

PBF November 2025 Project Progress Report



**PEACEBUILDING
FUND** 

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Thank you for taking the time to complete the PBF Progress report. For projects with more than one recipient, please consult among co-recipients prior to filling out the form to ensure collaboration on the responses. If you have any questions or require technical assistance in filling out the form, please send an email to gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org

Click Next below to start

» Report Submission

Type of report *

- ☐ Semi-annual
- ☒ Annual
- ☐ Final
- ☐ Other

Date of submission of report *

2025-11-18

Name and title of person submitting the report *

Jelena Miljanic

E-mail of person submitting the report *

jelena.miljanic@undp.org

Name and title of person who approved the report *

Ekaterina Paniklova, Resident Representative UNDP Montenegro; Michele Servadei, Representative UNICEF Montenegro; Sinisa Sesum, Head of Antenna Office in Sarajevo, UNESCO Regional Bureau for Science and Culture in Europe

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

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

You should normally ensure that the PBF Secretariat or the PBF focal point have an opportunity to review.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not Applicable

» Project Information and Geographical Scope

Is this a cross-border project? *

- ☐ Yes ☒ No

Please select the geographical region in which the project is implemented

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

Country of project implementation *

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

Other, please specify *

Project Title *

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please select the countries where this project is being implemented *

Other, Please specify *

Project Start Date (Date of first transfer) *

2024-01-10

Project End Date *

2026-01-07

Has this project received an extension? *

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

Will this project be requesting an extension? *

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

Will this project be submitting a Fund Transfer Request (FTR) in the next six months? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If so, around which month do you expect to submit the request? *

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> January | <input type="radio"/> February | <input type="radio"/> March |
| <input type="radio"/> April | <input type="radio"/> May | <input type="radio"/> June |
| <input type="radio"/> July | <input type="radio"/> August | <input type="radio"/> September |
| <input type="radio"/> October | <input type="radio"/> November | <input type="radio"/> December |

Is the current project end date within 6 months? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, please select which *

- ☐ National Trust Fund
- ☐ Regional Trust Fund

Recipients

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

- ☒ UN entity
- ☐ Non-UN Entity

Please select the convening agency recipient *

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

Other, Please specify

*

Are there other recipients for this project?

*

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

Please select other UN recipients

*

Select all that apply

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

Other, Please specify

*

Please select other non-UN recipients *

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

Other, Please specify *

Implementing Partners

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money **since the project's start** ?

12

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money **during this calendar period** ?

*(for June reports: January-June;
for November reports: January-December (anticipated);
for final reports: full project duration)*

12

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

national CSO active in the areas of youth, social protection, human rights

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Juventas

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

153300.36

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

125218

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

105218

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Implementation of the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab (UNDP-led activities) (Activity 1.1.3.), Implementation of activity 1.2.3 and 1.1.2 led by UNICEF - capacitating children and adolescents for participation and empowerment consisting of capacity building activities and peer to peer workshop for child and adolescents meaningful participation in identifying and preventing social cohesion threats, divisive narratives and hate speech for elementary and high school students as well as online survey among parents, dialogue with decision makers and producing Children Manifest on Social Cohesion

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☒ Other

Other, Please specify

University

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

University of Montenegro

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

64195

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start?** *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

19800

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

19800

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Introduction of a comprehensive Media and Information Literacy concept in schools and support establishment of the Resource Centre for Media and Information Literacy; Support academia-facilitated thematic dialogue platforms between students and diverse social actors; Strengthen the capacities of the media through the concept of solution journalism; (Activities 1.2.2, 2.2.4, 2.2.3)

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Prazan prostor/Empty space

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

29975.6

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

29975.6

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

29975.6

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period. *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

The implementing partner will organize "Connections", a youth artistic residency fostering dialogue, empathy and creative expression among young people from diverse communities in Montenegro. (Activity 2.2.4)

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Bureau for Education

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

28400

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

28400

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

19900

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Bureau for Education organizes Socio-Emotional skills delivery to children in primary schools and teacher training as part of activity 1.1.3

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

National CSO working with children

What is the name of the Implementing Partner

Centar za prava djeteta/Centre for Child Rights

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner?

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

69340

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start?**

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

69340

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

34340

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

The Centre for Child Rights supports the implementation of activities 1.2.3 (violence prevention programmes) and 1.1.2 (capacitating children and adolescents for meaningful civic and political participation)

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
☐ National women's and youth CSO
☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
☐ Other

Other, Please specify

National CSO working on civic education, democratic development

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Centar za gradjansko obrazovanje/Centre for Civic Education

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

41100

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

41100

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

41100

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

They support activity 1.1.3 aimed at building coalition and broad partnerships towards embedding human rights approach in education system reform and mandatory civic education subject in school curricula.

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

National CSO workign with parents and other actors on child rights

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Roditelji/Parents

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

8397.51

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start?** *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

8397.51

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

1397.51

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

They provided mapping services for the development of inputs to the Education Reform Strategy (activity 1.1.3) and also supports NGO Juventas in activity 1.1.2.

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

NGO to Improve Relations between Media and Youth

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

8890.09

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

8890.09

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

8890.09

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Supporting UNICEF Young Reporters (activity 1.2.4) - Development of social media stories, photos and videos covering UNICEF activities with children and adolescents

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

Association of Mediators

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Association of Mediators

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

40000

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

24481.35

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

24481.35

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Increasing capacities in a peaceful conflict resolution through a number of training of association of mediators as part of activity 1.1.3.

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

10

Other, Please specify

What is the name of the Implementing Partner

Office of the Ombudsman

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner?

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

29000

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**?

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

16304.68

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

16304.68

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Strengthening institutional capacity and mechanisms for research and independent monitoring of hate speech, violence, divisive narratives, reviewing ethical codes of conduct of national and local parliaments and political parties, and fostering child civic and political participation (Activity 2.1.3).

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
- ☐ National women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
- ☐ Other

Other, Please specify

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Association of Scouts

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

80000

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

80000

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

80000

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Support to Social Cohesion Innovation Lab Activities led by UNICEF (1.2.3).

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar 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
☐ National women's and youth CSO
☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
☐ Other

Other, Please specify

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

Institute for Social and Child Protection

What is the planned total amount (in USD) for the **overall duration of the project** to be disbursed to this implementing partner? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

15000

What is the total amount (in USD) disbursed to the implementing partner **since the project's start**? *

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

15000

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

Please use a dot (.) as decimal separator, instead of a comma (,)

15000

Briefly describe the main activities carried out by the Implementing Partner during this calendar period *

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Strengthening capacity for violence prevention programmes, Activities 1.1.3 and 1.2.3.

Financial Reporting

» Delivery by Recipient

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

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

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

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

Recipients	Total Project Budget (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars</i>	Transfers to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars</i>	Expenditure to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars</i>	Implementation rate as a percentage of total budget (calculated automatically)
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme	1157875	1157875	849336	73.35%
				%
UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund	1025595	1025595	707793	69.01%

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizatio n	<div><div></div><div>378459</div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div>378459</div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div>190874</div><div></div></div>	50.43%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%
	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	%

	*	*	*	%
TOTAL	2561929	2561929	1748003	68.23%

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **68.23%**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

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

» Gender-responsive Budgeting

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

41.96

The dollar amount of the budget contributing to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) based on percentage entered above and total project budget is **US \$ 1074985.41**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

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

Amount expended to date on efforts contributing to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US \$ 733462.06**. Is this correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

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

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE. *

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

Financial Report Nov 2025_UNICEF_UNESCO_UNDP (2)-13_34_21.xlsx



Project Markers

Please select the Gender Marker Associated with this project *

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

Please select the Risk Marker Associated with this project *

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

Please select the PBF Focus Area associated with this project *

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

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

Select all that apply

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

Steering Committee and Government engagement

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The Programme Steering Committee has held its second meeting on 11 March 2025.

In accordance with project document and the JSC ToR, the Steering Committee was co-chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator and representative of the Prime Minister's Office of the Government of Montenegro. In addition to the co-chairs, the other Steering Committee members - Representatives of the participating UN Agencies in Montenegro - UNDP, UNESCO and UNICEF participated in the meeting. The second Steering Committee meeting served as a key platform to review programme progress and set the course for the upcoming year. During the session, members adopted the programme progress report, the 2025 Work Plan and the Joint Communication Strategy. The committee was also introduced to the Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Learning (MEL) plan, reiterating the importance of the sound and innovative tools and approaches for impact assessment, and, equally important, capturing and leveraging learning and knowledge. The Steering Committee approved the expansion of project activities to include the municipality of Cetinje. Recognizing the programme's relevance and impact, the Committee expressed strong support for its continuation. The Steering Committee granted approval for the preparation of the No-Cost Extension Request and the Concept note for the continuation of the project. The discussion highlighted priority areas for the next phase, including addressing hate speech, enhancing critical thinking and media literacy of young people, promoting citizen participation in decision-making and tackling violence, particularly online and gender-based violence.

Please provide a brief description of any engagement that the project has had with the government over the last 6 months. Please indicate what level of government the project has been engaging with.

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The project closely engages with the national and local authorities, state institutions and organisations.

The presentation of KAP Survey and citizen dialogues on social cohesion gathered over 40 representatives from the Ministries of Sports and Youth, Education, Culture, Human and Minority Rights, Interior and others-as well as the Prime Minister's and President's offices, the Ombudsperson and UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO, RCO, providing evidence-based insights for national policy development and strengthening collaboration between government institutions and the UN to build community trust and resilience.

UNDP organized the National Dialogue with participation of the Prime Minister's Office and several national ministries and institutions. UNDP also cooperated with the Government of Montenegro in integrating outcomes of the Local Dialogues into the National Strategy on Gender Equality and its Action Plan.

UNICEF and UNDP engaged with the Institution of the Protector of Human Rights, building their capacities on international standards on social cohesion and capacities to monitor and respond on the risks to social cohesion, including hate speech, divisive narrative and violence, reviewing ethical codes of conduct of national and local parliaments and political parties and fostering child and adolescents civic and political participation UNDP and UNICEF have engaged with the Institution of the Protector of Human Rights, building their capacities to monitor and respond on the risks to social cohesion, including hate speech.

With UNESCO's support, the Faculty of Political Sciences at the University of Montenegro accredited its Media and Information Literacy (MIL) programme under the Center for Vocational Trainings, while an application to the Bureau for Education Services aims to extend MIL training to primary and secondary school teachers, integrating media literacy into the national education system.

Through the regional network-the Council of Ministers of Culture of Southeast Europe (CoMoCoSEE)-UNESCO advanced regional cooperation in arts education, leading to a July 2025 Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministries of Culture and Education to integrate arts education into national policies. UNESCO supports both ministries in developing school-based arts education programmes.

In partnership with the Ministry of Culture and Media, Central National Library "Đurđe Crnojević", Administration for the Protection of Cultural Properties, Municipality of Cetinje, Cabinet of the President, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Foundation Petrović Njegoš, UNESCO launched the Stone for Peace project to celebrate Cetinje's heritage and anti-war legacy, promoting culture as a driver of peace and social cohesion.

PART I: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS

NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

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

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

Contracting of partners *

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

Staff Recruitment *

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

Collection of baselines *

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

Identification of beneficiaries *

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

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

All staff contracting activities have been completed, alongside the identification of beneficiaries and the collection and analysis of baseline data. Partner contracting is finalized.

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

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

- ☒ Yes
 ☐ No

If no, please provide an explanation *

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Project progress summary

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

To empower communities for dialogue and resilience to divisive narratives, UNDP supported 60 leaders to strengthen and multiply skills in social cohesion, prevention of hate speech and gender-based violence. UNICEF enhanced civic structures for children and youth, forming Children's Parliaments with 187 children in five towns. They further mobilized 2,000+ peers through community actions and dialogue, boosting their civic competence. Peer education model trained 120 adolescents to facilitate discussions on hate speech and civic participation across schools. UNESCO trained and mentored 17 young journalists in solution-oriented journalism, shifting media focus from sensationalism to stories that build trust, inspire change and promote civic engagement. UNESCO empowered 30 youth to harness creativity for intercultural and intergenerational dialogue. Artistic workshops led to public performances, raising awareness and fostering public dialogue on diversity and mutual understanding.

UNICEF and Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation trained 206 teachers in socio-emotional learning (SEL) across 100+ schools, reaching 46,000 students with skills in empathy, tolerance, communication. SEL is integrated in the Montenegro's 10-year education strategy, while strengthening mediation capacities of six primary schools. UNICEF develops a civic education curriculum, informed by input from 400+ children, parents, teachers, NGOs and academics, who strongly advocate for its introduction as a regular subject in schools. UNESCO piloted Media Information Literacy (MIL) in four primary and secondary schools. To ensure sustainability, MIL is being accredited as part of standardized teacher training, building long-term resilience to hate speech and disinformation. UNICEF trained social welfare professionals in conflict sensitivity, followed up by supporting 130 vulnerable children and 76 parents with tailored services.

UNDP convened local dialogues on social cohesion in Ulcinj, Pljevlja and Podgorica, engaging 264 citizens-women, men, youth, children and those often unheard - such as elderly, Roma, people with disabilities, migrants. Dialogues served to collaboratively identify challenges and co-create solutions for social cohesion. To deepen youth engagement, UNESCO involved 225 university students in Academic Dialogues to challenge divisive narratives and rebuild trust between youth and institutions. Dialogues surfaced key threats to social cohesion, including hate speech, low trust in institutions, polarisation, violence, discrimination, biased media, inequality.

In response to citizen recommendations stemming from Dialogues Platform, all local governments-with UNDP support-developed Social Cohesion Pledges. These strategic documents institutionalize priorities identified through dialogues. Local assemblies of four municipalities adopted pledges with action plans to combat hate speech, discrimination and polarization, strengthen institutional trust and improve service accessibility. To elevate local voices, a National Dialogue on social cohesion gathered 120 citizens and institutions. The dialogue produced policy recommendations for a national Social Cohesion Pledge, calling for united action against hate speech, discrimination and violence. Participants urged inclusive decision-making, dialogue platforms, participatory budgeting and regular consultation with children, youth and vulnerable groups. UNICEF and UNESCO have supported children, adolescents and youth to meaningfully participate in the local and national dialogues on social cohesion.

To build citizen agency, the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab supported citizen-driven solutions to address challenges recognised through dialogues. UNICEF supported 40 adolescents to develop 10 innovative solutions - five of which were funded to address violence, mental health, environmental issues and public space use. More than 1000 adolescents are involved through the supported initiatives. UNDP supported 24 citizen groups to design local actions, with 16 funded to counter hate speech, rebuild trust, promote gender equality and inclusion.

To institutionalize innovative dialogue practices, UNDP trained municipalities in dialogue methodology. Strengthening these skills is critical for ensuring the sustainability of dialogue mechanisms, enabling municipalities to independently manage participatory processes, translate dialogue outcomes into policies and actions and maintain continuous, trust-based engagement with communities. The approach supports long-term resilience and positions local governments as key drivers of social cohesion and inclusive governance. In partnership with the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, UNDP strengthened capacities of gender equality focal points in 42 institutions, boosting gender-sensitive policymaking and support for women's public participation. UNDP supports the Institution of Protector of Human Rights in monitoring hate speech to identify emerging risks and shape policy responses. With UNICEF, the Institution is strengthening links of human rights and social cohesion, improving its use of international standards underpinning social cohesion, reviewing public officials' codes of conduct and analysing the state of discrimination, hate speech, and hate crimes. The Institution's children participation mechanism is empowered for meaningful civic participation. UNESCO supports the Ministry of Culture and Media in creating a National Media Network to combat hate speech and disinformation. In partnership with

and media in creating a national media network to combat hate speech and disinformation. In partnership with this ministry, Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation and local stakeholders, UNESCO implements Arts Education programme in Montenegrin schools. This programme uses cultural practice to help children and youth develop creativity, critical thinking and intercultural understanding. By promoting cultural diversity and dialogue, the initiative strengthens empathy, civic responsibility and youth participation in cultural life.

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

Youth-focused activities prioritized participation and empowerment, enabling young people to actively shape their communities and co-create solutions for social cohesion. As agents of peace and democratic development, they build resilience against hate speech and violence, while developing the skills and agency to prevent and counter these harmful trends through peer education and leadership in local initiatives. Adolescents and youth with fewer opportunities were systematically included in civic engagement efforts such as children's parliaments and peer educator networks.

Youth and women were central to social cohesion dialogues, influencing both insights and outcomes. Local and national dialogues emphasized women, adolescent and youth participation and addressed the challenges they face. Their recommendations are reflected in the Local Social Cohesion Pledges adopted by municipalities and are being integrated into the National Social Cohesion Pledge, impacting policies and programmes. Youth and women voices shaped advocacy efforts to introduce civic education in schools and influenced National Education Strategy. Participation of youth and women was further amplified through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab, which ensured their leadership in developing local solutions.

The programme advances the Youth, Peace and Security agenda by promoting meaningful youth participation, especially from marginalised groups, in intergenerational dialogue and policymaking. Civic and peacebuilding skills are embedded in both non-formal education and formal education reforms. Youth-led structures - such as Children's Parliaments and youth groups working with the Protector of Human Rights - are reinforced to support participation and accountability. The Innovation Lab provided space and funding for youth to lead actions that counter divisive narratives and peer violence, strengthen civic space and trust and promote social cohesion, directly contributing to YPS goals. Through art, culture and media, UNESCO promotes evidence-based, youth-centered approaches that enhance inclusive civic engagement and build a more resilient, cohesive society.

The programme supports the Women, Peace and Security agenda by promoting meaningful participation of women - especially those from marginalized and intersectionally vulnerable groups. Empowerment through skill-building, civic engagement and leadership helps dismantle structural barriers to public and social participation. Strong representation of girls and women across teams and projects reinforces the programme's role in translating WPS commitments into practical, community-driven solutions. Initiatives supported through the Lab empower women - including Roma women, women with disabilities, elderly - by providing vocational training, improving employability, fostering intercultural exchange between local and migrant communities and enabling intergenerational cooperation.

Is the project 1+ year in implementation?

☒ Yes

☐ No

FOR PROJECTS 1+ YEAR IN IMPLEMENTATION ONLY:

Is the project demonstrating outcome-level peacebuilding results?

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please provide concrete examples of such peacebuilding results

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Local communities across Montenegro-especially children, youth, women and marginalized groups-are emerging as proactive agents of social cohesion, collaborative action and resilience. The programme shows that trust and commitment to the common good can be built through empowerment, innovation, inclusive dialogue and meaningful participation of all, including underrepresented voices. Through platforms like Local and National Social Cohesion Dialogues and Pledges, Innovation Lab, children parliaments and academic forums, diverse voices now shape community priorities and decision-making. These efforts mark a fundamental shift from prevailing interaction of institutions and citizens to active, collective responsibility for dialogue, trust, development and social cohesion.

Dialogues and citizen-led initiatives are proving effective in countering hate speech and fostering solidarity across ethnic, gender and generational lines. Communities identified key challenges-hate speech, discrimination, access to services, peer violence, polarization and lack of trust-and proposed visions rooted in equality, inclusion, respect, positive narratives and sustainable development. Citizens are calling for open institutions, active civic life and a shared future.

Solutions from the Lab reflect lived realities and highlight the need for continued investment in social cohesion. Participants remained engaged post-dialogue, co-creating solutions and anchoring a culture of civic participation. This is strengthening ongoing engagement and community ownership. Lab-supported actions address hate speech, polarisation, access to services, inclusion, migrant integration, public space use, civic participation, brain drain, mental health, gender inequality, digital exclusion, environmental degradation and intergenerational fragmentation. These form a strategic portfolio of community-driven interventions designed to foster inclusive participation, civic agency and public trust.

What unites these initiatives is their emphasis on inclusive local ownership and bottom-up approaches. They are organic responses to gaps identified in participatory dialogues-not externally imposed, reflecting co-creation, intersectionality and strategic use of shared spaces to promote connection and belonging.

At the institutional level, the programme embeds inclusive and gender-responsive governance through capacity building and systemic reforms. Uptake of dialogue recommendations into local Pledges with concrete policy measures, the national gender equality strategy, socio-emotional learning in education and a new civic education curriculum are tangible steps toward institutionalizing social cohesion and peace principles.

Dialogues showcased co-creation and accountability-institutions sat with citizens to co-create people-centered solutions, increasing responsiveness and trust. Full embrace and institutionalisation of the dialogues, Local Social Cohesion Pledges and support for citizen-led action demonstrate local ownership and commitment to the long-term change. All adopted Local Social Cohesion Pledges (towns of Ulcinj, Bar and Bijelo Polje, with Podgorica to be adopted in December) institutionalize local dialogues on social cohesion, social cohesion councils or coordination bodies and establishing Day of Common Good. Pledges include measures addressing hate speech, peer violence, polarization, discrimination, inclusion, access to services and cultural, environmental and infrastructure needs. They also recognize the private sector's role in social cohesion, ensuring intersectoral approaches. This reflects growing local ownership and accountability in advancing inclusive governance.

By linking grassroots voices with formal institutions through dialogues, pledges, youth advisory bodies, education, cultural, human rights and gender equality policies, the programme creates sustainable feedback loops, boosts accountability and embeds resilience in governance systems.

The Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms and selected civil society organizations are better equipped to identify and respond to hate speech and exclusion. Curricula promoting peace-related skills are integrated into reforms and long-term policy agendas, reflecting structural transformation toward inclusive, responsive institutions and building trust and accountability across society. By integrating socio-emotional learning into the national 10-year education strategy and training teachers, the programme ensures that empathy, tolerance and communication skills reach tens of thousands of students sustainably. The civic education curriculum - shaped by broad stakeholder input - promises to institutionalize democratic values and active citizenship. Meanwhile, accrediting Media Information Literacy in teacher training and equipping social welfare professionals with conflict sensitivity skills strengthens systemic responses to hate speech, disinformation and social exclusion.

The programme reflects the New Agenda for Peace through inclusive, people-centered dialogue platforms, civic

The programme reflects the new Agenda for Peace through inclusive, people-centered dialogue platforms, socio-emotional learning and community-led initiatives addressing hate speech, polarization and institutional distrust-contributing to sustainable peace and resilient communities. It advances the Pact for the Future by embedding civic participation, social cohesion and gender equality into reforms and strategies. Core YPS pillars-participation, prevention and partnerships are addressed through youth engagement in policymaking, peer-led education and the Innovation Lab. The programme embodies the WPS agenda by ensuring women's participation in civic dialogues, empowering marginalized women through leadership and skills-building and embedding gender-sensitive governance through institutional capacity building.

These efforts collectively ensure that the Joint programme is not a one-off intervention but a durable, community-anchored process with institutional ownership and long-term policy alignment.

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

Sources of evidence-12_1_12.docx

PART II: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

How many OUTCOMES does this project have *

1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ more than 5.

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

Outcome 1: *

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

Outcome 2: *

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

Outcome 3: *

Outcome 4: *

Outcome 5:	*
Outcome 6:	*
Outcome 7:	*
Outcome 8:	*
Additional Outcomes <i>If the project has more than 8 outcomes, please enumerate the remaining outcomes here</i>	*

INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments, provide an update on the achievement of all **outcome** and **output** indicators in the table below.

- Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation.
- Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (500 characters max per entry)

» **Outcome 1: Diverse social groups in targeted communities are empowered and actively engage in dialogue to contribute to building a shared vision of the common good, public trust, respect for diversity and resilience to divisive narratives and violence.**

O C 1	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
1. 1	The level of meaningful participation of rights holders, especially women and discriminated groups, in selected public processes, supported by the UN (local and national dialogues)	level 2, as defined by global framework of mandatory UN indicators	level 3, as defined by global framework of mandatory UN indicators	n/a	n/a	Progress will be calculated at the end of the project.
1. 2	The level of trust in meaningfulness of participation in dialogue platforms disaggregated by sex and age	55,3% have high trust 40,3% moderate trust 4,4 low trust On average, men reported 2,86 - medium trust, as well as women - 2,81 . Adults on average report higher trust (2.98), then children (2.68).	10pp improvement	n/a	n/a	Progress will be calculated at the end of the project.

1. 3	The level of respect for diversity and ability to recognize hate speech and violence disaggregated by sex and age	<p>High level for respect – 95,7% of beneficiaries</p> <p>Medium level for respect – 3,6%</p> <p>Low level for respect – 0,7 %</p> <p>Male – avarage score 3.57 (high)</p> <p>Female – average score 3.65 (high)</p> <p>Adults – 3.64 (high level)</p> <p>Children – 3.61 (high level)</p> <p>High level of ability to recognize hate speech and violance - 83,5 %</p> <p>Medium - 15,4%</p> <p>Low – 1%</p> <p>Male – avarage score 3.57 (high)</p> <p>Female – 3.65 (high)</p> <p>Adults – 3.64 (high)</p> <p>Children – 3.61 (high)</p>	10pp improvement	n/a	n/a	Progress will be calculated at the end of the project.
---------	--	--	------------------	-----	-----	--

1. 4	The level of interpersonal trust and solidarity in the society	<p>High level of interpersonal trust and solidarity – 25,0%</p> <p>Medium level – 59,8%</p> <p>Low level – 15,3%</p> <p>Male – average score 2.43 (medium)</p> <p>Female – average score 2.40 (medium)</p> <p>Adults – 2,35 (medium level)</p> <p>Children – 2,46 (medium level)</p>	10pp improvement	n/a	n/a	Progress will be calculated at the end of the project.
1. 5	The percentage of people feeling: Engaged/Valued/Heard	<p>83,2% do not feel engaged/valued/heard (by institutions)</p> <p>16,8% feel engaged/valued/heard (by institutions)</p> <p>WOMEN (above 18years old):10,7% feel engaged, 89,3% do not</p> <p>MEN (above 18 years old): 17,6% feel engaged, 82,4% do not</p> <p>GIRLS: 17% feel engaged, 83% do not feed engaged</p> <p>BOYS:27,9% feel engaged, 72, 1% no not feel engaged</p>	10pp improvement	n/a	n/a	Progress will be calculated at the end of the project.

How many outputs does outcome 1 have?

1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 1

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

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

» Output 1.1: Improved capacities of children, adolescents, young people and women, for meaningful civic engagement and inclusive dialogue, upholding and advancing human rights and countering violence, hate speech and divisive narratives

1. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 1. 1	The number of participants with capacities for meaningful civic engagement, advancing and safeguarding human rights and gender equality, disaggregated by age and sex	0	50 adult members of the general population and 500 young people and adolescents, with at least 50% female participants	35 people, 20% male, 80% female 2322 adolescents (56% girls, 44% boys)	60 adults (80% womenfemale, 20% male) 2370 adolescents (55% girls, 45% boys)	
1. 1. 2	Number of actors capable of delivering socio-emotional skills programmes and Parenting for lifelong health program, disaggregated by sex	0	20 new facilitators 125 teachers, with at least 50% female actors	206 teachers (60%+ women)	206 teachers (60%+ women)	

1. 1. 3	Number of actors trained through Socio-emotional skills and Parenting for lifelong health program, disaggregated by sex	0	300 parents and 300 adolescents, with at least 50% female actors	46,399 adolescents (23,372 boys and 23,027 girls)	51 parents 46,457 adolescents (49.6% girls, 51.4% boys)	Due to the close cooperation with the Ministry of Education and the alignment with the ongoing education reform, the teacher training on socio-emotional learning was fast-tracked and implemented immediately in classrooms. This allowed the program to reach over 40,000 adolescents far exceeding the initial target of 300-as the state efficiently integrated the new practices into the education system much faster than anticipated.
1. 1. 4	Number of educational institutions to have successfully integrated the MIL concept across curricula to increase critical thinking and build resilience of young people on divisive narratives and the consequent challenges	0	MIL fully integrated in 13 schools in targeted locations	0	0	A pilot training was conducted with teachers from four schools, while full implementation is pending official accreditation of the tailored Media and Information Literacy (MIL) programme by the Ministry of Education.

1. 1. 5						
---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

» **Output 1.2: Targeted groups and communities participate in creating a shared vision for the common good through local and national dialogue platforms**

1. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>

1. 2. 1	The number of people actively involved in dialogue and contributing to promoting civic space and dialogue, addressing hate speech, violence and divisive narratives, aggregated by age and sex	0	<p>- 300 people with at least 50% female participants (UNDP dialogues)</p> <p>- 200 academia representatives and young people actively engaged in academia-facilitated thematic dialogues, with at least 50% female participants (UNESCO Dialogues)</p> <p>-At least 50 decisionmakers, CSO representatives, citizens etc participating in National Dialogues</p> <p>- 5,000 children, adolescents and young people empowered through UPSHIFT and the Young Reporters platform in five communities, at least 50% of whom are girls (UNICEF UPSHIFT)</p>	<p>384 people, 62% female participants (UNDP local dialogues)</p> <p>225 academia representatives and young people (82% women)</p> <p>120 participants in national dialogue (60% women, 40% men)</p> <p>- 2137 children, adolescents and young people empowered (595% girls)</p>		
---------------	---	----------	---	--	--	--

1. 2. 2	Number of Local social cohesion pledges/plans budgeted and funding sources identified and proposals for scale up developed	0	5	5	5	
1. 2. 3	The number of community projects and pilot initiatives which contribute to the implementation of local social cohesion action plans/recommendations from dialogues supported by the SCIL	0	10, of which at least a third support initiatives with a gender dimension	21 (18 have gender dimension)	21 (18 have gender dimension)	
1. 2. 4	Number of Social innovation lab ideas supported by LSGs, international partners, private sector	0	5	4	4	
1. 2. 5						

» Output 1.3:

1. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 3. 1						
1. 3. 2						
1. 3. 3						
1. 3. 4						
1. 3. 5						

» Output 1.4:

1. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 4. 1						
1. 4. 2						
1. 4. 3						
1. 4. 4						
1. 4. 5						

» Output 1.5:

1. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 5. 1						
1. 5. 2						
1. 5. 3						
1. 5. 4						
1. 5. 5						

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

O C 2	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
2. 1	The number of adopted social cohesion pledges	0	6	4	4	
2. 2	The level of trust that the institutions targeted by the programme will respond to citizens' recommendations	High level of trust that institutions will respond – 14,1% Medium level – 65% Low level – 20,9% Male – average score 2.23 (medium) Female – average score 2.20 (medium) Adults – 2.14 (medium level) Children – 2.43 (medium level)	10 pp improvement	n/a	n/a	Progress will be calculated at the end of the project
2. 3						
2. 4						
2. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 2 have?

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

Please list all outputs for outcome 2

Output 2.1

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

Output 2.2

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

Output 2.3

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

Output 2.4

Output 2.5

Other Outputs

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

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

» **Output 2.1: Local and national institutions facilitate inclusive, people-centred dialogue to adopt Social Cohesion Pledges and effectively implement and oversee human rights and social cohesion policies and measures that respond to the recommendations and solutions identified through dialogues.**

2. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 1. 1	The number of local and national institutions with increased capacities for participatory development, adoption and implementation of social cohesion pledges involved in local and national dialogues.	0	10	15	15	

2. 1. 2	The number of staff members of the Protector's office and CSO representatives capacitated to make more strategic use of regional and UN human rights mechanisms for prevention and consolidated action fostering social cohesion	0	10	17	17	
2. 1. 3	Progress made in establishing a comprehensive and effective monitoring system for hate speech online	Monitoring hate speech primarily relies on reported or publicly known incidents	100% - Robust system for hate speech monitoring established, for regular scanning and analysis of online media and social networks	20%	80%	Company to monitor hate speech and consultant to support the process engaged. The first monitoring report was produced for the period July-August 2025 and the process will be continued throughout the end of the year.
2. 1. 4						
2. 1. 5						

» **Output 2.2: Public narrative and policymaking informed with evidence and latest knowledge on social cohesion threats and public trust in institutions and countering divisive narratives, hate speech and violence**

2. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 2. 1	Number of people reached through the communication campaign	0	5000	30000	30000	
2. 2. 2	The number of journalists applying the principles of solution journalism to produce reliable reports that foster public understanding, trust, consensus-building, civic engagement and prevent conflicts.	0	30 (20 students of media and journalism studies and 10 journalists), with at least 50% female participants	17 (82% female participants)	17 (82% female participants)	Following the completion of the training sessions, the mentorship phase is currently in progress, guiding participants in applying their newly acquired skills.
2. 2. 3						
2. 2. 4						

2. 2. 5						
---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

» Output 2.3: Capacity building of targeted institutions to ensure girls' and women's public and political participation and to help counter hate speech, sexism, misogyny and any backlash related to gender equality

2. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 3. 1	The number of decision makers and opinion makers with enhanced capacities for countering the normalization of gender-based hate speech, sexism and misogyny and advocating for the important role of women in politics and peace and security disaggregated by sex	0	50, at least 50% of whom are male	Decision makers - 49 people, 20,4% male participants	Decision makers - 49 people, 20,4% male participants	The training targeted designated contact persons from state institutions responsible for gender equality. Hence m/f ratio could not be controlled.
2. 3. 2						
2. 3. 3						
2. 3. 4						

2. 3. 5						
.....

» Output 2.4:

2. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
.....
2. 4. 1						
.....
2. 4. 2						
.....
2. 4. 3						
.....
2. 4. 4						
.....
2. 4. 5						
.....

» Output 2.5:

2. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 5. 1						
2. 5. 2						
2. 5. 3						
2. 5. 4						
2. 5. 5						

» Outcome 3:

O C 3	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
3. 1						
3. 2						
3. 3						
3. 4						
3. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 3 have?

1

2

3

4

5

more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 3

Output 3.1

Output 3.2

Output 3.3

Output 3.4
Output 3.5
Other Outputs <i>If Outcome 3 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here</i>

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

» Output 3.1:

3. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3.1.1						
3.1.2						
3.1.3						
3.1.4						
3.1.5						

» Output 3.2:

3. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 2. 1						
3. 2. 2						
3. 2. 3						
3. 2. 4						
3. 2. 5						

» Output 3.3:

3. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 3. 1						
3. 3. 2						
3. 3. 3						
3. 3. 4						
3. 3. 5						

» Output 3.4:

3. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 4. 1						
3. 4. 2						
3. 4. 3						
3. 4. 4						
3. 4. 5						

» Output 3.5:

3. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 5. 1						
3. 5. 2						
3. 5. 3						
3. 5. 4						
3. 5. 5						

» Outcome 4:

O C 4	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
4. 1						
4. 2						
4. 3						
4. 4						
4. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 4 have?

1

2

3

4

5

more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 4

Output 4.1

Output 4.2

Output 4.3

Output 4.4
Output 4.5
Other Outputs <i>If Outcome 4 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here</i>

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

» Output 4.1:

4. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4.1.1						
4.1.2						
4.1.3						
4.1.4						
4.1.5						

» Output 4.2:

4. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 2. 1						
4. 2. 2						
4. 2. 3						
4. 2. 4						
4. 2. 5						

» Output 4.3:

4. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 3. 1						
4. 3. 2						
4. 3. 3						
4. 3. 4						
4. 3. 5						

» Output 4.4:

4. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 4. 1						
4. 4. 2						
4. 4. 3						
4. 4. 4						
4. 4. 5						

» Output 4.5:

4. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 5. 1						
4. 5. 2						
4. 5. 3						
4. 5. 4						
4. 5. 5						
If the project has more than 4 outcomes, use this space to describe progress on progress on indicators for the remaining outcomes						

PART III: Cross-Cutting Issues

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

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

Events	Event Description	Tentative Date	Location	Target Audience	Event Objectives (900 characters)
Event 1	Initiative to establish stone park in Cetinje	Q1 2026	Cetinje, Montenegro	Wide public	The initiative will be centered on the creation of a symbolic urban intervention involving the donation of stones from countries around the world, each representing a gesture of peace and unity. These stones will be integrated into a single public monument that will stand as a global tribute to peace, celebrating diversity and promoting mutual understanding across nations.
Event 2	Award ceremony for Solution Journalism	Q1 2026	Podgorica, Montenegro	Wide public	The project activity envisages three awards for three best stories which will be proclaimed by the international experts' jury.
Event 3					
Event 4					

Human Impact

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

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

ii. The impact of the project in their lives

iii. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group

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

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

1	Children and adolescents, National Dialogue participants	<p>Before the project's implementation, children involved in the National Dialogue, Children's Parliaments and local dialogues felt disconnected from decision-making, believing their voices were ignored by authorities. Many thought their ideas for improving schools, communities and the country were not taken seriously. As one participant shared, "We wanted to contribute and present our ideas, but we did not believe they would be accepted by decision-makers." The project profoundly changed this perception. Through their participation, children gained confidence and a sense of empowerment, realizing that their opinions matter and can influence change. "There are people who understand us and want to help us share our views," said one child. "Now we believe that institutions will really include our suggestions in public policies."</p> <p>Children now express greater trust in institutions such as the Center for Children's Rights, which they see as advocates ensuring their right to participation is respected. They feel stronger, more hopeful and aware that their voices can make a real difference. Equally important, the project helped them connect with peers from different schools and cities, discovering shared experiences and aspirations. This sense of solidarity and collective purpose has strengthened their belief in cooperation and shown them how much they can achieve together.</p>	<p>"There are people who understand us and want to help us share our views. They give us the platforms to do so and now we believe that institutions will really include our suggestions in public policies."</p>
---	---	--	---

2	National Dialogue participant, activist for the rights of people with disabilities	<p>A long-time advocate from the NGO sector with over 15 years of experience participated in the dialogue platforms to promote greater acceptance of persons with disabilities and bring their needs closer to decision-makers. Throughout the dialogues, they emphasized that even small, low-cost actions - simple changes in mindset and approach - can significantly improve the lives of persons with disabilities. What may seem minor to institutions, they noted, represents meaningful progress for people with disabilities.</p> <p>Following the local dialogues, a positive shift was observed among local authorities, who used the momentum to address long-standing issues. Hearing citizens raise these concerns gave them confidence and legitimacy to act, showing how public feedback can inspire real institutional change.</p> <p>The participant also highlighted the importance of authentic citizen engagement, noting that public participation is often limited or occurs too late. Previous consultations were sometimes viewed as formalities, but these dialogue platforms created genuine opportunities for exchange, enabling direct conversations between citizens and decision-makers.</p> <p>This experience provided a stronger voice and greater confidence to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities directly with authorities.</p> <p>The dialogues became a space for meaningful advocacy - where the voices of persons with disabilities are heard, respected and increasingly reflected in decision making</p>	<p>"Even small, simple steps-just minor changes in mindset or approach-can make a big difference in the lives of people with disabilities. For institutions, it may be a small effort, but for us, it has a meaningful and lasting impact. I have also seen that local institutions have realized this, thanks to the opportunity for us to advocate for our rights and show them that positive change is possible."</p>
---	--	---	--

		reflected in decision-making processes	
3	Local municipality Vice president	<p>Tanja Spičanović is the Vice President of the Municipality of Bar, one of partner municipalities in advancing social cohesion in Montenegro. Under her leadership, Bar has become a model of collaborative local governance - organizing a successful Local Dialogue on Social Cohesion, preparing and presenting its Local Social Cohesion Pledge at the Municipal Assembly session and actively participating in the National Dialogue. The municipality also supported three citizen-led initiatives developed through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab (SCIL), demonstrating how joint efforts between local government and communities can drive inclusion, solidarity and lasting social cohesion.</p>	<p>“Through initiatives like this, we aim to create a system where citizens’ voices are not lost in the maze of administration, but genuinely influence the decisions being made. The most significant achievement, however, lies in the fact that the citizens’ proposals voiced during the local dialogue have been translated into public policies - incorporated into local action plans and the Pledge on Social Cohesion, which has been adopted by the Assembly of the Bar Municipality.”</p> <p>“This isn’t just a procedural document,” Spičanović said in the local Assembly. “It’s rooted in the spirit of Bar - multiculturalism, unity and solidarity. It affirms our shared values and guides our future as a community. Its adoption is a significant step toward strengthening tolerance, solidarity and mutual respect - but its true impact must be seen in everyday actions, not just words.”</p>

4	Ministry Education, Science and Innovation and Ministry of Culture and Media	<p>The project has generated significant impact through strengthened collaboration with the respective educational and cultural ministries in Montenegro, particularly by aligning with the newly established institutional framework for arts, cultural and media education defined by the Protocol on Cooperation between the Ministry of Culture and Media and the Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation. This cooperation builds on national strategic documents-the National Programme for the Development of Culture 2023-2027 and the Media Strategy 2023-2027-and promotes intersectoral coordination in advancing creative and media literacy among children and youth. The project's engagement complements these national efforts by supporting the operationalization of the forthcoming National Programme for Arts and Cultural Education, which aims to connect schools with cultural institutions, expand young people's access to arts and heritage and strengthen their creative and critical capacities. In parallel, collaboration around the promotion of media literacy contributes to a more informed and resilient youth population, in line with the creation of the National Council for Media Literacy foreseen by the Protocol. Overall, the synergy between the project and this new national framework reinforces systemic collaboration between the education, culture and media sectors, ensuring the sustainability and institutional anchoring of results beyond the project's duration.</p>	<p>"We believe that this project is of exceptional importance for our society, as well as for the development of new professionals in a highly promising field. Given its focus on communication among different communities and the inclusion of underdeveloped areas, we consider its impact to be highly beneficial for Montenegro in multiple ways.</p> <p>The project plays an important role in raising young people's awareness of the value of culture through art, the importance of building healthy relationships based on respect and understanding and in connecting education and culture through public dialogue.</p> <p>Culture is alive, dynamic and constantly transforming - whether through the physical movement of people, digital technologies, artistic forms that move beyond museums, or social change, culture is in a state of continuous evolution."</p> <p>Aleksandra Gogić, Minister's Chief of Cabinet, Ministry Education, Science and Innovation of Montenegro</p>
---	--	--	--

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

Please limit your response to 4000 characters.

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

OPTIONAL

File 1

OPTIONAL

Pressclipping - Nov 2025-12_29_58.docx

File 2

OPTIONAL

Sources of evidence-12_21_14.docx

File 3

OPTIONAL

Programme results overview with human stories-12_22_36.pdf

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

OPTIONAL

Link 1

OPTIONAL

www.un.org/peacebuilding/content/dialogue-builds-trust-and-delivers-community-solutions-montenegro

Link 2

OPTIONAL

www.unesco.org/en/articles/together-common-good-youth-leading-change-building-inclusion-and-sparking-respectful-dialogue?hub=66976

Link 3

OPTIONAL

www.undp.org/montenegro/projects/enhancing-citizens-trust-institutions-and-building-resilient-communities

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.

Innovative ways of working

The innovative model of Dialogues, Pledges and Labs on Social Cohesion is an innovative model that introduces a more constructive, inclusive, and solution-oriented dialogue to social cohesion, citizen participation and strengthening trust in institutions. Through open conversations among themselves and with local institutions, citizens raised the challenges they face, proposed concrete measures and jointly formulated recommendations, which were translated into Local Social Cohesion Pledges. These pledges, adopted by local governments and parliaments, clearly demonstrate the readiness of institutions to respond to citizens' needs. The model's innovative cycle is further reinforced through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab, which enables citizens to turn dialogue recommendations into concrete actions. In this way, the model creates policies based on needs and builds citizens' trust in institutions, fostering more connected and resilient communities grounded in common values, collective knowledge and shared responsibility.

The Social Cohesion Innovation Lab to support citizen-driven solutions to challenges identified through local dialogues, using human-centred design to unlock local potential. The Lab promotes co-creation processes that generate viable, scalable solutions and includes a dedicated stream for youth-led initiatives through UPSHIFT flagship programme. The Lab particularly supports informal youth and citizen groups, offering them space, tools and mentoring to design and implement community solutions. In a context where direct citizen participation is often limited to CSOs, the Lab's open and inclusive format-combined with capacity building and funding-has proven invaluable for strengthening civic engagement and innovation at the local level.

The project launched Academic Dialogues where students engaged with experts from media, civil society and institutions on topics such as artificial intelligence, human rights and social inclusion. Additionally, workshops on constructive journalism for students and young journalists encouraged a shift from sensationalism toward solution-oriented reporting, fostering public trust and civic engagement.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Strengthened capacities

UNDP increased capacities of 60 community leaders and enhanced their understanding of social cohesion, hate speech, gender equality. UNICEF empowered children, adolescents and young people for civic engagement and influencing both their peers and public policies. Their capacities for meaningful civic engagement were strengthened, enabling active contributions to local dialogues and national processes. A peer-led model was rolled out, training youth to lead conversations with their peers on civic participation, social cohesion and countering hate speech. Young media professionals are trained by UNESCO in solution journalism, enhancing their ability to contribute to social cohesion and responsible reporting.

With UNICEF support, the Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation trained teachers across 100 schools in socio-emotional learning, reaching 46,000 students to enhance their skills related to tolerance, communication, optimism, empathy. The programme has been integrated in the Montenegro's 10-year education strategy, ensuring systemic continuity and generational shifts in social cohesion and civic responsibility. In co-creation process with children, adolescents, young people, teachers, parents, UNICEF is developing a comprehensive civic education programme to be introduced in schools, to further advance social cohesion through the formal educational system. Mediation capacities of 6 schools are enhanced through rising their capabilities for peaceful conflict resolution. Social welfare professionals were trained in conflict and LNOB sensitivity, supporting vulnerable children, youth and parents with tailored services. UNESCO piloted MIL programme with 4 schools, while the MIL curricula is being accredited as a standardized part of teacher training, achieving long-term system capabilities to foster critical thinking, media literacy, civic participation and resilience to hate speech and disinformation.

UNESCO supported Ministry of Media and Culture to develop a National Multi-stakeholder Media Coalition, a platform to combat hate speech and promote media ethics, involving various institutional and civil society actors-further demonstrating enhanced institutional capacity.

UNICEF trained Ombudperson's office on social cohesion and trust, including topics of anti-Gypsyism, xenophobia, inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities, discrimination and hate speech among children and youth. In collaboration with the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights, UNDP supported institutional capacities to ensure policy and legal framework which will enable women's public and political participation and help counter hate speech, sexism, misogyny.

Through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab, UNDP supported 24 grassroots groups and organisations to design local community actions and is funding 16 of them. UNDP partnered with CSO Juventas to support 16 selected citizen groups and organisations to implement local actions designed through the Lab.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Improved or initiated policy frameworks

The integration of socio-emotional learning (SEL) into the National Education Reform Strategy 2025-2035 and the development of a new civic education curriculum represent concrete policy changes that institutionalize social cohesion and peacebuilding principles. The strategy prioritizes children's well-being and the development of socio-emotional skills, emphasizing the importance of emotional intelligence, resilience and mental health support in schools. Media and Information Literacy (MIL) curricula is being accredited as official teacher training programme, while Media Strategy 2023-2027 implementation is supported in the key aspects of ethical reporting and combating hate speech.

With the strategic support of UNESCO, arts education programmes are currently being developed between the Ministry of Culture and Media and the Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation, fostering innovative, sustainable approaches to integrating arts into formal education and strengthening cultural and creative capacities among students.

All five municipalities participating in the program have co-organised local dialogues on social cohesion and based on the recommendations from those, developed Social Cohesion Pledges, four adopted by local Assemblies. The recommendations from local dialogues and insights from other project activities have been basis for the national dialogue on social cohesion and will be integrated in the National Social Cohesion Pledge.

Partnered with grassroots/CSOs

Through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab, UNDP supported 24 grassroots groups and organisations to design local community actions and is funding 16 of them. UNDP partnered with CSO Juventas to support 16 selected citizen groups and organisations to implement local actions designed through the Lab.

UNICEF collaborates with the CSO Centre for Child Rights on violence prevention programs and capacity-building for children and adolescents meaningful civic and political participation through Local Children's Parliaments. CSO Parents provided mapping services for the development of inputs to the Education Reform Strategy supported activity mapping and partnered with CSO Juventas to advance youth engagement and implement peer education activities. UNICEF also partnered with national Scouts association to implement UPSHIFT workshop, through which 10 grassroots youth groups were supported to design local community actions and 5 of them are funded. UNICEF also works with the CSO Centre for Civic Education on building coalitions and broad partnerships towards the reintroduction of a mandatory civic education subject in school curricula, as well as embedding the human rights approach in education system reform.

UNESCO partnered with CSO Prazan Prostor, a local civil society organization experienced in youth-focused cultural engagement.

Who are we working with *

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

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

UNESCO partnered with NGO Prazan Prostor to implement the artistic residency programme, using art as a tool to promote dialogue, empathy and peace. UNICEF collaborates with the Centre for Child Rights on violence prevention programs and capacity-building for children and adolescents. NGO Parents supported activity mapping and supported youth engagement and implementation of peer education activities. UNICEF partnered with Scouts association to implement UPSHIFT workshop, while UNDP partnered with Juventas who support the implementation of citizen-led initiatives through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab.

UNICEF works with the Centre for Civic Education on building partnerships towards the reintroduction of a mandatory civic education subject in schools, as well as embedding the human rights approach in education system. The project has partnered with the University of Montenegro, Faculty of Political Sciences, leading to the development and accreditation of Media and Information Literacy curricula, delivery of pilot teacher trainings and organization of student-centered Academic Dialogue sessions across major university hubs. UNDP established a partnership with the University of Donja Gorica to engage students in dialogue on social cohesion and strengthen the link between academia and social cohesion. The platform involved 400 young people to promote social cohesion, combating hate speech and youth participation.

UNESCO has partnered extensively with Montenegrin national institutions, including:

- **Ministry of Culture and Media, to establish the National Multi-Stakeholder Media Coalition and implement the Media Strategy.**
- **Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation and the Ministry of Culture and Media to pilot Arts Education programme in schools.**
- **Ministry of Education, the Center for Vocational Education and the Bureau for Education Services, to institutionalize MIL programming in schools.**
- **The Cabinet of the Prime Minister and other senior government offices, supporting interministerial cooperation on cultural and educational initiatives.**
- **Coordination with cultural institutions for the symbolic peace monument in Cetinje, a high-level initiative involving the President and Prince of Montenegro.**

UNDP partnered with the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights to strengthen the state network for gender equality, building capacities for gender-sensitive policymaking. UNDP and UNICEF engaged with the Institution of the Protector of Human Rights and Freedoms to support monitoring and systemic responses to harmful narratives and hate speech.

To contribute to the education sector reform and mainstreaming of relevant programme outcomes, UNICEF collaborated with the Ministry of Education, Science and Innovation. UNICEF has worked with the Education Centre of the Parliament to develop and integrate a social cohesion module into the human rights Programme of the Centre, which includes capacity building for all of the Education Centre staff.

Leave No one Behind

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

Mandatory

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

PART IV: Monitoring, Evaluation and Compliance

» Monitoring

Please list key monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

1. Baseline data collection on target beneficiaries
2. Baseline data collection on general population – Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions Survey
3. Survey with National Dialogue participants
4. Observation of the Local Dialogues
5. Observation of Academia Led Dialogue
6. Monitoring visit to Social Cohesion Innovation Lab
7. Monitoring visit to peer-educators activity

Do outcome indicators have baselines? *

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

During the reporting period, baseline data was finalized and collected for all project beneficiaries participating in key programme activities, including local dialogues held in Podgorica, Ulcinj, Pljevlja, Bijelo Polje and Bar; NextGen training participants; UNICEF's Local Children's Parliaments; peer educators; UPSHIFT participants; and UNESCO's Academia-led thematic dialogues. The data informs outcome-level indicators related to participants' competence to engage in political processes, sense of being valued and heard by institutions, interpersonal trust and solidarity and confidence that institutions will respond to citizens' recommendations. As data collection occurred in phases alongside participant enrolment, preliminary results from Local Dialogue participants were presented in the previous report. This report now provides the final combined baseline analysis across all key programme components. Findings among Local Dialogue participants-the project's direct beneficiaries-offer valuable insights into both vertical social cohesion (trust in institutions) and horizontal cohesion (interpersonal trust and solidarity) across gender and age groups. Overall, beneficiaries feel capable of understanding and influencing public policies but remain sceptical about institutional responsiveness. While over 95% report confidence in their ability to contribute, only one in five feel genuinely engaged or heard by institutions, highlighting the need to strengthen feedback loops and inclusive decision-making channels. Across groups, women and children report lower overall confidence, though children show greater optimism and trust in dialogue processes compared to adults, who are more cautious. Among municipalities, Podgorica residents display higher confidence but lower engagement-reflecting a "large city disconnect"-while Bar demonstrates stronger community trust and participation. On the horizontal dimension, participants express strong respect for diversity but weaker solidarity and trust toward those living differently, suggesting that tolerance does not always translate into close community bonds. Encouragingly, awareness of hate speech is high, yet participants note the need for more practical learning on how hate speech contributes to violence and social division. Together, these insights underscore the importance of maintaining transparent communication, ensuring institutional responsiveness and building inclusive spaces where citizens' voices translate into visible action-key to strengthening both trust and cohesion across communities

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.

As for the Outcome indicators, survey results have been used, while for the Output level indicators, diverse methods are used, such as reports from the capacity building and other activities, attendance/participants lists, pre- and post-training assessment results, photos and multimedia materials, meeting minutes and action points, evaluation reports, media coverage and press releases, beneficiary feedback, implementing partner quarterly reports

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

Perception survey is a formal collection of information from a randomly selected sample of respondents through their responses to standardized questions. See PBF Guidance Note for more information [link](#)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

In order to ensure quality of monitoring of the project progress towards the set outcomes, the baseline survey has been designed, launched and data has been analyzed. The survey has been done through the baseline questionnaire with the project participants (direct beneficiaries) – elaborated on above, as well as through the KAP (Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices) survey on general population, which will serve as the comparison group in measuring programme impact. The KAP survey was conducted on a nationally representative sample of 1,131 citizens aged 18+, with oversampling in five priority municipalities. It captured insights across Montenegro on programme indicators but also generally on trust, civic participation, social cohesion. Citizens show low trust in political institutions and/or authorities, both on central and local level. Most people believe that institutions do not provide real opportunities for citizen engagement, nor consider public input in policymaking, leading to perceptions that their views and attitudes, reflecting population needs are not being considered and won't influence decisions, particularly at the national level. At the same time, they do not see any feedback mechanisms designed at keeping the citizens informed, heard and valued. While most people state to accept differences and believe in equal participation, real interpersonal trust and solidarity are not that high. Most people believe in civic action as essential for progress. Hate speech is seen as frequent, mostly found in political discourse and online platforms, based on political views, ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation. Most citizens perceive gender inequalities, while are more likely to perceive it, especially in housework, childcare and career advancement.

Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms?

Community feedback mechanism, or community-based monitoring, is an organized system for communities of participants to monitor the local effects and impact of an intervention. Ideally, this system empowers the community to express whether their expectations are being met and to provide suggestions to decision-makers for possible (re)focusing. See PBF Guidance Note for more information. [link](#)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Yes, the project has established community feedback mechanisms to ensure that local voices inform both implementation and decision-making processes. As part of its participatory approach, the programme has established Local Resource Groups in each targeted municipality. These groups are composed of representatives from local institutions, civil society organizations and community members and serve as a structured forum for community-based monitoring. During the reporting period, the Resource Groups convened to review and discuss findings from the Local Dialogue Reports, allowing community stakeholders to reflect on identified priorities and provide input to guide ongoing and future actions (e.g. pledges). Implementing partners, including key NGOs, collected citizens' feedback throughout the implementation of programme activities. This feedback was shared ahead of the National Dialogue event and served as a foundation for drafting the National Social Cohesion Pledge, ensuring that citizens' voices were heard and their ideas translated into policy action.

» Evaluation

Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Applicable

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

Response required

50000

If project will end in next six months, is your upcoming evaluation on track?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not Applicable

Please describe the preparations

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

To ensure a robust, transparent and participatory evaluation process, several preparatory steps were undertaken. It began with a review of the PBF standard Terms of Reference (ToR) to identify necessary adjustments for the local context and specific project objectives. This ensured that the evaluation design reflected the unique focus, stakeholders and implementation arrangements of the Montenegro Joint Programme. In parallel, the evaluation guidance of all implementing agencies was reviewed to align methodologies, ethical standards and quality assurance mechanisms with agency protocols and the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation. Based on this foundation, an evaluation roadmap, management structure and ToRs for international and national evaluators were developed. The roadmap outlines the main phases of the evaluation-inception, data collection, validation and reporting-along with roles, responsibilities, decision-making procedures and timelines. It functions as a joint planning and coordination tool, ensuring coherence and accountability across all stages. The evaluation management structure defines the roles and coordination mechanisms among all bodies involved, safeguarding timeliness, independence and credibility of results. The Evaluation ToRs for international and national consultants, developed collaboratively with all implementing agencies, jointly define the purpose, scope, evaluation questions, deliverables and governance arrangements. They have been reviewed by gender and human rights experts and PBF focal point. All evaluation documents will be formally approved by the Steering Committee, ensuring institutional ownership and alignment. An essential component of the preparation process has been the systematic collection, organization and documentation of programme data, analyses and lessons learned. This ensures that the evaluation is grounded in comprehensive and verifiable evidence, enabling an accurate assessment of outcomes and facilitating continuous learning across partners.

Contact information	Name	Organization	Job title	Email
Please mention the focal person responsible for sharing the final evaluation report with the PBF:	Jelena Miljanic	UNDP	Joint Programme Coordinator	jelena.miljanic@undp.org

» Catalytic Effect

Catalytic Effect (financial): Has the project mobilized additional non-PBF financial resources since the project's start? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

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? Please refer to PBF Catalytic Effect Guidelines for more information. *

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please select the relevant option below: *

☐ Some catalytic effect

☒ Significant catalytic effect

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Four initiatives developed through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab were financed by the Municipality of Bar and Association of Scouts, unlocking domestic financing, demonstrating local ownership and institutional responsiveness.

UNDP's partnership with local municipalities led to Bar and Bijelo Polje joining ReLOaD 3 – an EU-funded, UNDP-led regional project - connecting them with over 50 municipalities across the Western Balkans, providing long-term access to resources and strengthening their capacity to deliver community services through transparent, citizen-focused partnerships with CSOs.

The Bureau for Education organized two additional socio-emotional skills trainings for teachers from its own budget, ensuring coverage of all schools in the selected municipalities and reinforcing institutional commitment and sustainability.

The programme also contributed to several national policies. The new Education Strategy 2025–2035, supported by UNICEF, ensured a participatory process that included youth and parent voices and integrated the socio-emotional, peace and civic competencies programme implemented through this Joint Programme-cementing its sustainability for the next decade.

Meanwhile, UNDP integrated citizen recommendations from the local dialogues into the National Strategy for Gender Equality and its Action Plan, resulting in new activities such as a gender-sensitive analysis of access to public transport and a grant scheme to enhance women's visibility in culture. Additional recommendations addressing hate speech, education and inclusion of marginalized groups were also reflected in the Strategy.

After the mass shooting that struck the town Cetinje early 2025, UNICEF supported the local community through working with children and adolescents in rebuilding trust, empathy and social cohesion. In partnership with Municipality of Cetinje, the Association of Scouts, the Association of Psychologists, the Faculty of Arts as well as individual trainers and coaches UNICEF designed the programme including the diverse activities for psychosocial support, social-emotional skills development and children and adolescents driven community initiatives and projects, involving more than 950 children and adolescents so far.

The activity of Child Parliaments has continued even after the funding support from UNICEF ended, with more than 200 children continuing to learn more about civic engagement and remaining active in their communities.

As a result of cooperation with the Ombudsperson's office, the institution has decided to review ethical codes of conduct of political parties in Montenegro, which goes beyond the original scope of the cooperation.

Finally, UNESCO continues to support implementation of the Media Strategy, expanding national efforts in media literacy, hate speech prevention and the role of journalism in strengthening social cohesion

Sustainability

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.

To sustain achievements beyond its lifecycle, the programme has institutionalized inclusive practices by embedding them in national systems and policies. One of key successes is the integration of the socio-emotional learning (SEL) programme into Montenegro's 10-year National Education Strategy, ensuring long-term development of peace and civic competencies. Similarly, civic education and Media and Information Literacy (MIL) initiatives-including accreditation of MIL into teacher training-position the education sector as a long-term enabler of democratic participation, critical thinking and resilience to hate speech and disinformation. Programmes such as Children Parliament and Social Cohesion Module in the national Parliament's training centre are continued and/or institutionalised.

Sustainability is reinforced through strong national ownership and active engagement of local stakeholders. This bottom-up approach ensures relevance and resilience, as initiatives are rooted in community needs. Full embrace and institutionalisation of the Social Cohesion Dialogues and Pledges and support for citizen-led action through the Lab demonstrate local ownership and commitment to the long-term change. Local Social Cohesion Pledges institutionalize local dialogues on social cohesion, social cohesion councils and establishing Day of Common Good. Pledges include measures addressing hate speech, peer violence, polarization, discrimination, inclusion, access to services and cultural, environmental and infrastructure needs. They also recognize the private sector's role in social cohesion, ensuring intersectoral approaches. This reflects growing local ownership and accountability in advancing inclusive governance.

The municipality's independent funding of community-driven initiatives designed through the Social Cohesion Innovation Lab shows that the programme successfully unlocked additional funding and life of its results beyond programme scope. Municipalities are leveraging the programme's outcomes to access EU funding and regional cooperation platforms, securing long-term resources and embedding community-responsive governance reforms. Citizen-led recommendations from dialogues have already shaped national strategies-such as the draft Strategy for Gender Equality and are finding their place in the national Social Cohesion Pledge. These concrete links between grassroots input and national policy underscore institutional responsiveness and programme relevance.

To support replication and scaling, the programme emphasizes capturing and dissemination of the lessons learned and innovative models introduced. The programme also explores the intersection of social cohesion and EU accession-Montenegro's top strategic priority-through dedicated knowledge products.

Together, these efforts ensure the programme is not a one-off intervention, but a durable, community-anchored, institutionally owned process with long-term policy alignment and impact.

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.

Monitoring and Oversight Activities

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

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

Monitoring and oversight activities	Name of the Event	Summary	Key Findings

Event 1	Baseline data collection on target beneficiaries	<p>During the reporting period, baseline data was finalised and collected on all project beneficiaries participating in key programme activities such as: local dialogues held in Podgorica, Ulcinj, Pljevlja, Bijelo Polje, Bar; NextGen training participants, Children Local Parliaments of UNICEF, peer educators, UPSHIFT participants, UNESCO's Academia led thematic dialogues.</p> <p>The data collected relates to project outcome-level indicators covering topics such as perceptions of respondents' competence to understand and participate in political processes, feelings of being engaged, valued and heard by institutions, interpersonal trust and solidarity and trust that institutions will respond to their recommendations, among other areas.</p> <p>As data collection occurred in stages alongside the enrolment of programme participants, a rapid assessment and analysis of data from Local Dialogue participants was included in the previous report. However, in this report we are providing finalised, combined baseline analysis gathered from all key programme activities.</p>	<p>.</p> <p>The findings reveal that programme beneficiaries feel capable of understanding and influencing public policies but often doubt that institutions truly listen or act on citizens' input. While over 95% of respondents express confidence in their political efficacy, only about one in five feel genuinely engaged or heard by institutions. This gap suggests the need to strengthen institutional responsiveness and create more inclusive decision-making channels.</p> <p>Across groups, women and minors report lower confidence overall, though minors show greater optimism and trust in dialogue processes organised through the Programme compared to adults, who tend to be more sceptical. Among municipalities, Podgorica residents report high confidence but low engagement and trust in institutions reflecting a "large city" disconnect, while Bar shows stronger community trust and participation.</p> <p>However, to build lasting institutional trust, these dialogues must lead to visible action and feedback loops that demonstrate responsiveness.</p> <p>On the horizontal social cohesion side, beneficiaries express strong respect for diversity but weaker feelings of solidarity and trust towards citizens that are and chose to live differently. This suggests that while tolerance may exist, it does not necessarily translate into close community bonds</p>
----------------	---	--	---

			close community bonds. High awareness of hate speech among programme participants is a positive foundation, but more opportunities to learn about practical examples of what consists hate speech and how does it lead to violence is needed.
--	--	--	---

Event 2	<p>Baseline data collection on general population – Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions Survey</p>	<p>A Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) survey of the general population serves as a comparison group for assessing programme outcome indicators. The data will be compared with outcome indicator results collected from programme beneficiaries to evaluate the programme's impact. KAP was conducted with a nationally representative sample of 1,131 adults (18+), using a stratified single-stage sampling method. Oversampling was conducted for 5 municipalities the Programme is implemented in. Data was collected through a combination of telephone and online surveys across 23 municipalities, covering urban, suburban and rural areas. The KAP data collection instrument included questions designed to inform key project outcome indicators - such as citizens' perceptions of being valued or heard by institutions, trust in institutions, levels of solidarity and interpersonal trust and the ability to recognize hate speech. It also incorporated additional questions to capture the broader context, including public perceptions of political and civic engagement, gender equality, social norms and social cohesion.</p>	<p>Citizens show low trust in political institutions and/or authorities, both on central and local level. Most people believe that institutions do not provide real opportunities for citizen engagement, nor consider public input in policymaking, leading to perceptions that their views and attitudes, reflecting population needs are not being considered and won't influence decisions, particularly at the national level. At the same time, they do not see any feedback mechanisms designed at keeping the citizens informed, heard and valued. While most people state to accept differences and believe in equal participation, real interpersonal trust and solidarity are not that high. Most people believe in civic action as essential for progress. Hate speech is seen as frequent, mostly found in political discourse and online platforms, based on political views, ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation. Most citizens perceive gender inequalities, while are more likely to perceive it, especially in housework, childcare and career advancement.</p>
----------------	---	--	--

Event 3	Survey with National Dialogue participants	<p>To assess the level of meaningful participation in dialogue platforms, participants of the two-day National Dialogue were invited to complete a post-event survey providing feedback on their experience and contributions to addressing key social cohesion challenges. In addition to informing the calculation of the meaningful participation indicator, this feedback is being used to further refine the How-To Note on organizing dialogue platforms, which will be shared with local municipalities and other relevant institutions.</p>	<p>The feedback from participants of the National Dialogue indicates a highly positive experience regarding inclusion, openness and respect during discussions. The majority (98%) felt fully able to express their opinions and believed that conversations were conducted with genuine respect for diverse perspectives. Most respondents (96%) reported receiving clear and relevant information that enabled them to contribute meaningfully, with many crediting institutional and expert panellists as the most useful sources of information. Only a small number mentioned encountering some type of barriers to participation (14%), primarily related to time constraints or interruptions during group work. Overall, the dialogue was perceived as a safe, respectful and well-structured platform for sharing views on social cohesion challenges. However, when it comes to perceptions of institutional responsiveness, the feedback reveals a degree of cautious optimism. While a significant share of participants believe that institutions will consider the dialogue's recommendations, fewer are confident that these ideas will be integrated into public policies or that follow-up information will be shared transparently. This suggests a gap between trust in the dialogue process itself and trust in subsequent institutional action. Participants also highlighted the importance of continuity calling for</p>
----------------	---	---	---

			or community-learning for follow-up activities and further opportunities for engagement-to ensure that the dialogue's outcomes translate into real policy change and sustained collaboration between citizens and decision-makers.
Event 4	Observation of the Local Dialogues	<p>The aim was to evaluate the meaningful engagement of dialogue participants (Outcome 1 Indicator) and identifying real-time factors that facilitate or hinder participation.</p> <p>The observation is done based on the comprehensive observation tool, measuring key aspects of meaningful participation.</p>	<p>Local dialogues brought together diverse community members- women, men, children, adolescents, young people, people with disabilities, residents of rural areas and decision-makers- creating an inclusive space for meaningful participation and a sense of being heard and valued. Engagement was strong across all groups, with children and youth especially active in presenting their work and representatives of community councils expressing particular interest in innovative approaches to citizen engagement. There was a high interest of elderly in expressing their voice, concerns and ideas. Inclusive methods such as creative group work, visual aids, simplified language and age-appropriate activities ensured broad understanding and participation. Local government representatives played a key role in encouraging open dialogue, reinforcing accountability and collaboration.</p>

Event 5	Observation of Academia Led Dialogue	<p>The aim was to evaluate the meaningful engagement of dialogue participants (Outcome 1 Indicator) and identifying real-time factors that facilitate or hinder participation.</p> <p>The observation is done based on the comprehensive observation tool, measuring key aspects of meaningful participation.</p>	<p>The Academia-Led Dialogue engaged students of journalism in critical discussions on media ethics, information and disinformation, particularly in relation to current events in Montenegro. This unique opportunity allowed them to directly pose questions to experienced journalists and representatives of relevant institutions. It was recommended that all inputs, questions and concerns raised during the dialogue be compiled and used to inform the National Dialogue Platform discussion, which was done.</p>
Event 6	Monitoring visit to Social Cohesion Innovation Lab	<p>The visit aimed to ensure the implementing partner aligns its activity design with programme objectives and reporting requirements.</p>	<p>The local challenges addressed by youth groups were directly informed by discussions from the local dialogues, effectively linking these two key programme components. The proposed solutions and initiatives demonstrated a clear gender dimension, reflecting an inclusive and responsive approach. The implementing partner ensured comprehensive reporting, including disaggregated data and participant quotes, providing valuable qualitative insights and ensuring transparency in the documentation process.</p>
Event 7	Monitoring visit to peer-educators activity	<p>The visit aimed to ensure the implementing partner aligns its activity design with programme objectives and reporting requirements.</p>	<p>The visit confirmed that the activity is implemented as planned, with high quality inputs and educational content, high youth participation and engagement and quality learning outcomes.</p>

Event 8			
---------	--	--	--

Final Steps

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

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

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