. By fostering a unified approach to digital peacebuilding, the training provides Wajir's youth with a platform for positive communication and conflict prevention, strengthening community ties and promoting stability. | "This digital peacebuilding training will help communities like ours to share information on online platforms like social media and people will share information, positive information. Also have a platform where they can resolve issue of conflicts in communities. Also help spread awareness and at the same time educate communities on the matter of peace. It will also empower the youth and when it comes to digital peacebuilding, the youth will become peace advocate and will also be able to spread positive information, message, resolve conflict issues. This will bring unity in the community, where the community will be more stronger, more united through this online platforms because it will create a place where people can communicate, share ideas, prevent conflicts before it happens". |

| 2 | Mohamed Adan, Director for Peace and Cohesion in Garissa County | Mr. Adan, a county-level official in Garissa, faced significant challenges before attending the five-day strategic CISEC training at the IPSTC headquarters in Nairobi from 29 July to 2 August. Garissa contends with ongoing threats like violent extremism, yet lacked structured coordination mechanisms to unify responses across local authorities, peace committees, and security agencies. Additionally, Mr. Adan had limited avenues for engaging with communities in Garissa and across border areas, making it difficult to address resource-based conflicts and share essential information for peacebuilding. The CISEC training had a transformative impact on Mr. Adan's work. Through the course, he gained tools to foster collaboration and establish effective communication channels with security agencies, strengthening local peace and security networks. He now leverages the Department of Peace and Cohesion at the county level as a conduit to disseminate information, reaching communities in Garissa and neighboring cross-border regions more effectively. Equipped with these skills, Mr. Adan is better positioned to address security challenges through a coordinated, community-centered approach | "This was a very nice course for us as a county. We have many issues at the county level, we have insecurity... the issue of the Garissa attack and what matters a lot is that we never had a coordination mechanism... what we lacked most was civilian and security coordination mechanism but now I am sure through this course... it will have a lot of impact" |

| 3 | Adan Ali Issack – Chair, Peace, Cohesion and Integration Committee, County Assembly of Wajir. | Before the PPID project's support, Hon. Adan Ali Issack, Chair of the Peace, Cohesion, and Integration Committee for the Wajir County Assembly, faced budgetary constraints that stalled the progress of the Wajir County Peacebuilding and Conflict Management Bill, 2023. Despite his efforts in drafting the Bill, limited funds prevented it from moving beyond the draft stage and hindered necessary public consultations. With the PPID project's financial facilitation, Hon. Issack was able to organize public participation sessions on the Bill. This support enabled community members to engage in the peacebuilding legislation process, providing critical input to finalize and move the Bill forward. Hon. Issack noted that the project's support came at a crucial time, allowing the Bill to progress and strengthening Wajir's approach to peace and conflict management. | 'I sincerely appreciate UNDP for supporting us in the finalization of the Wajir County Peacebuilding and Conflict Management Bill, 2023 which has been in draft form for quite some time due to financial challenges. I also thank UNDP for enabling us to capture the views of the public regarding the Bill, this will enable us to have a community-centered law that responds to the needs of our people." |

| 4 | Umulkaltuma Abdisalan – Vice Chair, Peace, Cohesion and Integration Committee, County Assembly of Wajir. | Before the public participation sessions supported by the PPID project, Hon. Umulkaltuma Abdisala, Vice Chair of the Peace, Cohesion, and Integration Committee in the Wajir County Assembly, felt that the voices of women, youth, and people with disabilities were often marginalized in peacebuilding discussions. As a woman leader, she recognized the need for these groups to have a more prominent role in shaping policies that affect their lives. The project's facilitation of the public participation sessions was transformational for Hon. Umulkaltuma. It provided a platform for community members, including women, youth, and people with disabilities, to express their perspectives on peacebuilding. She was particularly pleased with how the sessions highlighted the significant contributions these groups can make to peace processes, reinforcing their crucial role in the development of Wajir's peacebuilding strategies. | 'As a woman leader, I am happy that this Bill, once signed into law, will give women, youth and people with disabilities special membership position in peace committees, especially at community level. This contrasts with traditional practices where community elders used to dictate who gets involved in peace matters This was made possible by the engagements we have had with our stakeholders." |

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.

In addition to the stakeholder-specific impacts, the PPID project has contributed to significant human impact through its support for the community consultation process that led to the finalization of the Wajir County Peacebuilding and Conflict Management Bill, which is now an Act. The project played an important role in facilitating these consultations, which had previously stalled the Bill's progress.

Before the Bill was drafted, Wajir County lacked a formal framework for addressing conflict and managing peace. This absence of a legal structure meant that peace efforts were often uncoordinated and ineffective, with marginalized groups such as women, youth, and people with disabilities not having a voice in decisions that affected them.

The PPID project supported the process of engaging various community stakeholders in consultations, ensuring that all voices were heard, especially those of the marginalized groups. These consultations helped to shape the Bill to reflect the community's needs and priorities. It also highlighted the important roles that women, youth, and people with disabilities play in peacebuilding, making sure these groups were included in the Bill's provisions and in the broader peace strategy.

Thanks to these consultations, the Bill was finalized and passed into law as the Wajir County Peacebuilding and Conflict Management Act, 2023. The Act provides a much-needed legal framework for peacebuilding in Wajir, establishing structures for better coordination between security agencies, government departments, and local communities. It creates a foundation for more effective responses to conflicts and tensions within the county.

The next step is to operationalize the Act, which remains the key challenge. While the community consultation process was crucial in helping the Bill move forward, there is still work to be done to put the Act into practice. This will involve setting up the peace structures outlined in the law, building the capacity of local peace committees, and ensuring that the necessary institutional frameworks are in place.

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

Ms Maryan Ahmed-14_31_55.JPG

File 2
OPTIONAL

Adan Ali Issack leading Tarbj consultation-min-14_39_2.jpg

File 3
OPTIONAL

Umulkaltuma Abdisalan-14_40_9.jpg

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

Link 1
OPTIONAL
https://sway.cloud.microsoft/flyW1YUzcfMxcnWD?ref=Link

Link 2
OPTIONAL

Link 3
OPTIONAL

Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative.

How we worked: *
Please select up to 3.

- [ ] Enhanced digitization
- [x] Innovative ways of working
- [ ] Mobilized additional resources
- [x] Improved or initiated policy frameworks
- [x] 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 one of the selected options
Please limit your response to 3000 characters.
Innovative Ways of Working:
The project introduced digital peacebuilding training, empowering peace actors to leverage social media and other digital tools for early conflict warnings and responses. This innovative approach allows peacebuilders to reach broader audiences, identify digital harms such as disinformation, and engage in virtual mediation. By using online platforms for peace messaging and countering polarizing narratives, we're integrating technology into peacebuilding efforts, enhancing the project's reach and adaptability.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Improved or Initiated Policy Frameworks:
Our collaboration with the Wajir County Assembly supported the public participation process of the Wajir Peace Bill, demonstrating a commitment to inclusive policymaking. This process has facilitated community engagement in peace legislation, enhancing transparency and responsiveness. Such efforts foster a foundation for sustainable peace and help embed community voices within county-level policy.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Strengthened Capacities:
Through CISEC training, we bolstered the capacities of county governments and local communities to work collaboratively on peace and security. Additionally, digital peacebuilding training equipped peace actors with skills to navigate digital platforms for effective peacebuilding, from early warning systems to digital conflict resolution. These efforts are creating a network of well-prepared peace advocates who can address emerging peace and security challenges, both online and offline.

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

- [ ] Strengthened partnerships with IFIs
- [x] Strengthened partnerships within UN Agencies
- [x] Partnered with local civil society organizations
- [ ] Partnered with local academia
- [x] Partnered with sub-national entities
- [ ] Partnered with national entities
- [ ] Partnered with local volunteers

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Our project benefits from collaboration with three RUNOs, which contribute their expertise based on their respective mandate.
Through the issuance of Low-Value Grants (LVGs), we have engaged grassroots CSOs to enhance community feedback mechanisms. This partnership includes six CSOs, each working to strengthen local peace and security initiatives by gathering community insights and fostering inclusive dialogues. Their involvement has been vital for community-led peace efforts and for building trust, providing invaluable local context and direct engagement with diverse community members.
County governments in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera are integral to the project's success. We work closely with county commissioners, governors, and local councils to tailor peace and security initiatives to each county's unique context. Through training and regular consultations, these partnerships enhance sub-national government capacities in civil security coordination, fostering stronger connections between communities and security actors at the local level.

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.

Since early 2024, several key monitoring activities have been undertaken to ensure effective tracking and evaluation of project. These activities focused on refining indicators, building partner capacity, and maintaining close oversight.

Development of M&E Plan and Indicator Refinement
Upon her commencement on 15 January, the Knowledge Management and Communications Officer (KMCO) conducted an initial review of the project's results framework and developed a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan. This review revealed that several indicators needed refinement to fully meet SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound) criteria.

Contracting of Rufmo Consulting On 30 May, Rufmo Consulting was engaged to conduct both the evaluability assessment and three perception surveys to gather perspectives from 'leave no one behind' (LNOB) groups. After submitting an inception report in June, Rufmo trained enumerators and reviewed survey tools in July, initiating data collection in August. The first draft report of the perception survey was submitted on 16 October, with feedback provided on 22 October; the final report is expected by 5 November.

Capacity-Building Workshop with UNDP Grant Recipients
In August, a capacity-building workshop was held with UNDP low-value grant recipients, focusing on monitoring, reporting, finance compliance, and communications. This workshop aimed to equip partners with tools and knowledge to maintain high standards in project delivery and accountability.

Field Oversight and Engagement by RUNOs
RUNOs have actively participated in partner activities to provide oversight and support on the ground. The OHCHR focal point and county project officers attended CISEC trainings, ensuring alignment and guidance for project partners. Additionally, WFP conducted field missions to monitor progress with its two partners, enabling the team to address any emerging challenges in real-time.

Regular Monitoring and Reporting Mechanisms
A structured meeting schedule has been established to consistently track project progress. Weekly Project Management Unit (PMU) meetings are held every Monday morning, supplemented by bi-weekly technical meetings with the three RUNOs and PMU members. Monthly project update reports, based on team inputs, are shared with all stakeholders. Monthly county-level meetings with project partners further enhance information sharing and synergy identification. A WhatsApp group, created in August, facilitates real-time communication among partners. Quarterly Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings allow senior leadership to address risks and approve necessary adjustments.

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.

Yes, baseline indicators have been established as of October. Rufmo Consulting conducted an evaluability assessment and a comprehensive perception survey to collect data specific to the project's outcomes. The perception survey, conducted with a representative sample from the targeted communities, gathered baseline data on key indicators including community trust in local governance, effectiveness of conflict resolution mechanisms, and perceived levels of community safety and inclusion. In addition, the survey assessed attitudes towards peacebuilding and community engagement in conflict prevention. This data forms the foundation for measuring progress toward outcome-level peacebuilding goals, providing a clear starting point against which future shifts in community perceptions, behaviour changes, and institutional impact can be tracked. The baseline data will be re-evaluated in subsequent surveys to measure changes over time and refine our approach to achieving sustainable, community-driven peacebuilding outcomes.

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 following sources of evidence have been used to report on project indicators, and are available upon request: • Baseline Assessment Report: Conducted by Rufmo Consulting, this report established the starting conditions for key indicators, focusing on community attitudes towards peacebuilding, social cohesion, and trust in institutions. It serves as the foundation for future comparisons to track progress. • First Perception Survey: This survey, part of the baseline assessment, provided data on community views regarding safety, governance, and peace efforts. It offers valuable insights into public trust and perceptions of local conflict dynamics, forming a baseline for future surveys. • Forthcoming Human Rights Baseline Assessment: This assessment, underway, focuses on the initial human rights conditions in the project areas, examining rights violations, vulnerabilities, and access to justice. It will complement peacebuilding efforts and help track improvements in human rights protection. • Digital Peacebuilding Training Survey: A pre-training survey was conducted before training in Wajir. It assessed participants' knowledge of digital peacebuilding before the course. • IPSTC CISEC Training Surveys: Surveys taken after CISEC training sessions measured participants' satisfaction and their ability to apply knowledge gained, particularly in civilian-security coordination. These surveys provide feedback on the effectiveness of the training.

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.

To track outcome-level impacts, the project has initiated perception surveys aimed at understanding community views on peace, security, and development. These surveys, managed by Rufmo Consulting, focus on capturing insights from women, youth, and persons with disabilities across the three counties, with the first round gathering data from 2,149 respondents. This data will provide a foundation for assessing shifts in attitudes, behaviours, and institutional trust, guiding adjustments in project strategies and interventions to better address community needs.

Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? *

(○) Yes

(●) No

Please provide a brief description *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

» 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

80000

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.

Contact information	Name	Organization	Job title	Email
Please mention the focal person responsible for sharing the final evaluation report with the PBF:	**Aideen Conway**	**UNDP**	**Knowledge Management and Comms Officer**	**aideen.conway@undp.org**

» Catalytic Effect

Catalytic Effect (financial): Has the project mobilized additional non-PBF financial resources to date?   *

- ● Yes
- ○ No

How many funders has the project received additional non-PBF funding from?   *

1

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 *

Norway

Amount in USD *

1598578

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.

There is interest from stakeholders in the Northeastern region to follow up on and strengthen CISEC mechanisms after they were established by IPSTC. This month, the Garissa County Assembly, led by Speaker Hon. Abdi Idle, paid a courtesy call to IPSTC to discuss capacity-strengthening opportunities in peace and security and the formalization of an MoU developed between the two institutions.

Garissa County Commissioner has formally written to IPSTC stating that his office will raise funds so that the national government team in Garissa can have their capacity build on issues of civilian security coordination.

Director, Peace and Cohesion of Wajir county also wrote to IPSTC requesting for collaboration to capacity build county team on matters peace and cohesion.

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.

Throughout implementation, efforts have been made to ensure the long-term sustainability of peacebuilding gains. The project emphasizes capacity building, locally owned solutions, and fostering key partnerships to create lasting impacts that extend beyond its duration.

Strengthening institutional capacity of the Office of the Deputy President (ODP)
The project is being carried out in close collaboration with the ODP, with a specific focus on strengthening their capacity to sustain peacebuilding efforts independently. As part of this commitment, a digital data portal will be developed to support data-driven peacebuilding initiatives. This platform, which will ultimately be owned by the ODP, is designed to centralize, analyze, and share valuable insights related to peace and security across relevant stakeholders. The project team has incorporated capacity-building elements into the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the firm contracted to develop this portal, ensuring the ODP can manage and fully own the platform by the project's conclusion. This portal will provide a foundation for the ODP to continue data-informed decision-making and coordinate peace initiatives effectively.

Civil Security Cooperation (CISEC) training with Kenya Defence Forces (KDF)
The project's training initiatives included training courses on Human Rights and Civil Security Cooperation (CISEC), which has now concluded. These training courses were very well received, with participants expressing positive feedback on their relevance and effectiveness. Notably, this month, the Garissa County Assembly paid a courtesy call to the International Peace Support Training Centre (IPSTC) to discuss opportunities for capacity strengthening in peace and security and the formalization of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the two institutions. This engagement was initially sparked during the CISEC training held in Garissa, highlighting the impact of the training on fostering collaboration and institutional partnerships.

Through these efforts—building the ODP's digital capacity, advocating for systemic changes within the KDF, and fostering local networks—the project is setting a strong foundation for peacebuilding gains.

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.

One significant issue affecting the implementation of the project has been delays in disbursement of the second tranche. This delay has necessitated the postponement of several key activities, which in turn has implications for our reputation and credibility within the counties where we operate.

The pause in activities, especially the disbursement of grants and other essential initiatives, has led to frustration among stakeholders and local partners who are eagerly awaiting support. This situation undermines trust and hampers our ability to foster collaborative relationships, which are vital for the project's success. Given the importance of sequencing in this project, such delays can have wider repercussions, including disrupted timelines and diminished impact.

The need for a well-coordinated sequence of activities is critical for achieving the desired outcomes of the project. Interruptions in funding can jeopardize this carefully planned framework, leading to inefficiencies and potential overlaps in future initiatives. If these funding delays persist, we may have to consider a no-cost extension to realign our activities and project timelines. However, this extension comes with its own set of challenges; by that stage, funds allocated for salaries might be exhausted, which could further complicate project management and staff retention.

The ongoing uncertainty regarding funding and activity timelines can impact the motivation and engagement of project staff and partners. Continuous delays can lead to a decline in morale and may result in talent loss if staff seek more stable opportunities elsewhere. To address these capacity needs and mitigate the effects of funding delays, it is essential to maintain open lines of communication with stakeholders, provide regular updates on the funding situation, and engage them in discussions about potential solutions.

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** | **Baseline assessment** | On 30 May, the project contracted Rufmo Consulting to conduct a baseline assessment and three perception surveys among 'Leave No One Behind' (LNOB) groups. In October, the firm shared a reviewed results matrix with baseline data to guide the monitoring and evaluation. | The baseline results show that the project is not starting from ground zero already there is work happening on the ground that just needs to be enhanced. Communities are engaged in peace and development projects both by government and non-government and community peace structures are in existence though not very effective. The project findings from the baseline indicate little to no disparities among the different population groups. This is a strength for the LNOB objective of the project, as it can ride on existing inclusion mechanisms to reduce vulnerability of the often-forgotten groups. |

| Event 2 | First perception survey | Rufmo Consulting was contracted to conduct a baseline assessment and three perception surveys. The surveys measure and understand the views of women, youth, and persons with disabilities (PWDs) on peace, security, and development. | The first perception survey involved 2,149 respondents, providing a representative sample from diverse demographic groups. The survey revealed that while most respondents (78%) felt secure in their areas, there were notable disparities: 91% in Wajir and 87% in Garissa reported feeling secure, compared to only 57% in Mandera. PWDs, women, and youth, particularly in Mandera, faced heightened insecurity. Nearly 41% of respondents experienced conflict in the past year, driven by clan disputes, political manipulation, and resource competition, with additional threats from groups like Al-Shabaab in Mandera. The survey also identified challenges in peacebuilding coordination, noting that peace departments in counties rely heavily on resources from civil society organizations (CSOs), straining CSOs' capacity to sustain peace efforts. Inclusion remains limited, with youth, women, and PWDs often excluded from peace processes. Traditional mechanisms, like Maslaha, effectively mediate disputes but lack inclusivity. Strengthening formal peace initiatives, increasing government funding, and enhancing coordination between CSOs and government agencies were highlighted as critical steps toward sustainable, inclusive peacebuilding. |

Event 3	Human rights baseline assessment	KNCHR was contracted to a human rights baseline assessment and regular human rights monitoring and analysis in tour three project counties with the aim of feeding into ongoing human rights risk assessments, due diligence and identification of mitigation measures. Due to delays in issuing of the grant, this has not yet commenced. As of early November, the commission is in the process of hiring a data analyst and two human rights defenders in each of the three counties. It is expected that the baseline will be conducted before the end of the year.	N/A
Event 4			
Event 5			
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.
- In compliance with our reporting requirements, **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.