PBF November 2024 Project Progress Report



| 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 |

| Is this a cross-border project? Yes No | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Please select the geographical region in which the project is implemented |
|---|
| Asia and the Pacific Central & Southern Africa East Africa |
| Europe and Central Asia Global Latin America and the Caribean |
| Middle East and North Africa West Africa |
| Country of project implementation |
| Lebanon Libya Tunisia |
| Yemen Other, Specify |
| Other, please specify |
| Project Title |
| 00134328: Peacebuilding through Community Stabilization in the Southern Libyan Municipalities of Ghat Sebha & Ubari |
| Other, Specify |
| Write the 8 digit MPTFO number and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document EXAMPLE: 00118938: Community-based prevention of violence and social cohesion using innovation for young people in displaced and host communities |
| Please select the geographical region(s) in which the project is implemented If the project you are looking for does not appear in the following question, please make sure that you have selected the correct regions. A limited number of cross border projects span multiple geographic regions. For example, a cross border project between Niger and Chad spans both West Africa and Central & Southern Africa Asia and the Pacific Central & Southern Africa Europe and Central Asia Global Latin America and the Caribean Middle East and North Africa West Africa |
| Please select the title of the project for which you are submitting the report |
| Write the 8 digit MPTFO numbers and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document EXAMPLE: 00129699/700: Supporting Cross-Border Cooperation for Increased Community Resilience and Social Cohesion in The Gambia and Senegal |
| Please select the countries where this project is being implemented |
| Other, Please specify |
| Project Start Date (Date of first transfer) |
| 2022-12-19 |
| 2022-12-19 |
| Project End Date |
| 2025-03-16 |
| 2025-03-16 |
| 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 | |
| NO, NO EXCEISIONS | |
| 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 | |
| Please select the convening agency recipient UNDP: United Nations Development Programme IOM: International Organization for Migration | · |
| | ï |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme | · |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund | |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights | |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | - |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | - |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | • |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | • |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | |
| ● UNDP: United Nations Development Programme | |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 | |
| ● UNDP: United Nations Development Programme | * |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme 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 UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services UNIDO: United Nations Industrial Development Organization ITC: International Trade Centre UNDPO Other, Specify | * |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme | * |
| 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 Industrial Development Organization ITC: International Trade Centre UNDPO Other, Specify Are there other recipients for this project? | * |
| UNDP: United Nations Development Programme | * |
| 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 Industrial Development Organization ITC: International Trade Centre UNDPO Other, Specify Are there other recipients for this project? | * |

Yes, both UN and non-UN recipients

| Please select other UN recipient | S | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Select all that apply | | | | | |
| UNDP: United Nations Develop | | onal Organization for Migration | | | |
| UNICEF: United Nations Childre | | | | | |
| | OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights | | | | |
| | tity for Gender Equality and the Empower | | | | |
| UNHCR: United Nations High Co | _ | A: United Nations Population Fund | | | |
| FAO: Food and Agriculture Orga | anization WFP: World Food Progra | amme | | | |
| UNHABITAT: United Nations Hu | man Settlements Programme | | | | |
| UNESCO: United Nations Educa | itional, Scientific and Cultural Organization — | 1 | | | |
| UNEP: United Nations Environn | nent Programme ILO: Internation | al Labour Organization | | | |
| WHO: World Health Organization | on PAHO/WHO | | | | |
| UNCDF: United Nations Capital | Development Fund UNODC: Unit | ed Nations Office on Drugs and Crime | | | |
| UNOPS: United Nations Office f | or Project Services | | | | |
| UNIDO: United Nations Industr | ial Development Organization ITC | : International Trade Centre | | | |
| UN Department of Peace Opera | ations Other, Specify | | | | |
| Other, Please specify | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Please select other non-UN recip | nients | | | | |
| ACTED | Action Aid UK | AAITG (ActionAid the Gambia) | | | |
| AEDE | | ve Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) | | | |
| | echerche pour le Développement (ACORD | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| American Friends Service Comr | | | | | |
| Avocats Sans Frontières Belgiur | | | | | |
| CARE International UK | Centre d'étude et de coopération | | | | |
| Christian Aid Ireland | COIPRODEN | Concern Worldwide | | | |
| Conexion Guatemala | COOPI - Cooperazione Internazio | nale CORD Burundi | | | |
| CORDAID | Corporacion Sisma Mujer | CRS - Catholic Relief Services | | | |
| DanChurchAid | EQUITAS | Fund for Congolese Women | | | |
| Fundacion Estudios Superior (F | ESU) Fundación Mi Sangre (FMS) | | | | |
| Fundación Nacional para el Des | sarrollo de Honduras (FUNADEH) | Fundación para la Libertad de Prensa (FLIP) | | | |
| HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation | on Humanity & Inclusion (HI) | | | | |
| ICTJ (International Center for Tr | ansitional Justice) Instituto Holan | des para Democracia Multipartidaria (NIMD) | | | |
| Integrity Watch | International Alert | International Rescue Committee | | | |
| Interpeace | Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation | Life and Peace Institute (LPI) | | | |
| MDG-EISA - Institut Electoral po | ur une Démocratie Durable en Afrique (El | SA), bureau de Madagascar | | | |
| Mercy Corps | MLAL - ProgettoMondo | MSIS-TATAO | | | |
| NIMD (Netherlands Institute for | Multiparty Democracy) Norwegi | an Refugee Council (NRC) | | | |
| OIKOS | ONG Adkoul - ONG Adkoul | ONG AZHAR | | | |
| OXFAM | Peace Direct | Plan International | | | |
| PNG UN Country Fund | Red de Instituciones por los Dere | chos de la Niñez | | | |
| ROI - Roza Otunbayeva Initiati | Saferworld | | | | |
| Sampan'Asa Momba ny Fampai | ndrosoana (SAF/FJKM) Save the Ch | hildren | | | |
| Search for Common Ground (SI | -CG) SIHA (Strategic Initiative for N | Women in the Horn of Africa) | | | |
| SismaMujer | SOS Sahel Sudan | Stichting Impunity Watch | | | |
| Tearfund | The Carter Center, Inc. | Trocaire | | | |
| War Child | War Childhood Museum (WCM) | World Vision International | | | |
| World Vision Myanmar | ZOA | blank_placeholder | | | |
| Other, Please specify | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Other, Please specify | | | | | |

Implementing Partners

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

11

| 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 |
| O street |
| Other, Please specify |
| |
| What is the name of the Implementing Partner |
| What is the name of the Implementing Partner INTERSOS |
| |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? |
| 227690 |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner |
| Please limit your response to 1500 characters |
| INTERSOS is working in Sebha, actively engaged in various activities including capacity building for local CSOs, |
| delivering life skills training with a focus on peacebuilding modules, and facilitating social cohesion. |
| 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 |
| Terre de Hommes - TDH |
| |

| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? * 149286 |
|---|
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner *Please limit your response to 1500 characters TDH is working in Ubari and Ghat, actively engaged in various activities including capacity building for local CSOs, delivering life skills training with a focus on peacebuilding modules, and facilitating social cohesion. |
| 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 |
| General Movement of Scouts and Guides |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? |
| 5000 |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner |
| Please limit your response to 1500 characters In line with the local peacebuilding plans in Sebha, Ghat and Ubari, the General Movement of Scouts and Guides is closely engaging the community in all three municipalities by providing capacity-building initiatives focused on peacebuilding for local community leaders and youth, with a strong emphasis on empowering females. Additionally, they are conducting awareness sessions that address key social cohesion topics, aimed at fostering dialogue and understanding among community members. |
| 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 Youth and Giving |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? 13000 |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner Please limit your response to 1500 characters In line with the local peacebuilding plans in Sabha and Ghat, the NGO has implemented activities for youth and women to enhance social cohesion reaching a total of 388 youth (190 females and 198 males). The activities that were implemented include sport initiatives, computer literacy trainings, peacebuilding and community dialogue course. |
| 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 |
| Organization of Development Pioneers - ODP |
| * |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? |
| 0 |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner Please limit your response to 1500 characters Preliminary activities in preparation for water-food actions, including development of technical specifications, bill of quantities and working with local communities for defining locations for project activities. |
| |

| 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 CSO Regional Organisation International NGO Governmental entity Other |
| Other, Please specify Peacebuilding |
| What is the name of the Implementing Partner Fezzan Libya Organisation (FLO) |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? * 17257 |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner Please limit your response to 1500 characters FLO is supporting the completion of quarterly conflict analysis in Sebha, Ghat and Ubari. |
| 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 CSO Regional Organisation International NGO Governmental entity Other Other, Please specify |
| What is the name of the Implementing Partner Peaceful Change Initiative |

| * What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? 150400 |
|---|
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** |
| 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 CSO Regional Organisation International NGO Governmental entity Other |
| Other, Please specify What is the name of the Implementing Partner Moomken Organization for Awareness and Media |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? 25000 |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** |
| 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 Democracy Reporting International | |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? * 181109 | |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | 10 |
| 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 | |
| Private Sector What is the name of the Implementing Partner | |
| Tadawul Financials What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? * 250000 | |
| Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner Please limit your response to 1500 characters Implementation of a business incubation programme, permission of Training of Trainers (TOT) and business grants to new idea start-ups in Sebha, Ghat and Ubari. | |

| 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 Private Sector |
| *What is the name of the Implementing Partner Sabri Investments |
| What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner during this reporting period? 76750 |
| * Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner * Please limit your response to 1500 characters Support the enhancement of private sector engagements in Libya by conducting a mapping of more than 1000 private sector companies (co-funded by PBF) and undertaking commitment gathering activities with the private sector to enhance employment opportunities for local youth. |
| Financial Reporting |
| » Delivery by Recipient |

| Please enter the total amounts in full US dollars allocated to each recipient organization Please enter the original budget amount, amount transferred to date and estimated expenditure by recipient. Please make sure you enter the correct amount. All values should be entered in US Dollars |
|--|
| For cross-border projects, group the amounts by agency, even if different country offices are involved. You will have the opportunity to share a more detailed budget in the next section. |

| Recipients | Total Project Budget (in full US \$) Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US bollars | Transfers to date (in full US \$) Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars | Expenditure to date (in full US \$) Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars | Implementati on rate as a percentage of total budget (calculated automatically) | | |
|------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | * | * | * | | | |
| UNDP: | | | | 90.88% | | |
| United | | | | | | |
| Nations | | | | | | |
| Developmen | 1774367 | 1774367 | 1612572 | | | |
| t | | | | | | |
| Programme | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | * | * | * | % |
|--|--------------|---------|-------------|--------|
| IOM: Internation al Organizatio n for Migration | * 1258692 | 1258692 | * 983947 | 78.17% |
| UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund | 1001437 | 1001437 | 947730 | 94.64% |
| WFP: World Food Programme | 1053530 | 1053530 | 735030 | 69.77% |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | * | * | * | % |
| | | | | |

| TOTAL | 5088026 | 5088026 | 4279279 | 044 | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | 84.1 | | | | |
| | | | | 84.1 % | | | | |
| | | | | 70 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is 84.1% . Can you confirm that this is correct? Correct Incorrect | | | | | | | | |
| If it is incorrect, pleas | se enter the approxim | ate implementation ra | te as a % | * | | | | |
| » Gender-responsiv | ve Budgeting | | | | | | | |
| • | entage (%) of the bu | udget contributes to go locument? | ender equality or wom | * nen's | | | | |
| 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 \$ 2035210.4 . Can you confirm that this is correct? Correct Incorrect | | | | | | | | |
| If it is incorrect, pleas | se enter the <i>budget ar</i> | mount allocated to GE\ | WE in US Dollars | * | | | | |
| 2035775 | | | | | | | | |
| Amount expended to date on efforts contributiong to gender equality or women's empowerment is * US \$ 1711711.6. Is this correct? | | | | | | | | |
| Correct Inc | correct | | | | | | | |
| If it is incorrect, pleas 1719518.18 | se enter the <i>expenditu</i> | <i>ure to date</i> on GEWE in | US dollars | * | | | | |
| | CEL BUDGET SHOWING e budget are available | G CURRENT APPROXIM | IATE EXPENDITURE. | * | | | | |
| PBF 00134328 Annual F | Progress Report 2024 Fina | ncials-21_46_11.xlsx | | ± | | | | |
| Project Markers | | | | | | | | |
| _ | nder Marker Associate | . , | | * | | | | |
| 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 * | | | | | | | | |
| | w risk to achieving outcor | | | | | | | |
| | Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes | | | | | | | |
| Mak marker 2 - m | but the definering outco | | | | | | | |

| (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 |
| ottoring committee und covernment engagement |
| Does the project have an active steering committee/ project board? |
| |
| Does the project have an active steering committee/ project board? |
| 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 |
| Does the project have an active steering committee/ project board? Yes No |
| 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? |
| 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 |
| 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 board (steering committee) did not meet within the last 6 months. As part of the broader Local Peacebuilding and Resilience Programme in Southern Libya, a project board meeting was held on 10 May 2023 in Tripoli. This Project Board includes the Minister of Local Government (co-chair), Minister of Planning (co-chair), UNDP Representative (co-chair), Mayors of Municipalities in the South (including Sebha, Ghat and Ubari), UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) and Development Partners. Planned interventions under the PBF project, such as the PB plans, and progress achieved were discussed. The 2024 project board meeting was delayed due to scheduling conflicts of key members and is expected to take place in December 2024. Achievements under |

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

Over the last 6 months, RUNOs continued to engage the different sectors and levels of Government on project related activities. These engagements included:

- 1. Generally, the convening agency continued to have periodic discussions with the Ministry of Local Governance (MoLG), the main interlocutor of the project. The most recent meeting, where plans for the upcoming project board (steering committee) meeting were discussed, took place in November 2024.
- 2. As part of UNICEF's programme in the target municipalities, quarterly technical meetings were held with the MoLG to discuss project updates, challenges and mitigation measures.
- 3. IOM collaborated with the Women Empowerment Offices (WEOs) of the three municipalities and the Ministry of Labour (MoL) in building the capacity of staff members of the WEOs. Engagements with the MoL also continued as IOM advanced rehabilitation works for the establishment of the Technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET) centre.
- 4. WFP's main counterparts at the municipal level are the labour offices, the WEOs, and the entrepreneurship offices. Regular meetings were held with these actors throughout the reporting period. In addition, a regular relationship is maintained with the MoLG, specifically the WEO and the Agricultural Services department, the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Economic and Social Development unit to ensure that the implemented programme is in line with Government priorities and generate evidence on good practices that can be inherited by the Government counterparts and scaled up. During the reporting period, joint field visits for coordination and planning of activities related to the construction of the communal market in Sebha and on the water-food nexus initiative were also held with the Municipalities of and Sebha.

5. Given the imminent conclusion of the project and the need for continuity and sustainability, including in advancing the implementation of the Local Peacebuilding and Development Plans, UNDP engaged several national and sub-national government bodies including (i) participation in a meeting with the MoLG, Meteorology Authority, Ministry of Environment and the newly established National Committee for Disaster Response, where the prioritized requests for weather stations by the Ghat and Ubari Local Peacebuilding and Development Committees were discussed and endorsed; and (ii) discussion on the sustainability of the 'Art for Peace' initiative that is currently being implemented under the project were held with the Ministry of Culture and National Folklore Centre.

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 | n status of the following prelir | ninary/preparatory activities | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Contracting of partners | O | | | | | |
| 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 All preparatory/preliminary activities, including engagement of implementing partners, recruitment of staff, identification of beneficiaries and establishment of baselines, indicators and targets have been completed. | | | | | | |

| 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? |

O Yes

 \sim

If no, please provide an explanation

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

A no cost extension of three (3) months, that is a new completion date of 16 March 2025, was approved and signed on 7 November 2024. The principal reasons for this extension are:

- Central Bank of Libya crisis In 2024, a crisis emanating from political disagreements on the replacement of the Governor of the Central Bank of Libya (CBL) further complicated an already challenging payment system. This resulted in delays in payments to national partners, service providers and grant recipients. An agreement was facilitated by the UN Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL), and a Governor and Board of Directors were appointed in September 2024. While the processing of payments is still generally slow, the extension will allow for the cushioning of the delay.
- Land ownership challenges The project has experienced delays in the implementation of rehabilitation/construction works due to land ownership challenges. This has impacted: (i) the planned rehabilitation of the Technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET) center in Sebha: after significant delays in 2023 and 2024 and repeated processes to identify a suitable building, final confirmation and approval from the Ministry of Labour was received in September 2024 paving the way for the completion of the works; and (ii) the planned construction of the All Hajara market in Sebha: the site for the construction was handed over to the contractor in May 2024, however, after two days of work, the contractor was instructed to cease work due to a conflict between the Sports Facilities Company and the Sebha municipality over the ownership of the land. A new location was identified and the land ownership documents from the Authority of Urban Planning and the State Property Authority were received in September 2024. The process of identifying a suitable contractor is on-going and the works are expected to be completed within 4 months.

Project progress summary

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

During the reporting period, the project continued to strengthen local capacities for conflict management, prevention and resilience building.

Two rounds of cross sectoral, gender sensitive conflict analyses were completed in the municipalities of Sebha, Ghat and Ubari. The Local Peacebuilding and Development Committees (LPDCs), comprising 71 members across the 3 municipalities, with fair representation of 40% women (29 persons) and 33% youth (24 persons), continued to function. The local peacebuilding and development plans (LPDPs) were finalized and handed over to the Municipalities in 2024.

Peace awareness raising reached 1,694 youth & children and 725 female caregivers while 109 individuals participated in related events including commemorating international days. 30 teachers were provided with guidance on social behaviour. Through a new partnership with the General Movement of Scouts and Guides, awareness sessions on peacebuilding and social cohesion benefitted 200 youth & adolescents (110 F & 90 M).

In support of the role of women and girls in conflict resolution, the peacebuilding process and as peacebuilding accountability officers, 84 girls and 48 women were trained.

Advancing the sustainability of the PB planning process benefitted from the implementation of several priorities from the LPDPs:

- 1. Scouts Movement. Establishment of a partnership with the Scouts movement, where they conducted capacity building for 30 Scout leaders (15F| 15M). These Scouts will deliver the peacebuilding module to CSO youth leaders with a focus on females within the upcoming months.
- 2. Youth Council. 32 members (3F | 29M) of the Youth councils in Sebha, Ubari and Ghat received capacity building, equipping them to support the implementation of youth-led community initiatives that will contribute to peacebuilding and social cohesion with a focus on problem-solving and decision-making skills. In Ghat, collaboration with the Youth Council saw 109 youth (77F | 32M | 18 migrants & IDPs | and 91 members of host communities) participating in a youth debate training initiative.
- 3. Women Empowerment Offices. 45 female staff members of the WEOs acquired skills in conflict resolution, teamwork, presentation and interpersonal relations and gained an understanding of women's role in peacebuilding.

 4. Community members. Social cohesion activities, including Ramadan activities and other related events such sport initiatives, computer literacy trainings, peacebuilding and community dialogue reached 1,712 persons (987 M | 725F | 148 IDPs & 226 migrants.
- 5. Physical space: In Ubari, the WEO was further strengthened by the rehabilitation and equipping of the Women Empowerment Center which will serve as a place for the community to organize social gatherings, conduct livelihood trainings and other activities for the benefit of women. In Sebha, the rehabilitation and furnishing of a space for the Sehba municipality one stop shop will enhance access to municipal services.
- 6. Art for Peace. 11 CSOs are receiving financial and technical support to promote Art for Peace by reviving and enhancing traditional handcrafts and music.
- 7. Climate response. Responding to the climate vulnerability faced by South Libya and more specifically recent floods, the capacity to measure and forecast weather events is supported by the acquisition of weather stations and provision of related capacity training in the use and maintenance of these stations.

A variety of livelihoods programmes continued to be implemented to enhance the employability and entrepreneurial capabilities of deprived communities particularly women, girls, and adolescents.

In support of the preparation of adolescents and youth for the licit labour market, 75 (60F|15M) teachers and facilitators were trained in Ghat and Ubari. These facilitators in turn reached a total number of 373 (245 F; 128 M) individuals in the three municipalities.

Building on previous support for the expansion of the Haljaid market, capacity strengthening training was provided to the Sebha municipality and Sebha market managing committees on applying a conflict sensitive lens to selecting sellers and prioritising businesses that sell local products, while construction of the Hajara market was initiated and would be completed in the first quarter of 2025. In relation to the support for water-food nexus, works are ongoing for the installation of de-salinisation plants and solar power units.

Food for Training/Human Capital Development support enabled the provision of critical skills related to the agrofood nexus to vulnerable groups, particularly women. 402 people from Sebha, Ghat and Ubari received capacity building training and 2 months of cash transfer support. 200 of the 402 received entrepreneurship training and 67 of the 200 (72% women) received in-kind grants to start or expand their businesses. Moreover, 90 women benefitted from vocational training and business skills, and received tool kits to start business and generate sources of livelihood.

Awareness and outreach (200 persons), start-up weekends (98 youth—60 females) and hackathons (15 youths - 13 females) were completed in Sebha, Ghat and Ubari. 30 MSMEs and start-ups were identified and are receiving training and financial support. To support the sustainability of MSMEs and start-ups in the target municipalities, SOPs were developed for the municipal business incubators and capacity building were provided for municipal representatives (8 persons), university innovation centre (2 persons) and business centres (5 persons).

32 TVET trainers were equipped with ToT knowledge and skill sets required to become effective trainers in their respective field of specialty. 43 (30% female) TVET centre staff were trained on overall TVET management to enhance their TVET leadership capacity. The rehabilitation of the Sabha TVET centre will be completed by March 2025.

Approx. 1000 Private Sector companies in Libya were mapped to understand the landscape and potential for engagement, commitment gathering events are on-going and the strategy for Private Sector engagement will be finalized by December 2024.

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 The project continues to adhere to the budgetary allocation of 39% of the resources being directed at activities that promote gender equality and women empowerment. Peace and social cohesion capacity building for member of the peacebuilding committees, the Youth Councils, Women Empowerment Offices, Scout movement, CSOs and the wider community, all targeted women and youth as key beneficiaries. Moreover, the life skills, technical and vocational training, the human capital enhancement programme, support for start-ups/MSMEs and creation of private sector employment linkages all targeted youth and women as key beneficiaries. In addition to the results discussed in the previous section, another key area, which specifically targeted women development, including women in vulnerable situations, is the Women Salon Initiative. This is on-going across the three municipalities to expose women to subjects such as human development, time management, financial management & other personal and practical issues. Sessions are also supporting vulnerable groups such as mothers of autistic children, offering guidance and assistance in managing personal and family challenges. Further, the ninety (90) women who received vocational training in livelihood and business-related skills were specifically chosen from female-headed households to enhance their ability to support their families and improve their living conditions. Youth inclusion and responsiveness were clearly prioritized through collaboration with the Youth Councils, the Scouts movement, and initiatives such as the Debate Club, which engaged 109 young participants, including 64 females, migrants, and IDPs, in critical thinking and communication. Feedback mechanisms were established to ensure youth voices influenced programme planning. The livelihoods component has been crucial in promoting economic opportunities for youth, including but not limited to the emphasis on preparing adolescents and youth for the licit labour market, where 373 youths benefitted. By integrating women and youth into the economic fabric of their communities, the project fosters empowerment and contributes to social stability, ensuring that all participants are active contributors to community growth and Is the project 1+ year in implementation? Yes O No FOR PROJECTS 1+ YEAR IN IMPLEMENTATION ONLY: Is the project demonstrating outcome-level peacebuilding results? Outcome-level peacebuilding results entail results achieved at the societal or structural level, including changed attitudes, behaviours or institutions. Yes No

If yes, please provide concrete examples of such peacebuilding results

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Under this joint programme, to measure results, RUNOs are undertaking assessments and surveys (including pre and post intervention surveys), staff and trainer observations and completion of monitoring forms and in one case the most significant change interview (MSCI) tool is used.

For the outcome level indicators, RUNOs are currently collectively discussing joint measurements towards a consolidated reflection of the results, which are expected to be documented in the final report.

In the meantime, there has been evidence of some changes reflecting outcome level results. For example: i. The Women Salon Initiative targets vulnerable women, who are not usually involved in trainings and workshops, such as mothers – including mothers of people with disabilities - and unemployed women. For most participants, the event marked their first time engaging in an external activity. One participant from Ubari, expressed that: "we are under social pressure, with expectations to be perfect wives, mothers, cooks, housekeepers. I never socialized with other people and I understand now that I need time for myself and a space where I can be myself. I start coming to the salon and I see all these women willing to open [up] to each other and discuss personal and emotional experiences, I immediately felt a sense of belonging and I felt inspired to take over my life and focus on me!"

ii. Another life-changing result is the story of Ghazala Muftah, a resilient woman from Sabha, who after a vocational and business skills training turned her passion for sewing into a means of empowerment after fleeing conflict. She honed her skills and established a tailoring business. Her journey illustrates not only personal determination but also peacebuilding, as her business creates job opportunities and fosters community resilience. By inspiring other women and promoting unity. Ghazala's efforts contribute to social cohesion and hope in a challenging environment. Read Ghazala's story here: Stitching Dreams: Ghazala Muftah's Journey from Sebha to Success | IOM Libya https://libya.iom.int/stories/stitching-dreams-ghazala-muftahs-journey-sebha-success

iii. Under the inclusive and participatory process of developing Local Peacebuilding and Development Plans (LPDPs), including the establishment and capacity building for Local Peacebuilding and Development Committees (LPDCs), there has been shift from competition to collaboration between two municipalities, Ubari and Bint Baya, which previously experienced resources conflicts. The members of these two communities benefitted from training, including conflict sensitivity, thereby equipping them to engage and collaborate in an approach that no hard was done. This was highlighted by Basher Almehday, head of the Ubari PB Committee, when he remarked that "This collaborative effort allowed the involved parties to examine long-standing resource conflicts and commit to implementing synergistic projects. These projects are designed to ensure that development in one municipality complements and supports the others," and also emphasised on the importance of developing regional projects (as against individual municipality) with climate adaptation and sustainability in mind to take advantage of local economic and livelihood opportunities. More details are included in Local Peacebuilding and Development Planning: Three Municipalities in Southern Libya Lead the Way, Enhancing Inclusivity within Communities | PEACEBUILDING https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/content/local-peacebuilding-and-development-planning-three-municipalities-southern-libya-lead-way

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

| TAKT II. PROJECT RESOLTS I RAIMEWORK | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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: * Social cohesion is strengthened in target communities through an inclusive, collaborative peacebuilding process. | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: Resilient and sustainable livelihoods are created, especially for women & youth, in target municipalities | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 3: | | | | | | | |
| Outcome 4: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| outcome 5: | * |
|--|---|
| Outcome 6: | * |
| | |
| outcome 7: | * |
| Jutcome 8: | * |
| | |
| dditional Outcomes 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: Social cohesion is strengthened in target communities through an inclusive, collaborative peacebuilding process.

| Outcome 1 | Performanc e Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Current Indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) |
|-----------|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1.1 | 1 a: Availability and capacity of Peacebuilding committees (referral systems) to tackle potential threats to peace in supported municipalities. | Existing peacebuilding systems are complex, with formal and informal mechanisms and partners involved that limit their abilities to tackle potential threats to peace. | Peacebuilding committees capable to tackle potential threats to peace are institutionalized in supported municipalities. Increased number and percentage of peace structures' mediation in resolution of peace threats. | Peacebuilding committees have been established in all 3 municipalities through a consultative and participatory nominations process. Trainings & capacity building were completed in all 3 municipalities. Peacebuilding Local Development Committees continue to function, and Peacebuilding Local Development Plans have been finalized and handed over to the Municipalities. Committees are engaged in the implementation of priorities from the plans. Surveys and Focused Group Discussions (FGDs) will be undertaken to measure the progress of this outcome indicator during the next reporting period. | Not applicable |

| 1.2 | 1 b: % | Limited skills and | 75% increase in | During the | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | Peacebuilding | confidence of | capacity and | formation of the | |
| | committee | Peacebuilding | confidence of | peacebuilding | |
| | members who | committee | Peacebuilding | committees, | |
| | feel they have | members to | committee | committee | |
| | the capacity and | proactively | members to | members | |
| | confidence to | contribute to | contribute to | received training, | |
| | contribute to | peacebuilding in | peacebuilding in | and both pre- | |
| | peacebuilding | their | their | and post-training | |
| | and take action to mitigate a | municipality | municipality and mitigate a threat | tests were conducted. A | |
| | threat to peace | | to peace in their | perception | |
| | in their | | municipality | survey was also | |
| | municipality, if | | (disaggregated | administered to | |
| | needed | | by age, gender | assess | |
| | (disaggregated | | and | participant | |
| | by gender and | | municipality). | confidence. | |
| | age) | | | - " | |
| | | | | Baseline from | |
| | | | | pre-start-up workshop / | |
| | | | | training | |
| | | | | assessment in | |
| | | | | the 3 | |
| | | | | municipalities | |
| | | | | (average % for 3 | |
| | | | | municipalities): | |
| | | | | 45.1% of trainees | |
| | | | | felt very or fairly confident. | |
| | | | | confident. | |
| | | | | Ghat (very 7.7%, | |
| | | | | fairly 15.4%) | |
| | | | | Sabha (very 20%, | |
| | | | | fairly 13.3%) | |
| | | | | Ubari (Very 5.4%, | |
| | | | | fairly 73.6%) | |
| | | | | Book Conneits | |
| | | | | Post - Capacity building training: | |
| | | | | training | |
| | | | | assessment: | |
| | | | | Average of | |
| | | | | 88.33% (for 3 | |
| | | | | areas) of trainees | |
| | | | | felt very or fairly | |
| | | | | confident. | |
| | | | | Sabha Total (very | |
| | | | | 60.7 %, fairly | |
| | | | | 39.3%) | |
| | | | | Women: Very | |
| | | | | 40%, fairly 13.3% | |
| | | | | Youth: Very 6.6%, | |
| | | | | fairly 6.6% | |
| | | | | Ubari Total (very | |
| | | | | 53 %, fairly | |
| | | | | 33.4%) | |
| | | | | Women: Very | |
| | | | | 55.5%, | |
| | | | | fairly11.11% | |
| | | | | Youth: Very | |
| | | | | 33.33%, fairly 22.22% | |
| | | | | ££.££70 | |
| | | | | Ghat Total (Very | |
| | | | | 25%, fairly 53.6%) | |
| | | | | Women: Very | |
| | | | | 25%, fairly 0% | |
| | | | | Youth: Very 25%, | |
| | | | | fairly 0% | |
| | | | | | |

| 1.3 | 1 c: % of Peacebuilding | Communities have somewhat | At least 30% increase in | Following the formation and | Results of the |
|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | committee members who | welcoming environments | Peacebuilding committee | training of the peacebuilding | assessments were high, with |
| | believe their | but | members' | committees, an | an average of |
| | communities | opportunities for | assessments that | additional | 94.9%, which |
| | have welcoming environment | participation of the most | their communities | perception survey was | explains why results in the |
| | (disaggregated | vulnerable | have a | conducted. | post-workshop |
| | by gender and | groups are | welcoming | | assessment did |
| | age). | limited. | environment | Baseline from | not show the |
| | | | (40% women, | pre-start-up | targeted |
| | | | 20% youth across | workshop / | increase. |
| | | | all 3 | training | |
| | | | municipalities) | assessment | |
| | | | | Average of 94.9% | Post-start up |
| | | | | (for 3 areas) of | workshop / |
| | | | | trainees felt very or fairly | training assessment |
| | | | | confident; | results- average |
| | | | | 85.5% of women | 97% (for 3 areas) |
| | | | | felt very or fairly | of trainees felt |
| | | | | confident; and | very or fairly |
| | | | | 67% of youth felt | confident |
| | | | | very or fairly | 45% of women |
| | | | | confident. | felt very or fairly |
| | | | | | confident, and |
| | | | | Ghat (very 38.5%, | 50% of youth felt |
| | | | | fairly 46.2 %) Women: (very | very or fairly confident. |
| | | | | 16.6% fairly 50%) | Ghat (very 52.4%) |
| | | | | Youth (very 0 % | Fairly 42.9 %) |
| | | | | fairly 0%) | Women: (very |
| | | | | | 20% fairly 60%) |
| | | | | Sabha (80%, very, | Youth (Very 50% |
| | | | | 20%) fairly | Fairly 50%) |
| | | | | Women: (very 0% | |
| | | | | fairly 100%) | Sabha (very 69.6 |
| | | | | Youth (very 0% | %, fairly 26.1%) |
| | | | | fairly 100%) | Women: |
| | | | | | (very11.1% |
| | | | | Ubari (very | fairly77.8%) |
| | | | | 52.6%, fairly | Youth (Very |
| | | | | 47.4%) Women: (very | 33.3% fairly 66.7%) |
| | | | | 50% fairly 50%) | 00.770) |
| | | | | Youth (very37.5% | Ubari (Very |
| | | | | fairly 62.5%) | 64.3%, fairly |
| | | | | | 35.7%) |
| | | | | | Women: (very |
| | | | | | 66.7%fairly33.3% |
| | | | | | Youth (Very50% |
| | | | | | Fairly 50%) |
| low many outpu | its does outcome | 1 have? | | | |
| 1 2 | 3 4 5 | more than 5. | | | |
| Please list up to 5 | of most relevant | outputs for outcor | ne 1 | | |
| | | | | | |
| Output 1.1 | | | | | |
| | hanced, and mecha | nisms established to | o identify, analyse, r | nanage, and reduce | violent conflict. |
| ocal capacities en | | | | | |
| Local capacities en | | er-sensitive neacehu | ilding plans develop | ed and implemente | d as a mechanism |
| Output 1.2 | | • | | | |
| Output 1.2 | cipatory local gende al cohesion and pea | • | | | |
| Output 1.2 Inclusive and partifor enhancing soci | | • | | | |
| Output 1.2 Inclusive and partifor enhancing soci | al cohesion and pea | • | he local peacebuildi | ng process | |
| Output 1.2 Inclusive and partifor enhancing soci | al cohesion and pea | cebuilding | he local peacebuildi | ng process | |
| Output 1.2 nclusive and partifor enhancing soci Output 1.3 Nomen and girls a | al cohesion and pea | cebuilding | he local peacebuildi | ng process | |

| Output 1.5 |
|--|
| Other Outputs If Outcome 1 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

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

» Output 1.1

| Output | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1.1: Local capacitie s enhance d, and mechani sms establish ed to identify, analyse, manage, and reduce violent conflict. | Perform ance Indicator s Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline State the baseline value of the indicator | End of Project Indicator Target State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | Indicator progress for reportin g period State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | Indicator progress to date State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 1.1.1 | 1.1.1 # of gender-sensitive conflict assessments completed that capture the challenges, needs and priorities of excluded populations, especially women and youth, with additional focus on migrants, children/adolescand linkages between food security and peace. | Existing conflict assessments for supported municipalities are not comprehensive to capture all dynamic factors affecting peace and include diverse perspectives, such as those of women and migrants. | 3 (1 per municipality) comprehensive cross-sectoral gender sensitive conflict studies developed. | Two of four rounds of quarterly Conflict Assessments for three municipalities were completed in March 2024 and Oct/Nov. 2024. Next round is due by January 2025. | In 2023, a review and update of previously completed Conflict Analysis were done to incorporate gender and youth sensitive considerations. Two of four rounds of quarterly Conflict Assessments for three municipalities were completed in March and October 2024. Next round is due by January 2025. | Not applicable |

| 1.1.2 | 1.1.2.1 % of | Community | 70% of | Target | Following the | 7 |
|-------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| | community | members in | community | achieved in | formation and | |
| | members | community | members | previous | during the | |
| | included in | structures | included in | reporting | training of the | |
| | community | have broad | community | period. No | peacebuilding | |
| | structures | knowledge | structures | additional | committees, a | |
| | which benefit | about the | who | capacity | Pre-Post test | |
| | from Project's | challenges to | benefitted | building | was | |
| | capacity- | peace in their | from the | interventions | conducted. | |
| | building | municipality | Project's | took place | | |
| | interventions | and potential | capacity- | during this | Baseline from | |
| | and report | actions to | building interventions | reporting | pre-start-up | |
| | increased knowledge | address them. However, | report | period. | workshop / training | |
| | about the | their skills in | increased | | assessment | |
| | challenges to | managing | knowledge | | Average of | |
| | peace in their | them | about the | | 52.7% (for 3 | |
| | municipality | comprehensivel | | | areas of | |
| | and actions to | involving all | peace in their | | trainees felt | |
| | address them | partners are | municipality | | very or fairly | |
| | (disaggregated | limited. | and actions to | | confident | |
| | by gender, age | | address them | | | |
| | and | | (disaggregated | | Sabha (very | |
| | municipality) | | by gender, age | | 13.3%, Fairly | |
| | | | and | | 40%) | |
| | | | municipality). | | | |
| | | | | | Ubari (very | |
| | | | | | 15.8%, fairly | |
| | | | | | 73.7%) | |
| | | | | | Ghat (Very | |
| | | | | | 7.7%, Fairly | |
| | | | | | 7.7%, Fairly 7.7%) | |
| | | | | | 7.770) | |
| | | | | | Post-start up | |
| | | | | | workshop / | |
| | | | | | training | |
| | | | | | assessment - | |
| | | | | | average of | |
| | | | | | 77.8% (for 3 | |
| | | | | | areas) of | |
| | | | | | trainees felt | |
| | | | | | very or fairly | |
| | | | | | confident | |
| | | | | | Sabha (very | |
| | | | | | 8.7%, fairly | |
| | | | | | 65.2%) | |
| | | | | | Ubari (very | |
| | | | | | 7.1%, fairly | |
| | | | | | 85.7%) | |
| | | | | | Ghat (Very | |
| | | | | | 14.3%, Fairly | |
| | | | | | 52.4 %) | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Post-Capacity | |
| | | | | | building | |
| | | | | | training / | |
| | | | | | training | |
| | | | | | assessment - | |
| | | | | | Average of 92.6% (for 3 | |
| | | | | | areas) of | |
| | | | | | trainees felt | |
| | | | | | very or fairly | |
| | | | | | confident. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Sabha Total | |
| | | | | | (very 39.8%, | |
| | | | | | fairly 56.4 %) | |
| | | | | | Woman: | |
| | | | | | Woman: very 28.6%, | |
| | | | | | fairly 15.1% | |
| | | | | | Youth: | |
| | | | | | Very 6.65%, | |
| | | | | | Fairly 0% | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Ubari Total | |
| | | | | | (Very 15%, | |
| 1 | I |] | | l | Fairly 71.7 %) | 1 |
| | | | | | | |

| | | Woman: Very 36.1%, Fairly 5.55% Youth: Very 18.3%, Fairly13.3% Ghat Total (Very 50.7%, Fairly 44.3%) Woman: very 15%, fairly 5% Youth: Very 12.5%, | |
|------|------|--|--|
| | | | |

| 1.1.3 | 1.1.2.2 # children and youth covered by peace awareness raising activities, including through peace kiosks and sport and cultural events | Children and youth targeted by Project's peace awareness activities have limited knowledge about PB and conflict resolution structures, peacebuilding plans and their roles in building peace in the community | 1000 children and youth are covered by peace awareness raising activities, including through peace kiosks and sports and cultural events (disaggregated by gender, age and municipality). | During the reporting period, a total of 1,694 youth and children and 725 female caregivers were reached through awareness raising activities. An additional 109 individuals were reached through cultural events such as, international friendship day, world youth day, International Day of Support and Care. 30 teachers were provided with guidance sessions on social behaviour. In partnership with the Scouts, awareness sessions were conducted on peacebuilding and social cohesion to 200 youth and adolescents (110 Females and 90 Males). | To date, awareness sessions on topics related to social cohesion, social events and celebration activities reached a total of 1,694 and 725 Female caregivers, Sebha Male: 6-12 age group (253); 13 – 17 age group (72). Female: 6-12 age group (254); 13 – 17 age group (198) Ubari Male: 6-12 age group (25); 13 – 17 age group (10). Female: 6-12 age group (29). Ghat Male: 6-12 age group (371); 13 – 17 age group (307); 13 – 1 | |
|-------|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | youth day, International Peace Day and International Day of Support and Care. 30 teachers were provided with guidance sessions on social | |
| | | | | | In partnership with the Scouts, awareness sessions were conducted on peacebuilding and social cohesion to 200 youth and adolescents (110 Females and 90 Males). | |

.....

» Output 1.2

| » Output 1.2 | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Output 1.2: Inclusive and participa tory local gender- sensitive peacebui Iding plans develope d and impleme nted as a mechani sm for enhancin g social cohesion and peacebui Iding | Perform ance Indicator s Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline State the baseline value of the indicator | End of Project Indicator Target State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | Indicator progress for reportin g period State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | Indicator progress to date State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| 1.2.1 | 1.2.1 % of community members who were involved in consultations in the process of Peacebuilding Plans development who endorse the priorities identified in their municipality PBs (disaggregated by gender and age). | Lack of comprehensive local Peacebuilding plans for all 3 supported communities developed through complete inclusive participation of all partners. | At least 80% of all community members engaged in the consultation process endorse the PB in their municipality (40% women, 20% youth across all 3 municipalities) | Endorsement sessions were held for committee members in a consultation workshop to gather consensus. 100% unanimous endorsement of the plans by community members engaged in the consultation process. | Peacebuilding Local Development Plans have been finalized and handed over to the Municipalities. Endorsement sessions were held for committee members in a consultation workshop to gather consensus. 100% unanimous endorsement of the plans by community members engaged in the consultation process. | |

| 1.2.2 | 1.2.2 % and | PB Plans do | IOM: At least 5 | IOM: | Same as | Initially |
|-------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | number of | not exist for | initiatives | 1. Partnership | progress for | delayed due |
| | initiatives | supported | identified in | with the | the reporting | to the |
| | identified in | municipalities. | the PB plan | Youth | period under | extended |
| | the PB Plan | | are prioritized | Councils in | this indicator. | period |
| | successfully | | and | Sebha, Ghat | | required for |
| | implemented | | implemented | and Ubari to | | the |
| | within the | | (2 per | enhance | | completion of |
| | project | | municipality | capacity to | | the PB plans. |
| | duration | | for Ubari and Ghat and 1 for | implement | | These were finalized and |
| | | | Sebha). | youth-led community | | handed over |
| | | | Sebila). | initiatives. | | to the |
| | | | UNICEF: At | 2. Capacity | | municipalities |
| | | | least 3 | building and | | in March/April |
| | | | initiatives | support for | | 2024. |
| | | | identified in | the Women | | |
| | | | the PB plan | Empowerment | | ЮМ |
| | | | are prioritized | Offices (WEOs) | | experienced |
| | | | and | of the three | | delayed ability |
| | | | implemented | municipalities | | to obtain |
| | | | (1 per municipality); | and rehabilitation | | access approval in |
| | | | UNDP: At least | of training | | Sabha to |
| | | | 6 initiatives | center in | | conduct |
| | | | identified in | Ubari. | | peacebuilding |
| | | | the PB plan | 3. Promotion | | activities. |
| | | | are prioritized | of Social | | |
| | | | and | Cohesion | | |
| | | | implemented | activities for | | |
| | | | (2 per | vulnerable | | |
| | | | municipality) | groups (youth and migrants). | | |
| | | | | UNICEF: | | |
| | | | | 4. Partnership | | |
| | | | | with the | | |
| | | | | Scouts to | | |
| | | | | conduct | | |
| | | | | awareness | | |
| | | | | raising | | |
| | | | | activities, | | |
| | | | | capacity | | |
| | | | | building and deliver the | | |
| | | | | peacebuilding | | |
| | | | | module within | | |
| | | | | the three | | |
| | | | | municipalities. | | |
| | | | | UNDP | | |
| | | | | 5. Promotion | | |
| | | | | and | | |
| | | | | preservation | | |
| | | | | of intangible arts in Ghat, | | |
| | | | | Sebha and | | |
| | | | | Ubari – Arts | | |
| | | | | for Peace are | | |
| | | | | on-going. | | |
| | | | | 6. Support | | |
| | | | | capacity to | | |
| | | | | measure and | | |
| | | | | forecast | | |
| | | | | weather | | |
| | | | | events is | | |
| | | | | enhanced by an ingoing | | |
| | | | | process to | | |
| | | | | supply | | |
| | | | | weather | | |
| | | | | stations to | | |
| | | | | Ghat and | | |
| | | | | Ubari. | | |
| | | | | 7. | | |
| | | | | Rehabilitation | | |
| | | | | and furnishing Sehba | | |
| | | | | municipality | | |
| | | | | one stop shop | | |
| | | | | is ongoing. | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 1.2.3 | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

» Output 1.3

| Output | Perform | Indicator | End of | Indicator | Indicator | Reasons |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1.3: | ance | Baseline | Project | progress | progress | for |
| Women | Indicator | State the baseline value of | Indicator | for | to date | Variance |
| and girls | s | the indicator | Target | reportin | State the current | / Delay |
| are | Describe the indicator | | State the target value of the | g period | cummulative value of the | (if any) |
| empowe | muicator | | indicator at the | State the current value of the | <i>indicator since</i> <i>the start of the</i> | Explain why the indicator is off |
| red to | | | end of the project | indicator for the | project | track or has |
| play an | | | | reporting period | | changed, where relevant |
| active | | | | | | |
| role in | | | | | | |
| the local | | | | | | |
| peacebui | | | | | | |
| Iding | | | | | | |
| process | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| women and girls trained who feet that by the can use the skills/roods acquired during their training to help mitigate/prevered turning their training to conflicts in their mitigate/prevered turning their communities. (disaggregated by age and community) The community of the community of their mitigate/prevered turnicipalities. (disaggregated by age and community) The community of the community of their training to their mitigate/prever to the communities (disaggregated by age and community) The community of their training to their training to their mitigate/prever to the service of the service | 1.3.1 | 1.3.1 % and | A limited | 70% of the 165 | During this | During the | Due to access |
|--|-------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| girls trained who feel that they can use international the skills/tools acquired skills/ | | number of | number of | women and | reporting | previous | constraints, |
| who feel that by international they can use the skills/rools to acquired during their training to help their mitigate/preverevorturing their training to communities. (Gisaggregated by age and communities. (Gisaggregated by age and community) International their mitigate/prevered their mitigat | | | | • | • | | |
| the skills/rools to acquired a during their intigate/prevent sturing their training to halp their mitigate/prevent sturing their mitigate/prevent sturing their communities. Conflicts in their communities. (Gisagregated by age and communities. (Gisagregated by age and communities. (Gisagregated by age and communities.) UNICEF to target 120 girts across all 3 communicipalities. UNICEF to larget 45 Women across conflict. The conflicts in municipalities. UNICEF to target 45 Women across conflict. The conflict in their municipalities. UNICEF to the carget 120 girts across all sunch peace, conflict. The conflict in their municipalities. UNICEF to the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict in the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict in the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict in the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict is the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict is the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict is the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict is the carget 120 girts across and the 3 women across conflict. The conflict is the carget 120 girts across | | 0 | _ | Project feel | | | • |
| acquired during their training to help mitigate/prevent conflicts in help mitigate/prevent communities. Communities (disaggregated by age and community) Communities | | - | | - | | | |
| during their training to help their will gate of preverse to municities. In their mitigate of preverse to conflicts in their communities. (disaggregated (50%) youth across all 3 municipalities). Workshops on conflict in their communities of their communities of their communities of their communities of their communities. (disaggregated (50%) youth across all 3 municipalities. Workshops on conflict, workshops on conflict, workshops on conflict, and the same across of the 3 municipalities. Workshops on conflict, workshops on | | | • | | | | |
| training to help their mitigate/prevent trommunities. conflicts in their communities (disaggregated by age and community) Community) Community: Comminity: Com | | | | | | | |
| mitigate/prevert communities communities (disaggregated by age and communities) mitigate/prevert communities (20% youth participated in communities (20% youth participated in communities) municipalities. UNICEF to target 120 gifs a cross she 3 municipalities. UNIOP to Target 45 Women across she 3 municipalities. UNIOP to Target 45 Women across she 3 municipalities. Women across she 4 municipalities. Women across she 5 municipalities. Women across she 6 municipalities. Women across she | | _ | | _ | | | - |
| conflicts in their communities (diagagregated in their communities) (50% youth a cross all 3 municipalities. UNICET to target 120 girls across the 3 municipalities. UNICET to target 36 women across of municipalities. UNICET to target 45 women across of their acquired for the circles: UNICET to the section of the circles and the section of the circles and the section of the circles. Unicipalities and the section of the circles and the section of the circles. Unicipalities and the section of the circles and the section of the circles. Unicipalities and the section of the circles and the section of the circles. Unicipalities and the section of the circles and the section of the circles. Unicipalities and the section of the circles and the section of the circles. Unicipalities and the section of the circles and the section of the circles. Unicipalities and the section of the circles and the section of th | | | | • | | | _ |
| their communities (disaggregated to by age and community) (disaggregated across all 3 municipalities). UNICEF to target 120 girls across the 3 municipalities. UNIOP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIOP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIOP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIOP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. Uniopalities the cides: Ubarri, Sebha and Ghatt. Sabha Total every or fairly confident and Ghatt. Sabha Total every of fairly 52.5%, Fairly 94.6 % 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 11.1% Voutr. Very 13.3%, Fairly 00% Ubari Total: every 42.5%, fairly 11.11% Voutr. Very 25.5, Sidily 11.11% Voutr. Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: every 42.9%, fairly 93.8%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 93.8%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 11.1% Voutr. Very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next. | | | tcommunities. | | | | • |
| (disaggregated by age and across all 3 municipalities). UNICEF to target 120 girls across the 3 tools, conflict unucipalities. UNID to Target 35 Women across of municipalities. UNID To Target 36 Women across of municipalities. UNID To Target 36 Women across of municipalities. UNID To Target 36 Women across of municipalities. USAGE Women across of the cities: UBari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Voutt- Very 13.3%, Fairly 11.11% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.7 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 45.5%, Fairly 11.11% Ubari Total: very 42.9%, Fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Women: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Women: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Women: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Women across of the cities: very 42.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Women: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Women: very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6%) 96.5 Women very 2.9%, Fairly 93.6% 96.5 Women very 2.9% 96.5 Women v | | | | | , ,, | | |
| across all 3 municipalities. UNICEF to target 120 girls across the 3 the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 48 Women across the 48 Women across the 49 Women across the 50 Municipalities. UNIDP to Target 45 Women across the 48 Women across the 48 Women across the 49 Wom | | | | | | | 2024. |
| municipalities). UNICE to target 120 girls across the 3 unicipalities. UNDP to Target 32 municipalities. UNDP to Target 34 municipalities. UNDP to Target 36 municipalities. He a Women across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 43 municipalities. He a Women across the 3 municipalities. He a Women across the 3 municipalities. White Target 43 municipalities. UNDP to Target 43 municipalities. He a Women across the 3 municipalities. Women across the 4 cites: Ubari, sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very of 5a1by confident Sabha Total very of 5a7b, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0.62% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0.62% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 0.59%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 0.64, Fairly 0.65%, Fa | | | | | - | | |
| UNICEF to target 120 girls across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 45 Women across the 4 municipalities. Under the target testimenies of the cities: Uhart, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha 16 in Ubari. training / training assessment average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of the cities: Uhart, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha 16 in Ubari. training / training assessment average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of the cities: Uhart, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha 16 in Ubari. training / training assessment average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of the cities: Uhart, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha 16 in Ubari. training / training average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of the cities: Uhart, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha 16 in Ubari. to wateraining average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of the cities: Uhart, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha 16 in Ubari. to wateraining average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of training average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of training average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of training average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of training average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of training average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of trainees felt of training average 96.1% (or 3 areas): of training average 96.1% (or 3 areas) | | | | | _ | | |
| target 120 girls across the 3 manlysts and tools, conflict municipalities. UNDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. Women across of municipalities. Women across of their acquired skills in each of the cities. Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 6.25% Vouth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 6.25% Vouth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 11.11% Vouth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 11.11% Vouth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Vouth: Very 33.3%, Fairly 11.11% Vouth: Very 15.66%, fairly 8.33% Wiman very 2.2%, fairly 9.67, Vouth: Very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% Willie 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | - | conflict, | | |
| girls across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 35 Women across the 3 municipalities. UNDP to offered brief municipalities. Will be their acquired skills in each of the cities: Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very of fairly confident Sabha Total very of Sarity 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 51.8 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 45.5%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 52.8 %) 96.5 Woman: very 23%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 3.33%, Fairly 16.66%, fairly 3.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| the 3 municipalities. UNDP to Target 45 Women across of the cities: Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.5%, Fairly 75.1%) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 75.1%) 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 93.6%, Fairly 93.8%, Fairly 93.6%, Fairly 93.8%, Fa | | | | _ | • | | |
| UNDP to Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. William acquired skills in each of the cites. Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 52.5%, Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0.5%, Fairly 75.1%, Fairly 75.1%, Fairly 75.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%, Fairly 95.6%, | | | | - | - | | |
| Target 45 Women across the 3 municipalities. In their acquired skills in each of the cites. Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 46.0%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.0%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.33%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% | | | | municipalities. | Ü | | |
| Women across the 3 municipalities. In the 3 municipalities of their acquired skills in each of the cities. Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Voutt: Very 13.3%, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youtt: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.3%, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youtt: Very 13.3%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.3%, fairly 33.33%, Fairly 33.33%, Fairly 33.33%, Fairly 33.33%, Fairly 34.8 %) 96.5 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youtt: Very 13.35% Fairly 22.22% Women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | UNDP to | - | _ | |
| the 3 municipalities. Iteria required skills in each of the cities: Ubari, Sebba and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 57.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 52.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, Fairly 53.5%) 96.5 Woman: very 22.9% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, Fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 22.9% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | • | |
| municipalities. their acquired skills in each of the cities: Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0.9% Ubari Total: very 15.7 %, Fairly 75.5 %, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 15.5 %, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 95.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 18.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| skills in each of the cities: Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8%) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 9% Ubari Total: very 15.7%, Fairly 75.1%) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 13.33%, Fairly 11.11% Woman: very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 13.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Ve | | | | | | _ | |
| Ubari, Sebha and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 10% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 12.2.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 98.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | municipanties. | - | - | |
| and Ghat. Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| Sabha Total very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | confident | |
| very 45.3%, Fairly 54.8 %) 100 Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | and Gnat. | Sabha Total | |
| Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 10% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| Woman: Very 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| 46.6%, Fairly 6.25% Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| Youth: Very 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| 13.3%, Fairly 0% Ubari Total: very 16.7%, Fairly 75.1%) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 18.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| Ubari Total: very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | • | |
| very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| very 16.7 %, Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| Fairly 75.1 %) 91.8 Woman: Very 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| Woman: Very 55.5%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| 55.55%, Fairly 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| 11.11% Youth: Very 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 33.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| 33.33%, Fairly 22.22% Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | • | |
| Ghat Total: very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| very 42.9%, fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | 22.2270 | |
| fairly 53.6%) 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| 96.5 Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| Woman: very 25%, fairly 0% Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| Youth: very 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | Woman: very | |
| 16.66%, fairly 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| 8.33% While 132 women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| women and girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| girls were trained during the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| the current reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| reporting period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | trained during | |
| period. The perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| perception surveys on these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| these women and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | perception | |
| and girls would be documented in the next | | | | | | - | |
| would be documented in the next | | | | | | | |
| in the next | | | | | | _ | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | in the next reporting | |

| | | period. | |
|------|------|-------------|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| 1.3.2 | 1.3.2 # Women | Representatives | 36 members | UNICEF: | In the | |
|-------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | and youth led | of women-led | of women-led | during the | previous | |
| | CSOs within | and youth-led | and youth-led | reporting | reporting | |
| | the | CSOs are not | CSOs (at least | period, the | period, a total | |
| | Committees | engaged in | 12 per | Scouts trained | of 34 | |
| | who are | designing the PB Plans and | municipality, | 30 scout leaders on | members from CSOs | |
| | actively engaged in | in monitoring | including both youth-led and | peacebuilding | across 3 | |
| | designing the | their | women-led | initiatives. | Municipalities | |
| | PB Plan and in | implementation | | The Scouts | were trained. | |
| | monitoring | | present) | leaders that | | |
| | the PB Plan | | | were trained | Ubari: 13 | |
| | implementation | 1 | UNICEF will | will be | 69.23% | |
| | (disaggregated for women led | | target 1 CSO (the Scouts) | delivering training to | women, 61.5% youth | |
| | CSOs, youth- | | per | CSO youth | youth | |
| | led CSOs and | | municipality | leader in the 3 | Sabha:8 | |
| | by | | with a target | municipalities | 37.5% woman, | |
| | municipality) | | of 10 | with a focus | 25% youth | |
| | | | members in | on female members and | Ghat: 13 | |
| | | | each, totalling in 30 | leaders. | 15% women, | |
| | | | members. | icaaci 3. | 46.15%youth | |
| | | | | UNDP: | During this | |
| | | | UNDP will | during the | reporting | |
| | | | target 2 CSOs | reporting | period the | |
| | | | per | period, 48 | Scouts have | |
| | | | municipality for a total of 6 | women were trained as | trained 30 scout leaders | |
| | | | members. | peacebuilding | on | |
| | | | | accountability | peacebuilding | |
| | | | | officers. 36 of | initiatives. | |
| | | | | these women | | |
| | | | | represented | Ubari: 10 | |
| | | | | women-led CSOs in the 3 | 50 % women, 50% male | |
| | | | | municipalities: | youth | |
| | | | | Sebha: 15, | , | |
| | | | | Ubari 11 and | Sabha: 10 | |
| | | | | Ghat 10. | 50 % woman, | |
| | | | | | 50% male | |
| | | | | | youth | |
| | | | | | Ghat: 10 | |
| | | | | | 50% women, | |
| | | | | | 50% male | |
| | | | | | youth | |
| | | | | | Th | |
| | | | | | These Scouts leaders that | |
| | | | | | were trained | |
| | | | | | will be | |
| | | | | | delivering | |
| | | | | | training to | |
| | | | | | CSO youth leader in the 3 | |
| | | | | | municipalities | |
| | | | | | with a focus | |
| | | | | | on female | |
| | | | | | members and | |
| | | | | | leaders. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | UNDP: | |
| | | | | | during the | |
| | | | | | reporting | |
| | | | | | period, 48 | |
| | | | | | women were | |
| | | | | | trained as | |
| | | | | | peacebuilding accountability | |
| | | | | | officers. | |
| | | | | | 36 of these | |
| | | | | | women | |
| | | | | | represented | |
| | | | | | women-led | |
| | | | | | CSOs in the 3 municipalities: | |
| | | | | | Sebha: 15, | |
| | | | | | Ubari 11 and | |
| | | | | | Ghat 10. | |
| . ' | - ' | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--|------|------|--|
| 1.3.3 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| » Output 1.4 | | | | |

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

» Output 1.5

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

» Outcome 2: Resilient and sustainable livelihoods are created, especially for women & youth, in target municipalities

| target municipa | alities | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome 2 | Performanc e Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Current Indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) |
| 2.1 | % increase of Project beneficiaries who believe that private sector employment is a desirable goal (disaggregated by gender, age and municipality) | Limited but slightly increasing interest of Project beneficiaries in private-sector employment | Project training and supports' beneficiaries report 30% increase in their beliefs that private sector employment is a desirable goal (disaggregated by gender, age and municipality). | Joint Measurement of this outcome indicator is currently being collectively discussed by the 4 RUNOs and would be reported on in the next reporting period. | Not Applicable |
| 2.2 | % of individuals trained on business, economic development and supported with livelihood activities who adopt conflict-sensitive practices (disaggregated by gender, age & municipality) | Project beneficiaries supported with business training and livelihood support are unfamiliar with conflict-sensitive practices. | 75% of individuals trained on business, economic development and supported with livelihood activities adopt conflict-sensitive practices (disaggregated by gender, age & municipality). | Joint Measurement of this outcome indicator is currently being collectively discussed by the 4 RUNOs and would be reported on in the next reporting period. | Not applicable |
| 2.3 | | | | | |
| Please list up to 5 | uts does outcome 2 3 4 5 5 of most relevant o | more than 5. | | nts) identified in th | e conflict |
| assessments & loc with the relevant § Output 2.2 | al peacebuilding pla government institut aged in a conflict-se | ns are provided with ions | n gender-sensitive li | velihood opportunit | ies in coordination |
| | ions across the 3 mu | - | ate and facilitate in | active growth, emple | yment and rushe- |
| Output 2.4 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Output 2.5 | | | | | |
| Other Outputs If Outcome 2 has more | re than 5 outputs, pleas | e enumerate the remai | ning 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

| | 1 | | | | | |
|------------|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Output | Perform | Indicator | End of | Indicator | Indicator | Reasons |
| 2.1: | ance | Baseline | Project | progress | progress | for |
| Disenfra | Indicator | State the | Indicator | for | to date | Variance |
| nchised | s | baseline value of the indicator | Target | reportin | State the current | / Delay |
| populati | Describe the | | State the target | g period | cummulative value of the | (if any) |
| ons | indicator | | value of the indicator at the | State the current | <i>indicator since the start of the project</i> | Explain why the indicator is off |
| (includin | | | end of the project | value of the indicator for the | project | track or has |
| g | | | | reporting period | | changed, where relevant |
| women, | | | | | | |
| adolesce | | | | | | |
| nts, | | | | | | |
| youth | | | | | | |
| and | | | | | | |
| migrants | | | | | | |
|) | | | | | | |
| identifie | | | | | | |
| d in the | | | | | | |
| conflict | | | | | | |
| assessm | | | | | | |
| ents & | | | | | | |
| local | | | | | | |
| peacebui | | | | | | |
| Iding | | | | | | |
| plans are | | | | | | |
| provided | | | | | | |
| with | | | | | | |
| gender- | | | | | | |
| sensitive | | | | | | |
| livelihoo | | | | | | |
| d | | | | | | |
| opportu | | | | | | |
| nities in | | | | | | |
| coordina | | | | | | |
| tion with | | | | | | |
| the | | | | | | |
| relevant | | | | | | |
| governm | | | | | | |
| ent | | | | | | |
| institutio | | | | | | |
| ns | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 2.1.1 | 2.1.1 | Adolescents | 80% of | 75 teachers | 2,432 | |
|-------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | % adolescents | and youth are | trainees (at | and | adolescent | |
| | and youth | unprepared to | least 40% | facilitators | and youth | |
| | trained by the | enter the licit | women and | were trained: | were reached | |
| | Project who | labour | 40% youth | 15 (13 Females | | |
| | feel they are | market. | across all 3 | and 2 Males) | Ghat: 596 total | |
| | better | | municipalities) | in Ubari, 60 | participants | |
| | prepared to | | feel they are | (47 females | 10-12 y/o: 145 | |
| | enter the licit | | better | and 13 males) | males,155 | |
| | labour market | | prepared to | in Ghat. | female) | |
| | (disaggregated | | enter the licit | The | 14+ y/o: 134 | |
| | by gender, age | | labour market. | facilitators have reached | males, 162 female) | |
| | & municipality) | | market. | a total | remaie) | |
| | municipality) | | | number of 373 | Ubari: 717 | |
| | | | | individuals | total | |
| | | | | throughout | participants | |
| | | | | the three | 10-12 y/o: 111 | |
| | | | | municipalities; | males, 139 | |
| | | | | Ghat 154 (88 | females | |
| | | | | females, 66 | 14+ y/o: 210 | |
| | | | | males), Ubari | males, 254 | |
| | | | | 52 (23 | females. | |
| | | | | females, 29 | Cable 245 | |
| | | | | males), Sabha | Sabha: 213 in | |
| | | | | 167 (134 | total | |
| | | | | females, 33 males). | participants | |
| | | | | maies). | 10-12 y/o: 421 | |
| | | | | In the next | males, 387 | |
| | | | | reporting | females | |
| | | | | period, upon | 14+ y/o: 112 | |
| | | | | the | males, 199 | |
| | | | | completion of | females | |
| | | | | the Peace | | |
| | | | | building and | 75 teachers | |
| | | | | pathways to | and | |
| | | | | employment | facilitators | |
| | | | | modules, the | were trained: | |
| | | | | perception on | 15 (13 Females | |
| | | | | readiness to | and 2 Males) | |
| | | | | enter the | in Ubari, 60 | |
| | | | | labour market will be | (47 females | |
| | | | | assessed. | and 13 males) in Ghat. | |
| | | | | assesseu. | The | |
| | | | | | facilitators | |
| | | | | | have reached | |
| | | | | | a total | |
| | | | | | number of 373 | |
| | | | | | individuals | |
| | | | | | throughout | |
| | | | | | the three | |
| | | | | | municipalities; | |
| | | | | | Ghat 154 (88 | |
| | | | | | females, 66 | |
| | | | | | males), Ubari | |
| | | | | | 52 (23 females, 29 | |
| | | | | | males), Sabha | |
| | | | | | 165 (134 | |
| | | | | | females, 33 | |
| | | | | | males). | |
| | | | | | , | |
| | | | | | In the next | |
| | | | | | reporting | |
| | | | | | period, upon | |
| | | | | | the | |
| | | | | | completion of | |
| | | | | | the Peace | |
| | | | | | building and | |
| | | | | | pathways to | |
| | | | | | employment | |
| | | | | | modules, the perception on | |
| | | | | | readiness to | |
| | | | | | enter the | |
| | | | | | labour market | |
| | | | | | will be | |
| | | | | | assessed. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | Π | Π | ı | ı | Í | |
|-------|--|--|---|--|---|----------------|
| 2.1.2 | 2.1.2 % of women engaged in Project training and livelihoods activities who report that they improved their food security (disaggregated by age and municipality | Women identified by Project for training and support experience food insecurities due to lacking skills and limited access to livelihood activities. | At least 70% (at least 40% youth across all 3 municipalities) supported through trainings and livelihoods activities report that they improved their food security due to Project supports. | Capacity strengthening training was provided to the Sebha municipality and Sebha market managing committees on applying a conflict sensitive lens to selecting sellers and prioritising businesses that sell local product. Construction of the Hajara market was initiated and would be completed in Q1, 2025. Measurement of this indicator will take place in Q1 2025. | Expansion of the communal market in Sebha, which is providing access to all communities and traders by providing market space for 80 local merchants. Capacity strengthening were provided to the Sebha municipality and Sebha market managing committees on applying a conflict sensitive lens to selecting sellers and prioritising businesses that sell local product Construction of the Hajara market was initiated and would be completed in Q1, 2025. Measurement of this indicator will take place in | |
| 2.1.3 | 2.1.3 # of individuals from targeted vulnerable groups provided with vocational trainings and toolkits (disaggregated by gender, age and municipality) | Vulnerable groups cannot access relevant vocational trainings and supports. | 90 (100% youth, 30% women) individuals from targeted vulnerable groups provided with vocational trainings and toolkits who find support relevant and effective. | In total 90 women benefitted from vocational training and business skills, and tool kits to start business and generate source of livelihood. In Ghat, 30 women from the host community and 6 migrants. In Ubari, 30 women from host community and 4 migrants and Sabha 30 women. The age of participants ranged between the ages of 18-35. | Q1 2025. In total 90 women benefitted from vocational training and business skills, and tool kits to start business and generate source of livelihood. In Ghat, 30 women from the host community and 6 migrants. In Ubari, 30 women from host community and 4 migrants and Sabha 30 women. The age of participants ranged between the ages of 18-35. | Not applicable |

» Output 2.2

| » Output 2.2 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|----|----------------------------------|
| Output | Perform | India | ator | End of | | Indicator | | Indicator | | Reasons |
| 2.2: | ance | Base | eline | Project | | progress | | progress | | for |
| Private | Indicator | State | the | Indicat | or | for | | to date | | Variance |
| Sector | s | the in | ine value of idicator | Target | | reportin | | State the currer | ηt | / Delay |
| engaged | Describe the | | | State the | target | g period | | cummulative value of the | | (if any) |
| in a | indicator | | | value of indicator | the at the | State the cu | rrent | indicator since the start of the | | Explain why the |
| conflict- | | | | end of the project | ne | value of the indicator fo | r the | project | | indicator is off track or has |
| sensitive | | | | ,, | | reporting pe | eriod | | | changed, where relevant |
| way to | | | | | | | | | | |
| stimulat | | | | | | | | | | |
| e and | | | | | | | | | | |
| facilitate | | | | | | | | | | |
| future | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| growth, | | | | | | | | | | |
| employ | | | | | | | | | | |
| ment | | | | | | | | | | |
| and | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private | | | | | | | | | | |
| collabora | | | | | | | | | | |
| tions | | | | | | | | | | |
| across | | | | | | | | | | |
| the 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| municipa | | | | | | | | | | |
| lities | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1 | Indicator 2.2 | 1# | A limited | number | 3 (1 per | | Targ | et achieved | TI | hree Human |
| | of local econ | | of focused | | munici | | | ng previous | | entre Design |
| | assessments | | studies ex | | | onomic | repo | orting period. | | ssessments (1 |
| | completed th | ıat | challenge | | assessr | | | | | er municipality) |
| | capture the current copin | | solutions enable wo | | comple | tea. | | | aı | re completed. |
| | strategies, | ıg | and youth | | | | | | | |
| | incentives ar | nd | to private | | | | | | | |
| | disincentives | | opportuni | | | | | | | |
| | potential ent | ry | | | | | | | | |
| | points to exp | | | | | | | | | |
| | participation | | | | | | | | | |
| | particularly o | of | | | | | | | | |
| | women and | | | | | | | | | |
| | youth in the private sector | r | | | | | | | | |
| | private secto | · | | | | | <u> </u> | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2.2.2 | # of women and youth who developed new income generation streams due to provision of assets and micro-grants to build new agriculture value chains (disaggregated by age and municipality). | Women and youth experience limited income generation opportunities partly due to a lack of access to assets and micro-grants to build new agriculture value chains. | 500 (40% women, 70% youth across all 3 municipalities) who report that they developed new income generation streams due to Project support | 200 (119 females & 81 males) out of 402 graduates from Sebha, Ghat, &Ubari received entrepreneursh trainings. Then 67 participants (Sebha 27: 20 females & 7 males. Ghat 30: 20 females & 10 males. Ubari 10: 8 females & 2 males), who provided the best business plans, were selected to receive in-kind grants to start / expand their businesses. Measurement of this indicator, including the provision of disaggregated numbers, based on implementing partner post-intervention follow up, indicated that more 80% reported that they have benefited | 402 graduated out of 416 participants from Sebha, Ubari and Ghat that received imapacity strengthening. (Sebha 134: 59 males & 75 females. Ubari 113: 58 males & 75 females. Ghat 155) 200 out of 402 were provided with entrepreneurship training. 67 out of 200 (72% women) were selected to receive in kind grants. Measurement of this indicator will be in Q1 of 2025 |
|-------|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | / expand their | kind grants. |
| | | | | | of this |
| | | | | indicator, | be in Q1 of |
| | | | | disaggregated | |
| | | | | based on | |
| | | | | partner post- | |
| | | | | • | |
| | | | | reported that | |
| | | | | benefited | |
| | | | | from the trainings and | |
| | | | | the provision of in-kind | |
| | | | | grants. | |
| | | | | Measurement of this indicator will | |
| | | <u></u> | | be in Q1 of 2025 | |
| | | | | | 1 |

| 2.2.3 | 2.2.3 # of youth-led start- ups/MSMEs which received a grant from a programme administered through the established municipal business incubator | Youth-led start- ups/MSMEs have limited access to financial supports. | 30 start-ups receiving seed grants. | 30 start-ups have benefitted from business planning, marketing strategies, human resources, legal and financial matters, and project management training and are currently receiving financial support to implement their innovative | 30 start-ups have benefitted from business planning, marketing strategies, human resources, legal and financial matters, and project management training and are currently receiving financial support to implement their innovative | |
|--------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | receiving financial support to | receiving financial support to | |
| | | | | their | their | |
| | | | | ideas. | ideas. | |
| » Output 2.3 | | | | | | |

| Output | Perform | Indicator | End of | Indicator | Indicator | Reasons |
|--------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------------|---|----------|
| 2.3: . | ance | Baseline | Project | progress | progress | for |
| | Indicator | State the | Indicator | for | to date | Variance |
| | S | baseline value of the indicator | Target | reportin | State the current | / Delay |
| | Describe the indicator | | State the target g period value of the value of the | g period | cummulative value of the | (if any) |
| | marcator | | | the start of the | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2.3.1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2.3.2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2.3.3 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

» Output 2.4

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

» Output 2.5

| Output 2.5: | Perform ance Indicator S Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline State the baseline value of the indicator | End of Project Indicator Target State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | Indicator progress for reportin g period State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | Indicator progress to date State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
|----------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | |
| 2.5.1 | | | | | | |
| 2.5.2 | | | | | | |
| 2.5.3 | | | | | | |
| » Outcome 3: | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |

| Outcome 3 | Performanc e 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?



2 3 4 5 more than 5.

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

Output 3.1

Continuation of output 2.2

2.2.5 Level of awareness of private sector companies in the inclusive transparent and fair hiring practices and new models, including internships, capstones, on-job trainings

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: Continua tion of output 2.2 | Perform ance Indicator s Describe the indicator | Indicator Baseline State the baseline value of the indicator | End of Project Indicator Target State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project | Indicator progress for reportin g period State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | Indicator progress to date State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3.1.1 | Output Indicator 2.2.4 % of individuals who completed trainings in TVET centers developed with the Project support aimed at reducing the skill gap in key economic sectors (disaggregated by gender, age, municipality) | Minimal training opportunities to reduce the skill gap in key economic sectors available in supported municipalities | 75% individuals who completed TVET trainings are satisfied with relevance and effectiveness of trainings provided. | 32 TVET trainers equipped with training of the trainers (ToT) knowledge and skill sets required to become effective trainers in their respective field of speciality. 43 (30% female) TVET centre staffs (including human resources, finance, management and other support staffs) were trained on overall TVET management to enhance their TVET leadership capacity. The rehabilitation of the Sabha TVET centre commenced and will be completed before March 2025. | 32 TVET trainers equipped with training of the trainers (ToT) knowledge and skill sets required to become effective trainers in their respective field of speciality. 43 (30% female) TVET centre staffs (including human resources, finance, management and other support staffs) were trained on overall TVET management to enhance their TVET leadership capacity. The rehabilitation of the Sabha TVET centre commenced and will be completed before March 2025. | Due to delays in finding a suitable building, alternative approach was identified. The setting up of the TVET center in Sabha being undertaken in partnership with the Ministry of Labour and Sabha College where a space in the college has been converted to the TVET center. This process delayed the rehabilitation of the center. |

| 3.1.2 | Output | Limited | 10 private | Annuavimataly | Approximately | |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| 3.1.2 | | | • | Approximately | | |
| | Indicator 2.2.5 | awareness of | sector | 1000 Private | 1000 Private | |
| | Level of | private sector | companies | Sector | Sector | |
| | awareness of | companies in | participated in | companies in | companies in | |
| | private sector | the inclusive, | inclusive | Libya were | Libya were | |
| | companies in | transparent | employment | mapped, in | mapped, in | |
| | the inclusive | and fair hiring | and inclusive | partnership | partnership | |
| | transparent | practices and | business | funding from | funding from | |
| | and fair hiring | new models, | workshops to | the European | the European | |
| | practices and | including | commit to | Union and | Union and | |
| | new models, | internships, | transparent | Republic of | Republic of | |
| | including | capstones, | and fair hiring | Korea, to | Korea, to | |
| | internships, | and on-job | practices and | understand | understand | |
| | capstones, on- | trainings. | new models, | the landscape | the landscape | |
| | job trainings | | including | and potential | and potential | |
| | | | internships, | for | for | |
| | | | capstones, | engagement. | engagement. | |
| | | | and on-job | Commitment | Commitment | |
| | | | trainings. | gathering | gathering | |
| | | | _ | events are on- | events are on- | |
| | | | | going. | going. | |
| | | | | | | |
| 3.1.3 | | | | | | |
| 3.1.5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

» Output 3.2

| Output 3.2: 2.2.5 Level of awarene ss of private sector compani es in the inclusive transpar ent and fair hiring practices and new models, including internshi ps, capstone s, on-job trainings | Perform ance Indicator S Describe the Indicator | Indicator Baseline State the baseline value of the Indicator | End of Project Indicator Target State the target value of the Indicator at the end of the project | Indicator progress for reportin g period State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | Indicator progress to date State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project | Reasons for Variance / Delay (if any) Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| 3.2.1 | | | | | | |
| 3.2.2 | | | | | | |
| 3.2.3 | | | | | | |

» Output 3.3

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

» Output 3.4

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

» Output 3.5

| Output | Perform | Indicator | End of | Indicator | Indicator | Reasons |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 3.5: | ance | Baseline | Project | progress | progress | for |
| | Indicator | State the | Indicator | for | to date | Variance |
| | S | baseline value of the indicator | Target | reportin | State the current | / Delay |
| | Describe the | | State the target value of the | g period | cummulative value of the | (if any) |
| | indicator | | value of the indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | indicator since the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| | | | | | | |
| 3.5.1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 0.5.0 | | | | | | |
| 3.5.2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 3.5.3 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

» Outcome 4:

| » Outcome 4: | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Outcome 4 | Performanc e Indicators | Indicator Baseline | End of Project Indicator Target | Current Indicator progress | Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) | | | |
| 4.1 | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2 | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 | | | | | | | | |
| 7.5 | | | | | | | | |
| How many outpu | uts does outcome 4 | | | | | | | |
| Please list up to 5 | of most relevant | outputs for outcor | ne 4 | | | | | |
| Output 4.1 | | | | | | | | |
| Output 4.2 | | | | | | | | |
| Output 4.3 | | | | | | | | |
| Output 4.4 | Output 4.4 | | | | | | | |
| Output 4.5 | Output 4.5 | | | | | | | |
| Other Outputs If Outcome 4 has more | 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 | Perform | Indicator | End of | Indicator | Indicator | Reasons |
|--------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|---|
| 4.1: | ance | Baseline | Project | progress | progress | for |
| | Indicator | State the baseline value of | Indicator | for | to date | Variance |
| | S | the indicator | Target | reportin | State the current cummulative | / Delay |
| | Describe the indicator | | State the target value of the | g period | value of the indicator since | (if any) |
| | marcator | | indicator at the end of the project | State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period | the start of the project | Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant |
| | | | | | | |
| 4.1.1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 4.1.2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 4.1.3 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

» Output 4.2

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

» Output 4.3

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

» Output 4.4

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

» Output 4.5

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

4

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.)

| | 1 | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|----------|---|---|
| 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 | National launch of local peacebuilding and development plansThis target vulnerable women, who are not usually involved in trainings and workshops, such as mothers – including mothers of people with disabilities - and unemployed women. For most participants, the event marked their first time engaging in an external activity | Quarter 1, 2025 | Tripoli | Ministry of Local Government, civil society actors, civil servants, municipality members, development partners and donors. | National endorsement of local peacebuilding and development plans (already endorsed by Municipal Governments). Awareness raising for the attention of development partners towards resource mobilization. |
| Event 2 | | | | | |
| Event 3 | | | | | |
| Event 4 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Human Impact

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

- i. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implementation
- ii. The impact of the project in their lives
- iii. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group This is an optional question. You may leave it unanswered if not relevant

| 3 | Beneficiaries of capacity building activities. | This target vulnerable women, who are not usually involved in trainings and workshops, such as mothers - including mothers of people with disabilities - and unemployed women. For most participants, the event marked their first time engaging in an external activity | iv. One participant from Ubari, expressed that: "we are under social pressure, with expectations to be perfect wives, mothers, cooks, housekeepers. I never socialized with other people and I understand now that I need time for myself and a space where I can be myself. I start coming to the salon and I see all these women willing to open [up] to each other and discuss personal and emotional experiences, I immediately felt a sense of belonging and I felt inspired to take over my life and focus on me!" |
|---|--|--|--|
| 4 | Livelihood initiative in Sabha | Another life-changing result is the story of Ghazala Muftah, a resilient woman from Sabha, who after a vocational and business skills training turned her passion for sewing into a means of empowerment after fleeing conflict. She honed her skills and established a tailoring business. Her journey illustrates not only personal determination but also peacebuilding, as her business creates job opportunities and fosters community resilience. By inspiring other women and promoting unity. Ghazala's efforts contribute to social cohesion and hope in a challenging environment. | Read Ghazala's story here v. Stitching Dreams: Ghazala Muftah's Journey from Sebha to Success IOM Libya |
| In addition to the stakehold additional human impact t Please limit your response to 4000 Not applicable | hat the project has had. | ed above, please use this sp | ace to describe any |
| You can also upload upto 3 illustrate the human impac | · | cture files, powerpoint, pdf, | video, etc.) to |
| File 1 OPTIONAL Click here to upload file. (< 10M | 1B) | | |
| File 2 OPTIONAL Click here to upload file. (< 10M | 1B) | | |
| File 3 OPTIONAL Click here to upload file. (< 10M | 1B) | | |
| You can also add upto 3 lin | ks to online resources whic | th illustrate the human impa | act of the project |

| Link 1 OPTIONAL |
|--|
| Link 2 OPTIONAL |
| Link 3 OPTIONAL |
| Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative. |
| How we worked: Please select up to 3. Enhanced digitization 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. Mobilized additional resources [please explain] Based on the progress realized in the implementation of this project, during the reporting period, additional resources were mobilized for similar initiatives as follows: o USAID - \$1.5 million o UN PBF - \$2 Million o UNDP Governance and Peacebuilding Funding Window = US\$614,000. o Government of Norway - US\$380,000. |
| Please explain one of the selected options Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Strengthened capacities [please explain] By the very nature of the joint project, significant capacity building was supported by all four RUNOs, in both the social cohesion and livelihood outputs. See further disaggregated results under the project results framework section. |
| Please explain one of the selected options Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Partnered with local/grassroots civil society organizations [please explain] Given Libya's security and access challenges, the project has partnered with several CSOs, including the General Movement of Scouts and Guides, Youth and Giving, Fezzan Libya Organization, Organization of Development Pioneers and Moomken Organization for Awareness and Media to support capacity building, conduct conflict analyses, provide human capital enhancements and training, support and organize social cohesion events and forums. |
| |

| 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 |
| Pleas | se explain e limit your response to 3000 characters |
| Give Mov Pion | rtnered with local civil society organizations please explain] n Libya's security and access challenges, the project has partnered with several CSOs, including the General ement of Scouts and Guides, Youth and Giving, Fezzan Libya Organization, Organization of Development eers, and Moomken Organization for Awareness and Media to support capacity building, conduct conflict yses, provide human capital enhancements and training, support and organize social cohesion events and ms, |
| The expe | rtnered with local academia [please explain] project has partnered with Sabha Technical College to set up a TVET centre in the college premises after priencing challenges in security a suitable space for setting up the centre. In addition, persons from the Sebha |
| Univ | ersity Innovation centre participated in the Business Incubation capacity building. |
| | ersity Innovation centre participated in the Business Incubation capacity building. Te No one Behind |
| | |
| Leav | re No one Behind |
| Leav | |
| Leav | re No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative * |
| Leav | re No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative * datory |
| Leav | ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative * datory Unemployed persons |
| Leav | re No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative tatory Unemployed persons Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.) |
| Leav | te No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative datory Unemployed persons Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.) Indigenous communities |
| Leav | te No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative fatory Unemployed persons Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.) Indigenous communities Persons with Disabilities |
| Leav | te No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative datory Unemployed persons Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.) Indigenous communities Persons with Disabilities Persons affected by violence (e.g. GBV) |
| Leav | te No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative statory Unemployed persons Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.) Indigenous communities Persons with Disabilities Persons affected by violence (e.g. GBV) Women |
| Leav | te No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative datory Unemployed persons Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.) Indigenous communities Persons with Disabilities Persons affected by violence (e.g. GBV) Women Youth |
| Leav | tet all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative datory 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 |
| Leav | te No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative datory 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 |
| Leav | te No one Behind ct all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative datary 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 |

PART IV: Monitoring, Evaluation and Compliance

» Monitoring

| Please list key monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period **Mease limit your reposite of 2000 characters** 1. Monitoring activities included: 2. A two-livered monitoring and coordination structure which included monthly project technical coordination meetings and ad-hoc RUNO deputy/head of programme level internal UN steering committee meetings continued. The most recent meeting of the Heads of programme took place on June 9, 2024, where project progress was strutinized. 5. Ongoing scanning of reports on current affairs for security and political developments. 6. Review and consideration of conflict analysis of targeted municipalities. 6. Cemunity Mobilizers' attendance a broject implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. 7. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainee feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | * |
|--|--|
| 1. Montroring activities included: a. A two-tiered monitoring and actoordination structure which included monthly project technical coordination meetings and ad-hoc RUNO deputy/head of programme level internal UN steering committee meetings continued. The most recent meeting of the Heads of programme took place on June 9, 2024, where project progress was surfuringed. b. On-going scanning of reports on current affairs for security and political developments. c. Review and consideration of conflict analysis of targeted municipalities. d. Community Mobilizers' attendance at project implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. e. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainine feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' Yes No No No Hypes, please provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available. Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Repeate limit your response to 3000 characters. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff — weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No No No No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | Please list key monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period |
| a. A two-liered monitoring and coordination structure which included monthly project technical coordination meetings and adhore RUNO deputyhead of programme level internal UN steering committee meetings continued. The most recent meeting of the Heads of programme took place on june 9, 2024, where project progress was scrutinized. b. On-going scanning of reports on current affairs for security and political developments. c. Review and consideration of conflict analysis of targeted municipalities. d. Community Mobilizers' attendance at project implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. e. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainace feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select 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. Laborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon request). Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Limplementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. As the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g., perception surveys No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. ** **Pessal limit your response to 3000 characters. ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | |
| meetings and ad-hoc RUNO deputy/head of programme level internal UN steering committee meetings continued. The most recent meeting of the Heads of programme took place on June 9, 2024, where project progress was scrutifized. b. On-going scanning of reports on current affairs for security and political developments. c. Review and consideration of conflict analysis of targeted municipalities. d. Community Mobilizers' attendance at project implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. e. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainine feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? 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. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff – weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. A set project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | g . |
| The most recent meeting of the Heads of programme took place on June 9, 2024, where project progress was scrutinized. b. On-going scanning of reports on current affairs for security and political developments. c. Review and consideration of conflict analysis of targeted municipalities. d. Community Mobilizers' attendance at project implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. e. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainiee feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? "In only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' No If yes, please provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available. **Please limity your response to 3000 characters. Replace limity your response to 3000 characters. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | * |
| b. On-going scanning of reports on current affairs for security and political developments. c. Review and consideration of conflict analysis of targeted municipalities. d. Community Mobilizers' attendance at project implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. c. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainee feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? **Anonymen of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' ** **No If yes, please provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available. ** **Please firmit your response to 3000 characters.** Elaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. Elaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon request) ** **Please firmit your response to 3000 characters.** Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff – weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | |
| c. Review and consideration of conflict analysis of targeted municipalities. d. Community Mobilizer's attendance at project implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. e. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainer feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' Presse limit your response to 3000 characters. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. Elaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon request) Presse limit your response to 3000 characters. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff — weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g., perception surveys Please Irmit your response to 3000 characters. Please Irmit your response to 3000 characters. Please Irmit your response to 3000 characters. **Please Irmit your response to 3000 characters.** **Presse Irmit your response to | |
| d. Community Mobilizers' attendance at project implementation activities, such as training and capacity building workshop. e. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainee feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? if only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' in only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' in volves and the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' in volves and the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' in volves and the outcome indicators have baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. Elaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon request). 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys in ves in No | |
| workshop. - Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainee feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' • Yes No 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. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Implementing Partner quarterfy reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g., perception surveys Yes No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Please limit your response to 3000 characters. **Pelase limit your response to 3000 characters.** **Pelase limit your response to 3000 | |
| e. Periodic visits to the training sites by field staff and weekly monitoring forms with updates related to visibility, trainee feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? If you provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available. Please limit your response to 3000 characters. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff – weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys Yes No No No No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | |
| trainee feedback and location, implementation of feedback recommendations, etc. Do outcome indicators have baselines? if only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select yes' if 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. 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g., perception surveys Yes No No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | · |
| 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. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g., perception surveys Yes No No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. ** Please limit your response to 3000 characters. ** Please limit your response to 3000 characters. ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | |
| 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. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys Yes No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * **Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** * | |
| | |
| No | If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select 'yes' |
| 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. **Look and a sundertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. **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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. **Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys **Yes **No **No **No **Please limit your response to 3000 characters. **Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? **Yes **No **No **No **Please limit your response to 3000 characters. **Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? **Yes **No **No **No **No Applicable **Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: **Response required | (Yes |
| Please limit your response to 3000 characters. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff – weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. 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. * Please provide a brief description Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | ○ No |
| Please limit your response to 3000 characters. A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys Yes No No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | |
| A comprehensive study was undertaken to establish baselines for those indicators where baselines were not established at the project design stage. 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys Yes No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | If yes, please provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available. |
| 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.** 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.** **No **Please provide a brief description **Please provide a brief description **Please provide a brief description **Please limit, your response to 3000 characters.** **Please provide a brief description **Please limit, your response to 3000 characters.** **No **No **No **No **No **No **No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: **Response required | |
| 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. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. 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. * Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | |
| request) Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. 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. * Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | established at the project design stage. |
| request) Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. 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. * Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | Flaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon |
| Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Implementing Partner quarterly reports. Reports of RUNOs field staff - weekly for some activities, such as community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. * Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys * No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | |
| community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. 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. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | |
| 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. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: * Response required | |
| Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | community mobilizers. In some cases, third party monitoring reports and surveys. |
| Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | List the project is unched outcome level data collection initiatives? |
| Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | |
| Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | ○ Yes |
| Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | No |
| Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: Response required | * |
| Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * * * * * * * * * * * * * | |
| Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** No No | Please limit your response to 3000 characters. |
| Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** No No | |
| Yes No Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * ** ** ** ** ** ** ** No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? |
| Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. * ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** * | |
| Please provide a brief description Please limit your response to 3000 characters. ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | Ves Ves |
| ** 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 | ● No |
| ** 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* | * |
| ** Evaluation Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No No Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: ** Response required | |
| Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: **Response required** | Please limit your response to 3000 characters. |
| Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: **Response required** | |
| Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? Yes No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: **Response required** | |
| Yes No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: ** Response required ** | » Evaluation |
| Yes No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: ** Response required ** | Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? |
| No Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: ** Response required | |
| Not Applicable Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: * Response required | |
| Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: * Response required | U No |
| Response required | Not Applicable |
| Response required | * |
| | |
| 80000 | |
| | 80000 |
| | |
| | |

| If project will end in upcoming evaluation | | nd the overall project b | oudget is above USD 1.5 | 5 million, is your | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Yes | on track. | | | | |
| ○ No | | | | | |
| Not Applicable | | | | | |
| O Hot Applicable | | | | | |
| Please describe the | | | | | |
| Contact information | Name | Organization | Job title | Email | |
| Please mention the focal person responsible for sharing the | Vedyawattie Looknauth | UNDP | Project Specialist | vedyawattie.looknauth | @undp.org |
| final evaluation report with the PBF: | | | | | |
| » Catalytic Effect | | | | | |
| Catalytic Effect (final | ancial): Has the proj | ect mobilized additiona | al non-PBF financial res | ources to date? * | |
| | | | | * | |
| How many funders | has the project rec | eived additional non-P | BF funding from? | | |
| Indicate name of fu | | | unding support that has | | 1 |
| Name of Funder | | | | * | |
| Amount in USD | | | | * | |
| 1500000 | | | | | 2 |
| by the project since | | | unding support that has | | 2 |
| Name of Funder | | | | * | |
| Amount in USD 2000000 | | | | * | 3 |
| by the project since | | | unding support that has | s been leveraged | |
| Name of Funder UNDP Governance as | nd Peacebuilding Fun | ding Window | | * | |

| Amount in USD 614000 | * |
|---|---|
| Indicate name of funder and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project since it started. Please enter each funding agent and their contributions separately | |
| Name of Funder Government of Norway | * |
| Amount in USD 380000 | * |
| 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 | * |

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*.

The project has seen initial signs of a catalytic impact in peacebuilding and social cohesion in South Libya. Behavioural change has been noticed in the engagements among citizens. For example:

1. The trained Peacebuilding Committee of Ubari engaged in joint planning with the neighbouring municipality of Bint Baya (which is being supported under another project). This allowed the two bodies to examine long standing resource conflicts and commit to implementing synergistic projects that will ensure that development in one municipality would complement and support the other – a significant shift from competition to cooperation. See more details in this publication.

Local Peacebuilding and Development Planning: Three Municipalities in Southern Libya Lead the Way, Enhancing Inclusivity within Communities | PEACEBUILDING.

- 2. The Women Salon Initiative, which targets vulnerable women, who are not usually involved in trainings and workshops, such as mothers including mothers of people with disabilities and unemployed women. For most participants, the event marked their first time engaging in an external activity. One participant from Ubari, expressed that: "we are under social pressure, with expectations to be perfect wives, mothers, cooks, housekeepers. I never socialized with other people and I understand now that I need time for myself and a space where I can be myself. I start coming to the salon and I see all these women willing to open [up] to each other and discuss personal and emotional experiences, I immediately felt a sense of belonging and I felt inspired to take over my life and focus on me!"
- 3. Another catalytic result is the story of Ghazala Muftah, a resilient woman from Sabha, who after a vocational and business skills training turned her passion for sewing into a means of empowerment after fleeing conflict. She honed her skills and established a tailoring business. Her journey illustrates not only personal determination but also peacebuilding, as her business creates job opportunities and fosters community resilience. By inspiring other women and promoting unity. Ghazala's efforts contribute to social cohesion and hope in a challenging environment. Read Ghazala's story here: Stitching Dreams: Ghazala Muftah's Journey from Sebha to Success | IOM Libya

The latter two cases demonstrate how the project has enhanced individual lives while promoting collective progress, thereby corroborating that when women are empowered, they become agents of change within their communities, contributing to resilience and hope in challenging environments.

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 steps outlined in the exit strategy remain relevant. To this effect and in relation to the peacebuilding local development plans, these were handed over to the Municipal Governments, which are expected to lead the implementation process. The Peacebuilding Local Development Committees (LPDCs) are expected to continue to function. It is recognized that the support for these committees would be critical to their continued existence. The project is examining the potential of the Community Development Departments (CDD) of the municipalities taking on a greater ownership role in the process. The CDD are represented on the LPDCs. These departments have recently received institutional strengthening support under another related project, which has equipped them for this role in leading the implementation of the plans. In addition, with funding from other donors, UNDP will continue to build the capacity of the LPDCs. UNDP's Funding Window will support additional interventions for the Sebha committee while the Government of Norway will support three additional Municipalities (not currently covered by the PBF). The lessons learnt among the different committees/municipalities, will be shared, and considered in the efforts to enhance the sustainability of these bodies.

In terms of the socio-economic initiatives, sustainability is streamlined under the umbrella of the Deraya programme. Deraya is a programme that is being implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Local Government, with funding from the PBF, EU, African Development Bank, USAID, United Kingdom and Government of Norway, across the country, including in the South. It is a part of UNDP's Local Peacebuilding and Resilience efforts, aimed at creating socio-economic opportunities for youth and vulnerable groups to promote sustainable growth in Libya, including the establishment of business incubators to provide on-going, post project interventions. Linkages is also created with the Entrepreneurial Offices of the municipalities, which houses the newly established business incubators, to facilitate post project follow ups, support and tracking of new start-ups and MSMEs.

The youth skills programme would continue under the Baity centres being established by UNICEF and the TVET programme is being mainstreamed into the programme of the Ministry of Labour in partnership with the Sebha Technical College.

Context analyses in the municipalities are being undertaken in partnership with EU, which has funded similar analyses since 2022 and is expected to continue to fund quarterly analyses beyond the PBF project.

While the tension monitoring platform developed under the project was not handed over to the MoLG, where it was expected to operate under the Ministry's call centre, the platform was finalized and further engagements with the MoLG is required. UNDP will continue to engage the MoLG towards the full utilization of the platform.

To discuss lessons learnt and recommendations from the Municipalities, the project will undertake a joint technical mission to the South as part of the end of programme activities.

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 | Interagency mission by Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General/Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator & Representatives of Agencies/Funds/Programmes including the four Recipient UN Organizations (RUNOs), took place on 27 February 2024. Another interagency mission, to be led by the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General/Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator and which will include participation from Heads of Agencies/Funds/Programmes is planned for 27 November 2024. | security stakeholders on the proposed UN hub in Sebha. | Mayors and Municipal Council representatives expressed gratitude to UN agencies for their work in advancing peacebuilding, facilitating economic recovery, and improving access to essential services, which have yielded tangible benefits for the communities in southern regions. UN agencies were urged to collaborate closely with the Entrepreneurship Office established at the local level to streamline all activities pertaining to business incubation and vocational training. The initially identified location for the UN Hub was no longer available. |
|---------|---|--|---|
| Event 2 | Joint UN Mission to Sebha including representatives from the RUNOs, the Resident Coordinator's office (RCO) and the UN Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) visited the Sebha municipality from 17 to 20 April 2024. | The mission met with the Municipal Council of Sebha and the Mayors and Peacebuilding Committees of Sebha, Ubari and Ghat. Visits were also made to events that were on-going under the project, such as the capacity building training for the Women Empowerment Office and the IOM supported Youth Employment One Stop Shop (YESS) centre. The UNSMIL arm of the mission conducted a security scoping of possible locations for the UN Hub. | Municipal councils expressed the need for more post project monitoring and follow ups to ensure that project interventions are sustained, e.g. trainees are engaged in employment or business. The PB Committees expressed uncertainty on the responsibility for monitoring and follow up on the implementation of the PB plans. Clarifications were thereafter provided. Mayors emphasized the need for continued consultations with the Municipal councils in the implementation of the PB plans, inclusion of youth in project related activities through the municipal youth empowerment offices. |
| Event 3 | Review of conflict analysis of target municipalities | Context Analysis were produced in September 2024, covering the period from April 2024 to July 2024, for the 3 municipalities. | Conflicts in Ghat are related to service-related grievances and access to resources and not from social discord. While Sebha's challenges are primarily due to rule of law, tribal and social disputes, economic interest, issues of citizenship and identity and political division. In Ubari, tribal rivalries, political ambitions, and strategic economic interests are the primary drivers of conflicts. A number of recommendations for consideration and programming were put forward and remain an integral part of the decision making under the project. |

| Event 4 | Project's monthly monitoring and coordination meetings – most recent meeting held on 9 June 2024. | Project's monthly monitoring and coordination meetings – most recent meeting held on 9 June 2024. | Tranche 2 funding was received in March 2024. The delivery plus commitment under the project is 76%. A decision to re-allocate the funding earmarked for the Sebha hub was taken. While meeting in June 2024 did not confirm the need for a No Cost Extension, this decision was subsequently taken and an NCE was approved in November 2024. Challenges and mitigation measures which remain relevant are: - Requirements of security actors for permission to access/engage stakeholders caused delays, especially. in Peacebuilding Plans. Implementing partners are urged to comply with the requirements of the authorities Delays in the identification of a building for the TVET centre - the building that was initially identified became unavailable. This caused delays in the support for introduction of the Government certified TVET programme. An alternative space was found and the rehabilitation works are on-going Litigation on the plot of land assigned by the municipality of Sebha for construction of the market. A new plot had to be identified and construction is expected to commence by December 2024. |
|---------|---|--|--|
| Event 5 | Monitoring visits by Community Mobilizers | Community mobilizers' attendance at events such as the peacebuilding committee training, town halls and other events. | This allows for community mobilizers to have a first-hand experience of what is working, what risks exist and need to be addressed, etc. |
| Event 6 | Regular follow up visits in Sabha, Ubari and Ghat | RUNOs consultants and implementing partners are actively engaged in on-site visits and collaborating closely with government agencies and other partners to facilitate their effective coordination and follow-up of crucial activities on the ground. | Periodic reports are provided by implementing partners highlighting achievements, challenges, risk and related mitigating strategies. Periodic meetings also took place between RUNOs and Implementing Partners to discuss and navigate the implementation of project activities. |
| Event 7 | Low profile mission | UNICEF team conducted a low-profile mission to the south including Sabha, Ubari and Ghat. | The mission met with municipal councils, the officials, and partners to monitor the project progress, and talk about challenges. |
| Event 8 | | | |

Final Steps

- Please save a PDF copy of the form by clicking on the *Printer* icon on the top right corner of the nage
- 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 <u>gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org</u>

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