

PBF November 2024 Project Progress Report



**PEACEBUILDING
FUND** 

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 *

2024-11-14

2024-11-14

Name and Title of Person submitting the report *

Jelena Miljanic, Joint Programme Coordinator

E-mail of Person submitting the report *

jelena.miljanic@undp.org

Name and Title of Person who approved the report *

Ekaterina Paniklova, UNDP RR, Michele Servadei, UNICEF Representative, Siniša Šešum, Head of UNESCO Antenna in Sarajevo

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

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

Country of project implementation *

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo (As per UNSCR 1244) |
| <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Moldova | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Montenegro |
| <input type="radio"/> North Macedonia | <input type="radio"/> Serbia | <input type="radio"/> Tajikistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan | <input type="radio"/> Other, Specify | |

Other, please specify *

Project Title *

- ☒ 00140545: Enhancing citizens' trust in institutions and building resilient communities.
- ☐ 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

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

2024-01-08

2024-01-08

Project End Date *

2026-01-07

2026-01-07

Has this project received an extension? *

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

Will this project be requesting an extension? *

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

Is the current project end date within 6 months? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, please select which *

- ☐ National Trust Fund
- ☐ Regional Trust Fund

Recipients

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

- ☒ UN entity
- ☐ Non-UN Entity

Please select the convening agency recipient *

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

Other, Please specify *

Are there other recipients for this project? *

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

Please select other UN recipients *

Select all that apply

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

Other, Please specify *

.....

Please select other non-UN recipients

*

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

Other, Please specify

*

Implementing Partners

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

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 *

Centar za prava djeteta/Center for Child Rights

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

35000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

The Centre for Child Rights supports the implementation of activities 1.2.3 (violence prevention programmes) and 2.1.2 (capacitating children and adolescents).

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 *

Juventas

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

20000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Juventas supports the implementation of activity 1.1.2. (capacitating children and adolescents for youth participation and local dialogues)

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 *

Parents

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

7000

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

NGO Parents provided mapping services for multiple activities (especially 1.1.3) and also supports NGO Juventas in activity 1.1.2.

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

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Bureau for Education

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

8500

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Bureau for Education will organize socio emotional skills delivery and teacher training as part of activity 1.1.3.

Financial Reporting

» Delivery by Recipient

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

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

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

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

Recipients	Total Project Budget (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars</i>	Transfers to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars</i>	Expenditure to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars</i>	Implementation rate as a percentage of total budget (calculated automatically)
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme	1157875	810512.37	282943	24.44%
				%
UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund	1025595	717916.50	219010	21.35%

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizatio n <div></div>	<div>378459</div>	<div>264921.30</div>	<div>32867</div>	<div>8.68%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>
<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div>%</div>

	*	*	*	%
TOTAL	2561929	1793350.17	534820	20.88%

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **20.88%**. 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? *

41.96

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 \$ 1074985.41**. 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 contributing to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US \$ 224410.47**. Is this correct? *

☐ Correct ☒ Incorrect

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

197719

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

Final Financial Report_November 2024-13_44_7.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 did not meet over the past six months – its first meeting was held on April 29, 2024.

As defined in the project document, and the JSC ToR adopted at the first JSC meeting, the Steering Committee is co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator and representative of the Prime Minister's Office of the Government of Montenegro. In addition to the co-chairs, members include the Representatives of the participating UN Agencies in Montenegro - UNDP, UNESCO, and UNICEF.

The first JSC meeting, held on April 29th, 2024, was an opportunity to adopt the JSC ToR, the project workplan, and the proposal of the project locations – 5 local municipalities. The JSC members underscored the project's significance for the country, highlighting the importance of its key components– dialogue, civic engagement, collective action, countering divisive narratives, and enabling trust, as well as the importance of working at the local level. They also highlighted the commitment of Montenegro and UN to the common goals and the Agenda 2030, which go hand in hand with the acceleration of the European integration process. In that context, sustainable development is one of the government's top priorities, with focus on strengthening the resilience of the society and transparent institutions committed to citizens.

Keeping in mind that the Steering Committee meets at least once a year (as per the Project Document) with a mandate to provide strategic direction, oversight, and guidance, the next meeting is planned for February 2025. At this time, the 2025 annual work plan, implementation progress to date, and baseline report will be available for the Steering Committee's review.

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

The Prime Minister's Cabinet is the key focal institution for the project. The Cabinet was highly responsive and committed to the project, including through the main inception milestone – Joint Steering Committee establishment and its first meeting. On behalf of the Government of Montenegro, the Prime Minister's Office has reiterated its unwavering support for the project, emphasizing Government's commitment to the Agenda 2030 and European integration. In this context, sustainable development remains one of the government's top priorities, with a focus on strengthening societal resilience and ensuring transparent institutions dedicated to citizens. The other key institutional partners were introduced to the project and preparatory activities are carried out with institutions such as the Council on the Rights of the Child, Parliament, including Women's Club, Protector of human rights and freedoms of Montenegro, Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation, and the Bureau for Education, Ministry of Culture and Media and its Directorate for Media, Ministry of Justice and Centre for Mediation all of which supported the project and are partnering in the implementation of specific activities. Five municipalities (Bar, Bijelo Polje, Pljevlja, Podgorica and Ulcinj) were selected to participate in program activities as target communities, covering all 3 regions of the country and more than half total population. All municipalities expressed great interest to participate in the programme and high levels of commitment for partnership towards the project goals and enhancing social cohesion. They have welcomed the unique nature of the programme that enables participatory design and co-design of specific activities/interventions based their unique needs. The local self-governments have already established a strong local infrastructure – they have formed diverse teams for the project implementation. The project thus created a foundation for effective collaboration and coordination at the local level.

PART I: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS

NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

- Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general /common language.
- Report on what has been achieved in the reporting period, not what the project aims to do.
- Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.
- Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.

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

Contracting of partners *

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

Staff Recruitment *

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

Collection of baselines *

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

Identification of beneficiaries *

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

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The project staff in all three agencies has been engaged. UNDP successfully recruited the Programme Manager, Communication and Outreach Associate and Project Associate. As for the UNESCO team, in addition to the Programme Specialist for Culture and Education and the M&E Officer who oversee the project, the recruitment of the Project officer has been completed. Alongside the existing UNESCO operational team, a Youth Empowerment Associate Officer has been appointed to further support the project's implementation. UNICEF existing staff has been engaged in the project implementation. When it comes to the Joint staff, Joint Project Coordinator and Joint M&E Officer have been recruited.

The Joint Project Team (JPT) has been meeting regularly, including meetings with the Heads of Agencies and the Resident Coordinator. The Joint Project Team membership and working protocols have been defined and adopted by implementing agencies. Besides programme focal points, the JPT includes M&E and communications specialists and focal points. Project work plan has been designed through the thorough project review and sequencing of all project activities, ensuring planned synergies and identifying synergetic effects. The JPT has also drafted M&E plan as well as Communications Strategy, including project info sheet, branding and visual identity.

Major partners, vendors and experts for most of the activities have been either contracted or open calls have been published with partners to be contracted by the end of the year.

The JPT has also selected project locations - 5 municipalities that will be project community-beneficiaries based on the criteria outlined in the project document. Those are Podgorica, Bar, Bijelo Polje, Pljevlja and Ulcinj, covering all 3 regions of the country and more than half total population. JPT has held meetings with all municipalities, and they have all welcomed the project and expressed high levels of commitment for partnership towards the project goals and enhancing social cohesion. The local self-governments have already established a strong local infrastructure – they have formed diverse teams for the project implementation. The project thus created a foundation for effective collaboration and coordination at the local level. This setup has already proven to be efficient and essential in facilitating smooth implementation and ensuring the local ownership and full participation of local communities.

In order to ensure quality of monitoring of the project progress towards the set Outcomes, the baseline survey has been designed and launched. The survey has been done through the baseline questionnaire with the project participants as well as through the KAP Survey on general population, which will serve as the control group and overall measuring of the project indicators. The baseline survey among project participants has been launched and will be implemented in succession, following the timeline of beneficiaries' engagement. KAP Survey has been launched and data should be available in November.

Describe overall progress under each Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration). Do not list individual activities. If the project is starting to make/has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context.

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If no, please provide an explanation

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Project progress summary

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

To improve capacities of children, adolescents, young people and women for meaningful civic engagement and inclusive dialogue (Output 1.1), some of the groups have been specifically empowered. UNDP has engaged 60 #NextGen, progressive and empathetic leaders for common good from all 5 municipalities. Their capacities for meaningful contribution to dialogues as well as for authentic leadership for common good, social cohesion, gender equality and addressing hate speech are being raised. UNICEF has built capacities of 220 children and adolescents for civic participation and social cohesion, and empowered them to participate in the local dialogues and contribute to the social cohesion pledges. UNICEF has also ensured that 5,000 parents provide their views of the education system, peer violence, social cohesion, conflict prevention and resolution, as an input to design the activities that will be deployed in schools from November 2024. To enhance the skills, capacities and resilience of children, adolescents, parents/caregivers, and teachers through civic education programmes, UNICEF has provided support and training on peaceful conflict resolution and violence prevention for 58 children and 51 parents who required support with conflict issues in school and community.

UNESCO has launched a capacity development program to enhance the quality of education and strengthen teachers' pedagogical skills in addressing critical media and information literacy challenges such as fact-checking, artificial intelligence manipulation, and combating stereotypes, prejudices, and hate speech. By fostering media and information literacy, the program promotes respect for human rights and emphasizes evidence-based decision-making and problem-solving in diverse settings. Tailored capacity-building initiatives for diverse groups of teachers across 5 project locations will facilitate the achievement of these objectives.

The project has been successfully engaging local communities in dialogue for the common good (Outcome 1) through the launch of the robust local dialogues' platforms by UNDP. To ensure local ownership and sustainability, UNDP has established local resource groups in all 5 municipalities, which serve as the local advisors, partners, sounding boards and sustainability champions for the project outcomes and methodologies. The groups will also act as the monitoring mechanism for the implementation and sustainability of the local community vision of common good resulting from dialogue platforms. Local dialogues platforms have been successfully launched and implemented in Bar and Bijelo Polje, where 169 people have collaboratively identified issues and designed solutions for the common good and social cohesion in their towns. The recommendations stemming from the Dialogues will be the core of the Social Cohesion Pledges and sets of policy measures that are to be adopted by the local governments and state institutions, thus contributing to creation of inclusive, gender responsive, rights based, people and child responsive social cohesion policies (Outcome 2).

The dialogues' participants reflected the diverse demographics of local communities, including women and men, people living in rural areas, children and adolescents, people with disability, decision-makers, thus providing an inclusive opportunity for meaningful participation and building the sense of being heard and valued. To ensure the design and implementation of the social cohesion Pledges and related policies, local governments representatives were actively engaged in local dialogues, exemplifying accountability, collaboration and commitment to common good and social cohesion. The municipality of Bar has already committed to integrate several proposals from the local dialogue into the municipal plan and budget for the 2025.

The power of direct involvement and co-creation between citizens and institutions has proved to be an excellent model resulting not only in people centred solutions, but also high level of responsiveness of local authorities, based on their own commitment but also compelling, human, real-time and real-life feedback and dialogue with citizens. The dialogues methodology has been meticulously designed to not just serve to the project purpose, but in a long-term, to enable dialogue between people and between people and institutions and provide people-centred solutions and policies in any given area or topic. The joint nature of the programme has reflected in ensuring children and adolescents participation by UNICEF as well as UNESCO taking part in the final panel discussion on the dialogues recommendations.

To ensure that national and local institutions respond to the citizens recommendations and adopt social cohesion policies (Outcome 2), UNDP and UNICEF have ensured partnerships and commitment of the main institutional stakeholders that will play key role in ensuring the feedback loop and accountability of institutions for ensuring policy and programmatic response to the citizens recommendations voiced through dialogue platforms (Output 2.1). These partnerships include local self-governments and local parliaments, the National Council for Sustainable Development, Prime Minister's Office, Ministries, and Women's club of the national Parliament. With the aim to strengthen institutional capacity and mechanisms for the monitoring of hate speech, violence and other social

conesio issues, partnership with the protector of human rights has been established by UNICEF, supported by the Human Rights Adviser, and UNDP. UNDP has also partnered with Ministry of Human and Minority Rights to build institutional capacities to ensure women's participation and counter hate speech, violence, sexism, misogyny and backlash related to gender equality. UNESCO, in partnership with the Ministry of Culture and Media, initiated the establishment of a mechanism for close coordination aimed at combating hate speech, online harassment, and disinformation, aligned with Montenegro's Strategy for Media (Output 2.2.).

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

Local Civic Dialogues involved diverse groups including children and young girls and boys. Approximately 24% of all participants were children. To ensure the meaningful participation of children and the respectful discussion, they were capacitated through the empowerment activities before the dialogue, while experienced facilitators guided conversations to ensure children and adolescents feel and are included at equal basis with adults. Local Dialogues used interactive methods like visual aids and art to help children and adolescents to express their views comfortably. Also, breakout groups were set up with mixed-age group with facilitators ensuring their voices are heard, while providing them with the opportunity to meaningfully engaged in discussions alongside the adults.

The high percentage of women (67,5 %) participating in local dialogues on social cohesion reflects a positive step towards gender equality, as it ensures that women's voices and perspectives are actively included in shaping community dynamics and addressing local challenges. Women's participation in these dialogues brought critical insights on issues related to social cohesion, ensuring that the needs and concerns of women, alongside those of other community members, are represented and addressed. The specific focus has been on engaging the groups that are facing intersectional vulnerability such as women belonging to the Roma population. To do so, dialogues were designed to accommodate different preferences in the ways of expressing opinions: in small groups, individually, in the plenum.

While designing capacity building activities, special care has been taken to leave no one behind and to include vulnerable groups including children, adolescents and youth, people with disabilities, people living in rural areas, Roma, LGBTIQ+.

The Project has put a special emphasis on gender and age analysis of incoming baseline data. The KAP survey has a specific section on Gender Equality, which will ensure valuable insights to be further integrated in the project activities.

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

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

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

PART II: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

How many OUTCOMES does this project have *

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

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

Outcome 1: *

Diverse social groups in targeted communities are empowered and actively engage in dialogue to contribute to building a shared vision of the common good, public trust, respect for diversity and resilience to divisive narratives and violence.

Outcome 2: *

Based on participatory dialogue, national and local institutions initiate adoption of inclusive, gender-responsive, rights-based, people- and child-centred policies and strengthen oversight to enable consensus on a shared vision of the common good and enhancement of trust.

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: Diverse social groups in targeted communities are empowered and actively engage in dialogue to contribute to building a shared vision of the common good, public trust, respect for diversity and resilience to divisive narratives and violence.

Outcome 1	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Current Indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
1.1	The level of trust in meaningfulness of participation in dialogue platforms disaggregated by sex and age	Mean value – 3.11 (1-feeling no trust in meaningfulness at all, 4 - feeling an absolute trust in meaningfulness of participation) Girls - 3.05 Women - 3.20 Boys - 3.17 Men - 2.99 * Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement.	10 pp improvement	n/a	Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues held. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement. In-depth data analysis will be done when the collection is finalised, where the % of respondents feeling different levels of trust will be reported and tracked over time (at the endline).

1.2	The percentage of people feeling Engaged/ Valued/ Heard	Mean value – 2.37 (1-feeling not heard/engaged/valued at all; 4 - feeling always engaged/valued/heard) Girls - 2.39 Women -2.41 Boys - 2.22 Men - 2.37 * Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement.	10 pp improvement	n/a	Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues held. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement. In-depth data analysis will be done when the collection is finalised.
1.3	The level of interpersonal trust and solidarity in the society	Mean value – 2.61 (1 – no trust and solidarity at all; 4 – absolute trust and solidarity) Girls - 2.65 Women - 2.61 Boys - 2.70 Men - 2.55 * Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement.	10 pp improvement	n/a	Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues held. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement. In-depth data analysis will be done when the collection is finalised.

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

<div>Output 1.1</div> <div>Improved capacities of diverse groups with a focus on children, adolescents, young people and women for meaningful civic engagement and inclusive dialogue, upholding and advancing human rights and countering violence and harmful narratives.</div>
<div>Output 1.2</div> <div>Targeted groups and communities participate in creating a shared vision for the common good through local and national dialogue platforms</div>
<div>Output 1.3</div>
<div>Output 1.4</div>
<div>Output 1.5</div>
<div>Other Outputs</div> <div>If Outcome 1 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here</div>

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: Improved capacities of diverse groups with a focus on children, adolescents, young people and women for meaningful civic engagement and inclusive dialogue, upholding and advancing human rights and countering violence and harmful narratives.	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>

1.1.1	The number of participants with capacities for meaningful civic engagement, advancing and safeguarding human rights and gender equality, disaggregated by age and sex	0	50 adult members of the general population and 500 young people and adolescents, with at least 50% female participants	60 (80% being women) 220 adolescents (54% girls)	60 (80% being women) 220 adolescents (54% girls)	
1.1.2	Number of actors capable of delivering socio-emotional skills programmes and Parenting for lifelong health program, disaggregated by sex	0	20 new facilitators 125 teachers, with at least 50% female actors	0	0	Preparatory activities for the impl. are underway, and the indicator will be achieved in 2025.
1.1.3	Number of actors trained through Socio-emotional skills and Parenting for lifelong health program, disaggregated by sex	0	300 parents and 300 adolescents, with at least 50% female actors	58 children (43% girls) 51 parents	58 children (43% girls) 51 parents	

» Output 1.2

Output 1.2: Targeted groups and communities participate in creating a shared vision for the common good through local and national dialogue platforms	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1.2.1	Number of Local social cohesion pledges/plans budgeted and funding sources identified and proposals for scale up developed	0	5	0	0	As per the programme logics and sequencing dynamics, the indicator will be achieved in 2025.

1.2.2	The number of people actively involved in dialogue and contributing to promoting civic space and dialogue, addressing hate speech, violence and divisive narratives, aggregated by age and sex	0	<p>- 300 people with at least 50% female participants (UNDP dialogues)</p> <p>- 200 academia representatives and young people actively engaged in academia-facilitated thematic dialogues, with at least 50% female participants (UNESCO Dialogues)</p> <p>At least 50 decisionmakers, CSO representatives, citizens etc participating in National Dialogues</p> <p>- 5,000 children, adolescents and young people empowered through UPSHIFT and the Young Reporters platform in five communities, at least 50% of whom are girls (UNICEF UPSHIFT)</p>	-169 people, 67,5% female participants (UNDP local dialogues)	-169 people, 67,5% female participants (UNDP local dialogues)	
-------	--	---	--	---	---	--

1.2.3	The number of community projects and pilot initiatives which contribute to the implementation of local social cohesion action plans/recommendations from dialogues supported by the SCIL	0	10, of which at least a third support initiatives with a gender dimension	0	0	As per the programme logics and sequencing dynamics, the indicator will be achieved in 2025.
-------	--	---	---	---	---	--

» Output 1.3

Output 1.3:	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1.3.1						
1.3.2						
1.3.3						

» Output 1.4

Output 1.4:	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1.4.1						
1.4.2						
1.4.3						

» Output 1.5

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

» **Outcome 2: Based on participatory dialogue, national and local institutions initiate adoption of inclusive, gender-responsive, rights-based, people- and child-centred policies and strengthen oversight to enable consensus on a shared vision of the common good and enhancement of trust.**

Outcome 2	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Current Indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
2.1	The number of adopted social cohesion pledges	0	6	0	As per the programme logics and sequencing dynamics, the indicator will be achieved in 2025.
2.2	The level of trust that the institutions targeted by the programme will respond to citizens' recommendations	<p>Mean value – 2.38 (1 being no trust at all – 4 being absolute trust)</p> <p>Girls:2.63 Women: 2.26 Boys:2.25 Men:2.41</p> <p>* Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement.</p>	10 pp improvement	n/a	Indicator values are based on data collected from participants in 2 local dialogues held. Baseline data collection is still ongoing, in line with the timeline of target groups engagement. In-depth data analysis will be done when the collection is finalised.
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

Local and national institutions facilitate inclusive, people-centred dialogue to adopt Social Cohesion Pledges and effectively implement and oversee human rights and social cohesion policies and measures that respond to the recommendations and solutions identified through dialogues.

Output 2.2

Public narrative and policymaking informed with evidence and latest knowledge on social cohesion threats and public trust in institutions, and countering divisive narratives, hate speech and violence.

Output 2.3

Capacity building of targeted institutions to ensure girls' and women's public and political participation and to help counter hate speech, sexism, misogyny and any backlash related to gender equality.

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: Local and national institutions facilitate inclusive, people-centred dialogue to adopt Social Cohesion Pledges and effectively implement and oversee human rights and social cohesion policies and measures that respond to the recommendations and solutions identified through dialogues.	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>

2.1.1	The number of local and national institutions with increased capacities for participatory development, adoption and implementation of social cohesion pledges involved in local and national dialogues.	0	10	0	0	The indicator will be achieved in 2025.
2.1.2	The number of staff members of the Protector's office and CSO representatives capacitated to make more strategic use of regional and UN human rights mechanisms for prevention and consolidated action fostering social cohesion	0	10	0	0	The indicator will be achieved in 2025.
2.1.3	Progress made in establishing a comprehensive and effective monitoring system for hate speech online	Monitoring hate speech primarily relies on reported or publicly known incidents	Robust system for hate speech monitoring established, for regular scanning and analysis of online media and social networks	0	0	Preparatory activities underway, the indicator will be achieved in 2025.

» Output 2.2

Output 2.2: Public narrative and policymaking informed with evidence and latest knowledge on social cohesion threats and public trust in institutions, and countering divisive narratives, hate speech and violence.	Performance Indicator <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2.2.1	Number of people reached through the communication campaign	5000	0	0		The indicator will be achieved in 2025.

2.2.2	The number of journalists applying the principles of solution journalism to produce reliable reports that foster public understanding, trust, consensus-building, civic engagement and prevent conflicts.	0	30 (20 students of media and journalism studies and 10 journalists), with at least 50% female participants	0	0	Preparatory activities underway - the indicator will be achieved in 2025.
2.2.3						

» Output 2.3

Output 2.3: Capacity building of targeted institutions to ensure girls’ and women’s public and political participation and to help counter hate speech, sexism, misogyny and any backlash related to gender equality.	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>

2.3.1	The number of decision makers and opinion makers with enhanced capacities for countering the normalization of gender-based hate speech, sexism and misogyny, and advocating for the important role of women in politics and peace and security disaggregated by sex	0	50, at least 50% of whom are male	0	0	Preparatory activities underway, the indicator will be achieved in 2025.
2.3.2						
2.3.3						

» Output 2.4

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

» Output 2.5

Output 2.5:	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2.5.1						
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 <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3.1.1						
3.1.2						
3.1.3						

» Output 3.2

Output 3.2:	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3.2.1						
3.2.2						
3.2.3						

» Output 3.3

Output 3.3:	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3.3.1						
3.3.2						
3.3.3						

» Output 3.4

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

» Output 3.5

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

12345more 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 <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4.1.1						
4.1.2						
4.1.3						

» Output 4.2

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

» Output 4.3

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

» Output 4.4

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

» Output 4.5

Output 4.5:	Performance Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress to date <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
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 approxima te date of the event and a brief descriptio n, including its key objectives, target audience and location (if known)	Event Descriptio n	Tentative Date	Location	Target Audience	Event Objectives (900 characters)

Event 1	Local Dialogues	21 - 22 November, 25 - 26 November, 4-5 December 2024	Ulcinj, Pljevlja, Podgorica	Citizens, incl. children, youth, women, representatives of local self - government, Resource Groups members, members of the local parliament, CSOs, media, businesses.	Local dialogues on social cohesion ensure a platform for local communities to jointly explore realities and challenges to social cohesion, with focus on trust in institutions and divisive narratives. The participants will collaboratively provide recommendations and solutions for the identified challenges. Local self-governments and national authorities will develop local and national action plans and Pledges based on the recommendations from dialogues. Additionally, project will provide funds and tools to design concrete solutions, some of which will be piloted during the course of the project.
----------------	------------------------	--	--	---	--

Event 2	Academia facilitated Dialogues - 3 student dialogue platforms	February 2025	Podgorica, (plus potential different faculty units of the University of Montenegro – Kotor and Niksic)	Young women and men, university students	Ensure a dialogue platform for university students to jointly explore realities and challenges to social cohesion, as well as solutions, with focus on youth participation, respect for diversity and trust within society. The objective is to ensure student participation and engagement by providing them with a platform to voice their needs and concerns, while seeking solutions to important social issues that impact their lives. This empowering environment will promote civic engagement, encourage collaborative problem-solving, and foster a strong sense of community. The dialogues will be focused on human rights, media and information literacy, and addressing hate speech and peer violence.
----------------	--	----------------------	---	---	--

Event 3	UPSHIFT – Social Innovation bootcamp based on Design Thinking methodology	March 2025	Podgorica or Bar	Adolescents (13-19)	Adolescents apply with issues based on inputs from local dialogues. 50 adolescents go through a three-day bootcamp and use design thinking methodology to develop community projects. The 5 best projects receive seed funding and mentorship support
Event 4	National Dialogue	April 2025	Podgorica	Participants of local and academia facilitated dialogues, representatives of relevant state institutions and national Council for Sustainable Development	Recommendations and pledges initiated at the local level will be channelled into national dialogues. These dialogues will be administered under the auspices of the National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD)

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 Organiziations, 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	Local Dialogue participant/beneficiary –a woman belonging to Roma community	<p>The Local Dialogue event marked a turning point for a Roma woman who had long felt overlooked and frustrated in her efforts to secure support for herself and her family. As a single mother, she had faced relentless challenges, from losing state financial support to navigating a maze of unresponsive institutions. Each time she sought help, she was redirected to yet another institution. When she heard about a local dialogue event, she decided to attend, hoping it might bring some help. But, this event wasn't like the other workshops or training sessions she had attended, she says. Other events were often limited to capacity-building within and for Roma people only. This time, the gathering included people from different backgrounds and communities, all coming together to discuss shared issues in their town. As she joined others in group work, sitting shoulder to shoulder, she felt an unfamiliar yet comforting sense of belonging. By hearing other people talking about similar challenges, she finally felt she was not alone—there were others, people from other communities, who shared her experience. These dialogues weren't just about solving her problem; they were about building trust and breaking down barriers. For many Roma women, this was the first time they felt comfortable sharing their thoughts with people outside their community. She recalled her initial hesitation, how she had been too shy to introduce herself at the beginning of</p>	<p>"Other events I was invited to were often just focused on building capacity of Roma community members. This time, it was different—the gathering included people from all backgrounds and communities, with the aim to come together to discuss shared issues. And we, Roma people, were at the table. The organizers were so warm and welcoming; they made me feel like I truly belonged."</p>
---	---	--	--

		<p>herself at the beginning of the event. Yet, as the day went on, she found herself slowly opening up, although she still remained shy. She admitted she stayed for the entire day, captivated by the chance to be seen as equally present and valuable member of the community.</p>	
--	--	---	--

2	Local self-government representative	<p>One of the high level political representatives of the municipality remembers the days back in the 1980s, when he was a university student in another city and that was a period of strong civic activism. Back then, they fought for everything, he recalls, but today, people are much more passive. In his current role as a decision maker, he fully supports any effort to encourage more civic engagement and to motivate citizens to be more active. But he faces a challenge. He witnessed many public debates that people attend motivated by their own particular political interests and with negative energy and constant unconstructive criticism that lead nowhere. Although he has participated in similar community events before, he noted that this Local Dialogue took a unique approach in engaging people and bringing together diverse groups: older generations, RAE population, children, young leaders, people with disabilities, representatives of local institutions. This allowed many people to express their concerns, not only the most vocal ones. The novelty is in inclusiveness and innovative outreach that has real potential for future community-building efforts. Secondly, he highlighted that in contrast to some other public debates that devolve into personal or political conflicts, this event encouraged constructive dialogue focused on solutions using innovative methodology.</p>	<p>“Only in this type of positive environment can positive results emerge. We lack these kinds of local dialogues, where people are not focused solely on their own particular, often political, interests but are genuinely interested in finding solutions for the community.”</p>
---	--------------------------------------	--	--

		<p>This experience demonstrated that by working together and concentrating on solutions, the community can be mobilized and inspired to make a difference. He clearly sees how some of these ideas can be incorporated into local action plans, particularly those focusing on youth, RAE (Roma, Ashkali, and Egyptian) communities, and persons with disabilities, while others may even deserve consideration at the national level. He emphasized that this should not be a one-off event. Instead, similar activities should continue, perhaps through open-door days or other formats, to promote civic engagement as a core value in the city.</p>	
3			
4			
<p>In addition to the stakeholder specific impact described above, please use this space to describe any additional human impact that the project has had.</p> <p><i>Please limit your response to 4000 characters.</i></p>			
<p>You can also upload upto 3 files in various formats (picture files, powerpoint, pdf, video, etc.) to illustrate the human impact of the project</p> <p>OPTIONAL</p>			
<p>File 1</p> <p>OPTIONAL</p> <p>Programme FACTSHEET_eng-14_35_37.pdf</p> <div></div>			

File 2

OPTIONAL

PBF_UNDP press clipping (2)-14_35_50.docx



File 3

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

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

OPTIONAL

Link 1

OPTIONALUNDP Local Dialogue Bar and Bijelo Polje photos: <https://flic.kr/s/aHBqjBQeJG> and <https://flic.kr/s/aHBqjBQeJG>

Link 2

OPTIONALUNDP Local Dialogue video: <https://t.ly/u70WZ>

Link 3

OPTIONALUNICEF activities with children and adolescents photos: <https://t.ly/OyPL2>

Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative.

How we worked:

*

Please select up to 3.

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

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The innovative dialogues methodology has been meticulously designed to not just serve to the project purpose, but in a long-term, to enable dialogue between people and between people and institutions and provide people-centred solutions and policies in any given area or topic. The methodology relied on the innovative tools and approaches such as human-centred design, sense-making, etc. The power of direct involvement and co-creation between citizens and institutions has proved to be an excellent model resulting not only in people centred solutions, but also high level of responsiveness of local authorities, based on their own commitment but also compelling, human, real-time and real-life feedback and dialogue with citizens. This was recognised and particularly stressed out by the local decision-makers attending the events. The high level of engagement was facilitated by a variety of inclusive methods. Group work strategies were tailored to accommodate all age groups and abilities, using activities that encouraged active participation from everyone. Visual aids and simplified language were used to make the concept of social cohesion accessible to everyone, ensuring the presentation was interactive and easily understood across all ages and backgrounds.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

To expand coalitions, ensure coordination and regular exchange of information with international community, the programme has launched the series of meetings with representatives of PBF countries contributors and other embassies, international organisations active in the area of social cohesion and institutional representatives. The intention of the platform is to become a series of ongoing discussions and collaborations on social cohesion issues in the country, allowing participating stakeholders to exchange information, coordinate and maximise efforts and share experiences consistently. It also has potential for the scale up and sustainability of the programme results.

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

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

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Through all of its activities, the programme has involved and partnered with local civil society organisations, university, local self-governments, local and national Parliaments, Prime Minister Office as well as Ministries in charge of media, culture, education, human rights and gender equality, etc.

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.

1) M&E Plan Developed.

Under the leadership of Joint M&E Associate, the Joint Project Team (JPT) has drafted M&E plan, which includes the actions planned for the successful monitoring of the progress towards the planned Outcomes and Outputs, as well as foreseen risks, context and catalytic effects monitoring. The plan also includes relevant action towards deployment of the final evaluation. Furthermore, it contains Metric Framework which provides detailed description of each indicator (definition), responsible agency for indicator value reporting, tools for data collection, reporting frequency, unit of measure and methodology for indicator value calculation. It is therefore serving as a Performance Indicator Reference Sheet. The Metric Framework is crucial as it establishes a clear, structured approach to tracking and evaluating progress, ensuring consistency and clarity in data collection.

2) Baseline data collection through Knowledge Attitudes and Practices (KAP) survey and Programme participants survey.

The baseline data collection is under way and it is being collected on target group (through Programme participants survey) and comparison group (through KAP survey). The purpose of KAP survey is to provide data on groups similar to direct beneficiaries for the comparison purposes, but also to provide a snapshot of the situation in 5 selected municipalities and guide future programming. The estimated completion date is December 2024. The purpose of the Programme participants survey is to provide baseline for the group targeted by programme interventions and track the progress made. We are using rolling baseline approach, where data collection occurs as participants are enrolled. This approach accommodates the different timeframes across different project interventions and ensures that baseline data is captured as close as possible to the start of each participant's involvement in the project.

3) Observation of the Local Dialogues

The observation method is employed to assess the depth of meaningful engagement of dialogue participants, contributing valuable data for indicator assessment by cross-verifying with participants' self-reported perceptions; and second, to monitor enabling factors that support meaningful participation, aiding facilitators in identifying and addressing any challenges real time. Observation covered local dialogues in selected municipalities where these dialogues have been implemented to date (Bar, Bijelo Polje). Multiple tools will support this unobtrusive observation, including checklists to quantify behaviours and field notes to document notable absences and descriptive comments on observed actions, ensuring a comprehensive and structured approach to understanding participant engagement with a special emphasis on participation of children and women.

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.

In order to ensure quality of monitoring of the project progress towards the set Outcomes, the baseline survey has been designed and launched. The survey has been done through the baseline questionnaire with the project participants as well as through the KAP Survey on general population, which will serve as the control group and overall measuring of the project indicators. The baseline survey among project participants has been launched and will be implemented in succession, following the timeline of beneficiaries' engagement. KAP Survey has been launched and data should be available in November.

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.

To report on outcome indicator values, baseline data was collected on direct beneficiaries, participants of the two Local Dialogues. Rapid analysis is being done after each event serving as beneficiaries' enrolment. In depth analysis of the baseline will be completed after all dialogues in all 5 municipalities are completed. To track the indicator of meaningful participation of program beneficiaries in Local Dialogues, an observation method was being used. Checklists and event notes are drafted, cleaned and available upon request.

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

In order to ensure quality of monitoring of the project progress towards the set Outcomes, the baseline survey has been designed and launched. The survey has been done through the baseline questionnaire with the project participants as well as through the KAP Survey on general population, which will serve as the control group and overall measuring of the project indicators. The baseline survey among project participants has been launched and will be implemented in succession, following the timeline of beneficiaries' engagement. KAP Survey has been launched and data should be available in November.

Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Project has established a core community-based mechanism supported by Real Time Monitoring tool, a digital platform allowing for the administration of brief surveys via Viber and Messenger to project participants. This tool is procured and set up for the purpose of collecting views on specific issues from community members. This tool allows for continuous monitoring, outreach, and feedback collection from programme beneficiaries. It is also designed to be used for outreach activities focusing on sharing information and issuing calls for engagement in programme activities, complemented by distributing key messages and promotional content to build awareness and encourage participation. The real Time Monitoring Tool is going to be used as a feedback mechanism for project participants thus fostering engagement throughout the implementation and informing the participants about the status of their ideas, suggestions provided at the initial stage of the engagement.

» 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

50000

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:

Jelena Miljanic

UNDP

Joint Programme
Manager

jelena.miljanic@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? *

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.

Efforts are continuously invested in creating spaces for the potential catalytic effects of the programme. In the reporting period, the programme has unlocked the following catalytic processes:

The success of the dialogues for common good model and methodology as a means of citizen engagement has led to discussions between UNDP and Association of Municipalities of Montenegro on institutionalizing it across other municipalities. This model not only ensures continued community participation but also facilitates the engagement of additional stakeholders at the sub-national level, strengthening national ownership of social cohesion and development processes.

UNICEF has leveraged on the partnership with Ministry of Education to advocate for the integration of programme results into the upcoming National Education Reform Strategy (2025-2035): The implementation of Civic Education and Socio-Emotional skills programs will inform and potentially be integrated into the Government of Montenegro's Education Reform Strategy for the next 10 years period. This will create a momentum for structural change and ensure that social cohesion and peace values are embedded within the national educational framework.

In partnership with Ministry of Culture and Media, UNESCO is supporting implementation of the national Media Strategy, by providing support to several initiatives related to ethical reporting and hate speech in media. This will enable long-term, sustainable, whole society action and results in ensuring ethical and responsible reporting and media space safe from harmful narratives and hate speech.

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.

The programme has embedded sustainability in its methodologies and partnerships. Programme locations were chosen to ensure diverse social groups in five towns are involved in dialogues that foster a shared vision, collaboration, public trust, respect for diversity, and resilience against divisive narratives. Municipalities across northern, central, and southern regions, covering half the country's population, have welcomed the unique nature of the programme that enables participatory design and co-design of specific activities/interventions based their unique needs, which contributes to the local ownership and sustainability.

One of the core activities, the local dialogues for common good, is co-created with local actors and seeks to identify processes where dialogues can be integrated as a long-term tool and space for dialogue among people and between people and local authorities. Each municipality has a resource group to act as advisors, partners, and champions for sustainable project outcomes. Local resource groups in all 5 municipalities have been established, serving as the local advisors, partners, sounding boards and sustainability champions for the local dialogues' outcomes and methodologies, enhancing the programme's capacity to integrate local insights and resources into the process. The groups will also serve as the monitoring and championing mechanism for the implementation and sustainability of the local community vision of common good that will be collectively designed through dialogue platforms.

The power of co-creation between citizens and institutions has proved to be an excellent model resulting not only in people-centered solutions, but also high level of responsiveness of local authorities, based on their own commitment but also compelling, human, real-time and real-life feedback and dialogue with citizens. The dialogues methodology design has been a meticulous and comprehensive process, which was implemented with a view of developing a methodology that will not just for the project purpose, but in a long-term, enable dialogue between people and between people and institutions and provide people-centered solutions and policies in any given area or topic. Sustainability is further supported through school-based curricula on civic education, socio-emotional skills, conflict resolution, and human rights education.

All institutional partners have shown strong commitment to advancing social cohesion through this partnership. The UN's support aligns with national priorities like EU accession and the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as well as the Montenegro's SDG Pledge and the global Pact for the Future. Regular communication and coordination with international partners and donors is one of the mechanisms to galvanise wide network of partnerships, ensure synergy of actions and to enhance collaborations on social cohesion in the country, allowing participating stakeholders to exchange information, coordinate and maximise efforts and share experiences consistently.

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.

No.

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 data collection on target beneficiaries	Baseline data with project beneficiaries has been collected so far from participants of two local dialogues. The data collected relates to project outcome-level indicators covering topics such as perceptions of respondents' competence to understand and participate in political processes, feelings of being engaged, valued, and heard by institutions, interpersonal trust and solidarity, and trust that institutions will respond to their recommendations, among other areas.	While adults tend to exhibit higher levels of political efficacy and trust in institutions, there is a significant need to engage and empower younger individuals to develop their confidence and involvement in the political process. This analysis underscores the importance of addressing internal efficacy as a precursor to external engagement and trust in political institutions. Adults, both men and women, report relatively similar, high mean scores for their perceived confidence in his or her own abilities to understand politics and to participate in the political process (internal political efficacy). However, male minors report the lowest mean score (2.39), indicating a potential gap in confidence or belief in their political understanding and participation compared to their female counterparts. The highest scores in adult men suggest that as individuals mature, their confidence in their understanding of politics increases, possibly due to greater life experiences and political exposure, including the lower participation of women. On the other hand, when it comes to the feeling that they have a say in what institutions do (local and national level), there is a difference between adults and children. Across both genders, minors exhibit lower mean scores than adults, indicating that younger individuals feel less engaged, valued, and heard by the institutions. When looking at the
----------------	---	---	---

			aggregated data, respondents feel moderate level of trust that institutions will respond to their recommendations, but adult men have more trust than adult women.
--	--	--	---

Event 2	Observation of the Local Dialogues	<p>The aim was to evaluate the meaningful engagement of dialogue participants (Outcome 1 Indicator) and identifying real-time factors that facilitate or hinder participation.</p>	<p>Local dialogues brought together people reflecting the diverse demographics of local communities, including women and men, people living in rural areas, children and adolescents, people with disability, decision-makers, thus providing an inclusive opportunity for meaningful participation and building the sense of being heard and valued. All groups demonstrated a high level of engagement, both in group activities and plenary discussions. Participants from the Roma community engaged in discussions to the extent they felt comfortable, with facilitators respecting individual levels of participation. Observations indicated that children were especially active in presenting their group work, displaying confidence and ease in discussing topics related to social cohesion. Special attention should be given to encouraging their engagement in group settings, where they interact with adults, to ensure their voices are consistently heard and valued. The high level of engagement was facilitated by a variety of inclusive methods. Group work strategies were tailored to accommodate all age groups and abilities, using activities that encouraged active participation from everyone. For example, it involved creative exercises that promoted self-expression, as well as structured dialogues. Visual aids and simplified language were used to make the concept of social cohesion accessible to everyone, ensuring the</p>
----------------	---	--	---

			<p>everyone, ensuring the presentation was interactive and easily understood across all ages and backgrounds. To ensure the design and implementation of the social cohesion Pledges and related policies, local governments representatives were actively engaged in local dialogues, exemplifying accountability, collaboration and commitment to common good and social cohesion. Additionally, the presence of local institution representatives appeared to motivate participants to share their perspectives even more openly. The power of direct involvement and co-creation between citizens and institutions has proved to be an excellent model resulting not only in people centred solutions, but also high level of responsiveness of local authorities, based on their own commitment but also compelling, human, real-time and real-life feedback and dialogue with citizens. The dialogues methodology has been meticulously designed to not just serve to the project purpose, but in a long-term, to enable dialogue between people and between people and institutions and provide people-centred solutions and policies in any given area or topic. This was recognised and particularly stressed out by the local decision-makers attending the events</p>
<p>Event 3</p>			

Event 4
Event 5
Event 6

Event 7			
Event 8			

- 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.