

# PBF November 2025 Project Progress Report



## PROJECT OVERVIEW

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

Click Next below to start

### » Report Submission

Type of report \*

- Semi-annual
- Annual
- Final
- Other

Date of submission of report \*

2025-11-15

Name and title of person submitting the report \*

Amara N. M. Kanneh/M&E Specialist/UNDP

E-mail of person submitting the report \*

amara.kanneh@undp.org

Name and title of person who approved the report \*

Mr. Louis Kuukpen/Deputy Resident Representative for Programmes/UNDP

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

Yes  
 No

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

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

Yes  
 No  
 Not Applicable

## » Project Information and Geographical Scope

Is this a cross-border project? \*

Yes  No

Please select the geographical region in which the project is implemented

Asia and the Pacific  Central & Southern Africa  East Africa  
 Europe and Central Asia  Global  Latin America and the Caribbean  
 Middle East and North Africa  West Africa

Country of project implementation

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

Other, please specify

Project Title

00129168: Delivering Peace Dividends in Liberia: Consolidating National, Regional and Local Reconciliation and Social Cohesion Opportunities  
 00113699: Support to LMPTF-PBF Joint Secretariat: UNDP  
 00133452: Promoting Peaceful Electoral Environment and Community Security in Liberia  
 00140121: Girls and Young Women Take Action for Peace  
 00140293: Enhancing Social Cohesion through Rehabilitation and Empowerment of Marginalized Youth in Liberia  
 00140354: Empowering citizens and communities to foster social accountability and transparency in governance and public service delivery.  
 00140355: Enhancing peace and social cohesion through the promotion of equitable access to and use of land for rural women in conflict-prone communities and concession areas  
 00140582: Accelerating Digital Opportunities for Youth Civic Participation as a lever for Building and Sustaining Peace in Liberia  
 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)

2023-10-10

Project End Date

2026-10-05

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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**?

4

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)*

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

**civil society organization**

What is the name of the Implementing Partner \*

**Accountability Lab**

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 (,)*

228127.31

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 (,)*

228127.31

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 (,)*

100000

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

*Please limit your response to 1500 characters*

**During the reporting period, Accountability Lab implemented two strategic initiatives under the project:**

**Strengthening investigative capacity:** Through targeted training and network-building, Accountability Lab equipped civil society organizations and media practitioners across counties to monitor corruption cases and public contract awards. This resulted in the production of credible, evidence-based reports that enhanced public awareness and institutional accountability.

**Promoting institutional transparency and citizen oversight:** The Lab supported CSOs and women's rights organizations in tracking ongoing investigations and piloting a reward-based system using scorecards and institutional rankings. These efforts fostered greater transparency, incentivized performance improvements, and amplified citizen engagement in anti-corruption efforts.

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 \*

**Naymote Partners for Democratic Development**

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 (,)*

17724500

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 (,)*

17724500

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 (,)*

100000

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

*Please limit your response to 1500 characters*

**During the reporting period, the national partner NAYMOTE actively advanced two core initiatives under the project:**

**Empowering civil society actors:** NAYMOTE facilitated targeted support to women and youth-led groups, enabling them to monitor and report on national commitments related to peacebuilding, governance, and transparency. This contributed to increased civic engagement and strengthened accountability mechanisms at community and national levels.

**Fostering institutional dialogue:** NAYMOTE expanded platforms for constructive engagement between civil society organizations and national integrity institutions, including sustained advocacy for the National Integrity Forum. These efforts enhanced trust-building, policy dialogue, and collaborative action on anti-corruption and governance reforms.

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

**civil society organization**

What is the name of the Implementing Partner \*

**Center for Transparency and Accountability in Liberia (CENTAL) in partnership with Women NGO Secretariat of Liberia**

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 (,)*

230980.2

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 (,)*

205581.4

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 (,)*

67663.8

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

*Please limit your response to 1500 characters*

**During the reporting period, CENTAL, in partnership with WONGOSOL, implemented a series of civic engagement and accountability initiatives across Bong, Nimba, Gbarpolu, and Grand Gedeh Counties to strengthen citizen participation in local governance. Key actions included 16 town-hall meetings and 25 community and school awareness forums, reaching 627 citizens (336 women, 291 men), including youth and persons with disabilities. These activities deepened citizens' understanding of the Local Government Act (2018), gender inclusion, and accountability in service delivery. CENTAL and partners also issued a joint national press statement on 24 June 2025 defending decentralization and inclusive governance against proposed legislative amendments and aired a radio jingle across three counties to promote transparency and public participation. Through these efforts, communities demonstrated greater awareness of County Councils, improved engagement with local authorities, and stronger advocacy for integrity, gender inclusion, and citizen-responsive service delivery.**

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 \*

Ministry of Internal Affairs

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 (,)*

220000

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 (,)*

174474.72

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 (,)*

121372

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

*Please limit your response to 1500 characters*

In the reporting period, the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), with technical and financial support from UN Women, conducted onboarding training in Zwedru, Grand Gedeh County, to establish County Development Planning Units (CDPUs) in the five south-eastern counties of Grand Gedeh, River Gee, Maryland, Grand Kru, and Sinoe. The sessions convened 70 participants, including newly appointed county planning officers (50 – 9 women and 41 men) and local government staff, and were facilitated by experts from the Ministries of Finance and Development Planning (MFDP), Gender, Children and Social Protection (MGCSP), the Governance Commission, and the Internal Audit Agency. Participants gained practical skills in development planning, programme budgeting, public sector investment, internal audit and compliance, and gender-responsive planning and monitoring, aligning county priorities with national frameworks. The exercise concluded the nationwide establishment of CDPUs, with all fifteen counties now operating under the structure envisioned in the Local Government Act (2018).

Building on this achievement, the MIA, in consultation with the MGCSP, will conduct a Gender and Inclusion Capacity-Building Training for County Councils, local leaders, and County Security Scheduled for November 2025, the training aims to strengthen gender-sensitive leadership, promote inclusive local governance, and enhance women's and marginalized groups' participation in county-level decision-making processes.

# 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 <i>(calculated automatically)</i>
<b>UNDP: United Nations Developmen t Programme</b>	2095000	1257000	1202102.36	57.38%
	*	*	*	%

<b>UNWOMEN:</b> <b>United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerme nt of Women</b>	*	*	*	54.53%
	1155000	693000	629864.73	
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
<b>Integrity Watch</b>	250000	250000	250000	100%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%

	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3500000</b>	<b>2200000</b>	<b>2081967.09</b>	<b>59.4</b> <b>8%</b>

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **59.48%**. 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? \*

43.57

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 \$ 1524950**. Can you confirm that this is correct? \*

Correct  Incorrect

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

Amount expended to date on efforts contributiong to gender equality or women's empowerment is \*

**US \$ 907113.06.** 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](#)

Accountability Project Annual Financial Report November 2025 Final-20\_5\_44.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 Resident Coordinator's Meeting on the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) Portfolio was also held on 19 June 2025 at the Kofi Annan Conference Room in Monrovia, chaired by Ms. Christine N. Umutoni. The session brought together Heads of UN Agencies and technical staff implementing PBF projects to review progress, share lessons, and strengthen coordination across portfolios. The discussion focused on improving delivery, monitoring, and reporting, while highlighting the Fund's contribution to peacebuilding priorities such as women's empowerment, youth engagement, and social cohesion. Agencies agreed to enhance joint communication and coordination on results, ensure timely reporting, and explore opportunities for closer collaboration to sustain peacebuilding gains in Liberia.**

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*

**During the reporting period, the Social Accountability Project has actively collaborated with both national and sub-national levels of government to advance inclusive, transparent, and decentralized governance across Liberia.**

**Between July and November 2025, the Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission (LACC) undertook a series of strategic engagements aimed at strengthening media accountability, enhancing local government integrity, and improving corruption monitoring mechanisms.**

**In August 2025, LACC convened a national media training in Ganta, bringing together journalists from all 15 counties. The sessions focused on ethical journalism, investigative techniques, digital tools, and the application of the Freedom of Information Act. This initiative resulted in the formation of a dedicated cohort of investigative reporters and contributed to a noticeable increase in corruption-related media coverage nationwide.**

**From August to September, LACC, in collaboration with UNDP, conducted regional integrity trainings in Ganta and Buchanan for 120 local government officials representing six counties. These sessions addressed anti-corruption legislation, procurement compliance, financial accountability, and strategies for community engagement. The trainings significantly bolstered institutional transparency and fostered stronger partnerships between local authorities and citizens. A follow-up training is scheduled for November 2025, targeting senior officials from Maryland, Sinoe, River Gee, Grand Kru, and Grand Gedeh. This upcoming session, led jointly by LACC, the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), the Internal Audit Agency (IAA), and UNDP, is designed to advance the decentralization agenda and reinforce subnational governance integrity.**

**At sub national level, with MIA and county administrations, the project helped operationalize County Development Planning Units (CDPUs) nationwide. From 20-24 October 2025, MIA led onboarding in Zwedru for 70 newly appointed county planning officers (50 , 9 women and 41 men) and local staff from Grand Gedeh, River Gee, Sinoe, Maryland, and Grand Kru. This completed the establishment of CDPUs in all 15 counties and aligned county planning with national guidelines. In partnership with MIA and MGCSP, the project advanced gender-responsive practices in County Service Centers (CSCs), with targeted training completed in five counties and a plan to extend support to the remaining ten. MIA, with project support, compiled and shared data on women's and youth representation in County Councils to inform county-level planning and public communication.**

## PART I: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS

### NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

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

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

Contracting of partners \*

Not Started

Initiated

Partially Completed

Completed

Not Applicable

### Staff Recruitment \*

Not Started  Initiated  Partially Completed  
 Completed  Not Applicable

### Collection of baselines \*

Not Started  Initiated  Partially Completed  
 Completed  Not Applicable

### Identification of beneficiaries \*

Not Started  Initiated  Partially Completed  
 Completed  Not Applicable

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

*Please limit your response to 3000 characters*

**The project completed all preliminary/preparatory activities, with all partners contracted by UNDP and UN Women. All implementing partners have also completed the recruitment of relevant staff who are currently implementing and managing the project, driving it towards the achievement of set objectives and desired results. In addition, the project has completed the collection of baselines by completing a baseline and perception survey that guided the project team to set and refine the baselines and targets of the project's indicators. Similarly, all key beneficiaries of the project have been selected and are currently actively participating in the project implementation.**

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*

During the reporting period, the project advanced its work at national and county levels to strengthen transparency, decentralization, and citizen participation in governance. The year's activities continued to reinforce the implementation of the Local Government Act (2018), expand oversight mechanisms, and increase opportunities for communities to take part in decision-making processes. The project remained focused on creating practical shifts within institutions while supporting citizens, civil society organizations, and local authorities to carry out their roles more effectively.

In March 2025, the project enhanced the capacity of 70 (41 men and 29 women) Social Accountability Volunteers (SAVs) across Bomi, Grand Cape Mount, Gbarpolu, Montserrado, and Margibi counties to enhance community-level monitoring and reporting of corruption. The training focused on anti-corruption laws, whistleblower protections, and the use of the TALKAY app for confidential reporting. Their deployment improved community trust, expanded geographic coverage, and strengthened real-time reporting and early warning systems. SAVs now serve as credible links between citizens and the Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission (LACC), helping raise awareness, mobilize civic action, and support institutional response to corruption cases.

Integrity Watch Liberia (IWL) upgraded the TALKAY platform to enhance data protection and user access. During this period, the project renewed collaboration with LACC to restore institutional access to the system. In addition, over 300 students from Grand Bassa, Grand Cape Mount, and Montserrado were trained to use TALKAY, strengthening youth participation and digital accountability networks.

The project also supported concrete progress in implementing the Local Government Act (2018) through inclusive planning and institutional capacity-building. In collaboration with the Ministries of Finance and Development Planning (MFDP), Internal Affairs (MIA), and Gender, Children and Social Protection (MGCSP), it facilitated inclusive participation in County Development Agenda (CDA) validation workshops across all 15 counties. A total of 987 participants took part 34% women (337), 19% youth (187), and 6% persons with disabilities (58) marking a significant step toward inclusive governance. Prior training delivered by CENTAL and WONGOSOL helped participants engage more meaningfully in the planning process.

A major milestone was reached between 20 and 24 October 2025, when the project supported the Ministry of Internal Affairs and partner institutions to complete the establishment of County Development Planning Units (CDPU) in the remaining southeastern counties: Grand Gedeh, River Gee, Maryland, Grand Kru, Sinoe, and Grand Bassa. This final set of units completed the nationwide roll-out of all fifteen CDPU. CDPU 70 participated in the onboarding sessions, including 50 (9 women, 41) assigned directly to the units. Technical teams from the Governance Commission, MFDP, MGCSP, the Internal Audit Agency, and the Liberia Revenue Authority delivered sessions on development planning, gender-responsive budgeting, internal audit, monitoring and evaluation, compliance with the Revenue Sharing Law, and the use of sex-disaggregated data in planning. With the CDPU now active nationwide, counties have functional technical structures capable of leading participatory planning and improving accountability in the management of public resources. The project supported the establishment of twelve of these units during 2024 and 2025, while the Liberia

To strengthen civic engagement and accountability in 2025, the project contributed to a series of CSO- and community-led initiatives across the country. Through these efforts, 123 representatives from civil society and community groups received training on gender equality, civic participation, anti-corruption, and the Local Government Act. Radio discussions at county and national level helped expand public awareness on transparency and citizens' rights, while targeted support to county officials and community leaders strengthened their ability to integrate gender perspectives into planning. A national session with CSO and media actors further improved their capacity to monitor public resources and engage in governance advocacy.

Between 18 September and 8 October 2025, the project also supported awareness campaigns in Nimba, Grand Gedeh, Bong, and Gbarpolu, reaching 876 participants, including women, youth, persons with disabilities, and local authorities. Through school and community forums, citizens received practical information on the Local Government Act, the Freedom of Information Act, County Councils, and County Service Centers. These activities deepened public understanding of local governance and strengthened citizens' confidence and ability to participate in county decision-making and track the use of public resources.

In addition, over 2,000 citizens have participated in monitoring 375 government projects, contributing to improved civic oversight and accountability. Investigative journalism and media coverage on governance have expanded, and digital platforms such as TALKAY and COMM CARE have strengthened transparency through real-time reporting and feedback loops.

These efforts have advanced Liberia's peacebuilding and governance goals by promoting inclusive decision-making, reducing impunity, and reinforcing citizen trust in local institutions. The project's alignment with UNSDCF Outcome 4 (Inclusive Governance and Human Rights) and CPD Outcome 1 (Effective and Accountable Institutions) underscores its continued relevance and contribution to long-term institutional stability and democratic governance.

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*

**Gender equality and youth inclusion have been central pillars of the Social Accountability Project, systematically embedded across institutional reforms and community-level interventions. All 15 County Development Planning Units (CDPUs) now feature dedicated Gender and Social Inclusion functions, staffed by trained officers who apply sex-disaggregated data and utilize a gender and social protection planning checklist introduced through the project. This has ensured that county-level planning, budgeting, and monitoring processes reflect the priorities of women, youth, and marginalized groups.**

Community engagement activities were intentionally designed to shift decision-making power toward underrepresented populations. Reserved seats for women, youth, persons with disabilities, and Peace Hut leaders were established during the validation of County Development Agendas (CDAs), promoting inclusive governance. Where participation gaps were identified particularly among women and youth the project provided technical guidance to the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning (MFDP) and the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), resulting in formal inclusion of these groups in the planning process. This advocacy led to notable improvements in 2025, with women comprising 34% and youth 19% of participants in county validation workshops.

County Councils have increasingly embraced diverse representation, with women now holding an average of 40% of seats and youth 29%. Mentorship, civic education, and awareness forums have empowered these groups to engage confidently with local leaders, scrutinize planning decisions, and monitor resource use. These gains reflect a broader shift in Liberia's decentralization process, where gender equality and youth inclusion are no longer peripheral goals but embedded principles.

The project's success in promoting gender and youth responsiveness was made possible through collaboration with key government and civil society partners, including MIA, MFDP, MGCSP, CENTAL, WONGOSOL, and Naymote. Gender mainstreaming was evident across all activities, with nearly half of training participants and 40% of deployed social accountability monitors being women. Media training sessions addressed the unique challenges faced by female journalists, equipping them with ethical reporting tools, digital literacy, and access to public records under the Freedom of Information Act. Gender-sensitive monitoring frameworks were also applied to assess the differentiated impact of public services on women and girls.

Youth inclusion was equally prioritized. Young people served as County Accountability and Advocacy Team (CAAT) members, contributing to real-time tracking and civic outreach. Trainings and campaigns targeted youth groups, enhancing their understanding of anti-corruption laws, procurement oversight, and civic engagement. The integration of digital platforms like TALKAY and COMM CARE leveraged youth familiarity with technology to improve reporting and data collection.

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*

**Liberia's Corruption Perception Index increased from 25 in 2023 to 27 in 2024, which aligns with the project's work on reporting, community oversight and public awareness. A total of 876 citizens completed Training of Trainers sessions across all 15 counties and reached more than 5,000 people through community campaigns and awareness activities, meeting and exceeding Indicator 1.2.1. Baseline survey findings also reflect growing awareness of accountability systems. Forty four percent of respondents know where they can report corruption, and forty five percent know how to report a case. More than 2,000 citizens monitored 375 government projects using TALKAY and COMM CARE, which strengthened scrutiny of county development interventions. A national training for 30 CSO and media representatives contributed to better reporting on integrity issues. Indicator 1.2.3 stands at 58 percent, showing steady improvement in institutional responsiveness and public engagement**

.

**Progress in decentralized governance is becoming more visible. The establishment and operationalization of all 15 County Development Planning Units, including six finalized in 2025, has strengthened implementation of the Local Government Act. Fifty planning officers, including nine women, were trained in planning, budgeting, monitoring, internal audit and gender tools, and these are now reflected in county operations. Counties have begun preparing and validating their County Development Agendas with broader inclusion. A total of 987 people participated in CDA validation sessions across all counties. Thirty four percent of participants were women, nineteen percent were youth and six percent were persons with disabilities. This level of inclusion has reduced disputes around priority setting and has increased acceptance of agreed development plans.**

**Citizen participation is expanding. According to the baseline survey, 47 percent of respondents took part in county-level planning in the last year, and 73 percent participated in community meetings. County Accountability and Advocacy Teams facilitated regular discussions between citizens and county authorities in all 15 counties, which helped address issues raised through monitoring and created more consistent communication channels between communities and duty bearers.**

**Gender inclusion is advancing across project counties. Twelve CSO and community initiatives trained 123 representatives, with women accounting for 64 percent of participants. Ninety-nine county officials and community leaders received training on integrating gender in planning. Women represented 52 percent of participants in the awareness campaigns in Nimba, Grand Gedeh, Bong and Gbarpolu. Baseline survey results show that 72 percent of respondents believe women and youth are safe to speak in community meetings. This indicates gradual changes in attitudes toward women's participation in governance.**

**Access to information and legal awareness improved during the period. Awareness activities held from 18 September to 8 October 2025 reached 876 citizens, including youth, persons with disabilities and community leaders. Participants received practical information on the Local Government Act, the FOI Act, County Councils, County Service Centers and reporting pathways. Survey responses show growing confidence in using these mechanisms to seek information or raise concerns.**

**These combined results point to outcome-level peacebuilding change. Local governance systems are becoming more open and predictable, citizens are using accountability tools more actively, women and youth are participating in greater numbers and institutions are becoming more responsive to public demand for transparency.**

---

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

SAP Baseline and Perception Survey Report\_fina-22\_34\_58.pdf



## 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: \*

**National anti-corruption and integrity institutions and social accountability framework and mechanisms enable greater and more inclusive citizen participation and gender and youth-oriented public service delivery.**

Outcome 2: \*

**Communities and CSOs demand increased transparency, inclusivity and accountability of county planning processes and service delivery**

Outcome 3: \*

Outcome 4: \*

Outcome 5: \*

Outcome 6: \*

Outcome 7: \*

Outcome 8: \*

Additional Outcomes \*

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

## INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments, provide an update on the achievement of 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: National anti-corruption and integrity institutions and social accountability framework and mechanisms enable greater and more inclusive citizen participation and gender and youth-oriented public service delivery.**

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	# of corruption cases prosecuted by LACC	14 (2022)	20	3 new cases prosecuted	Increased from 14 to 17 cases, showing incremental gains despite backlog.	Case backlog and limited investigative capacity have slowed prosecution rates.

1. 2	Disposal rate of corruption cases indicted by LACC.	10%	50%	0	Since the inception of the project, the LACC has indicted a total of 85 cases as a result of trainings, awareness, and sensitization initiatives. Nevertheless, many other cases remain unresolved due to persistent judicial delays and insufficient coordination with prosecutorial bodies.	Since the inception of the project, the LACC has indicted 85 cases as a result of trainings, awareness, and sensitization initiatives. Despite this significant achievement, the disposal rate remains at 0%, far below the 50% target. This gap is largely attributable to structural and systemic challenges, including slow judicial processing that creates prolonged timelines and backlogs, weak coordination between the LACC and prosecutorial bodies that prevents indictments from advancing to timely trials or judgments, and limited investigative and prosecutorial resources that constrain the system's ability to move cases efficiently through the courts. These challenges lie beyond the
---------	---	-----	-----	---	---	---

project's direct control; however, discussions have been held with the government through the LACC, and we have been informed that the Commission is advocating for the establishment of Court 'F,' which is expected to help address these bottlenecks and improve case resolution

1. 3	Liberia Corruption Perception Index Score.	26 (2022)	36	CPI score improved to 27 (2024)	Since the project's inception, there has been a +1- point increase in the CPI score. This modest gain reflects early recognition of the project's interventions, which have played a significant role in enhancing awareness and sensitization around the anti-corruption mandate. While these efforts mark meaningful progress in strengthening public understanding and institutional visibility, perceptions remain cautious and will only shift more substantially once enforcement outcomes become visible, credible, and sustained.	The +1-point CPI gain reflects early recognition of Liberia's anti- corruption efforts, but perceptions remain cautious until reforms deliver visible, sustained enforcement outcomes.
1. 4						
1. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 1 have?

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

Please list all outputs for outcome 1

.....

Output 1.1

**Communities and CSOs demand increased transparency, inclusivity and accountability of county planning processes and service delivery**

.....

Output 1.2

**Capacity of CSOs and Citizens improved to engage with national institutions on integrity and accountability**

.....

Output 1.3

.....

Output 1.4

.....

Output 1.5

.....

Other Outputs

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

.....

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

» **Output 1.1: Communities and CSOs demand increased transparency, inclusivity and accountability of county planning processes and service delivery**

1.	# of justice actors trained on anti-corruption related legislations provision of the PPCC and the new LACC laws fully implemented or adhered to.	84 (2024)	100	33 (Female-11 Male-22) Trained across 6 counties	93 (33 female, 60 males)  The project has remained instrumental in advancing institutional accountability, ensuring legal compliance, and reinforcing anti-corruption advocacy across multiple sectors. Through targeted training and capacity-building efforts, it has equipped 93 judicial personnel (33 females, 60 males) with specialized expertise in integrity frameworks, thereby strengthening governance structures and contributing to meaningful systemic reforms.	Remaining sessions planned for next quarter.
1.	% of corruption cases reported through the Talky platform and investigated disaggregated by type and change.	0%	60%	38% of reported cases investigated this period	42% cumulative investigation rate	Limited investigative bandwidth and verification delays have slowed follow-up. Coordination with LACC and CSOs is being strengthened

1. 1. 3	# of corruption cases reported and tracked in the platform.	52 (2024)	200	58 new cases reported and tracked	137 total cases tracked	Platform uptake is growing steadily. Awareness campaigns and CSO engagement are boosting citizen reporting.
1. 1. 4						
1. 1. 5						

» **Output 1.2: Capacity of CSOs and Citizens improved to engage with national institutions on integrity and accountability**

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. 2. 1	# of citizens conscientized by the project involved in engaging national institutions on integrity and accountability disaggregated by sex and age.	0	5,000	876 citizens (467 women, 409 men) engaged through 20 awareness forums in Bong, Gbarpolu, Nimba, and Grand Gedeh	1,351 citizens (752 men, 599 women) conscientized through structured forums; over 5,000 reached via broader public outreach on anti-corruption laws and governance	None. Direct engagement is on track; broader outreach exceeded expectations through media and community platforms.
1. 2. 2	# of advocacy activities on integrity and accountability undertaken by CSOs and citizens disaggregated by themes or issues.	6 (2024)	30	12 advocacy actions conducted, including town halls, radio dialogues, petitions, and community scorecard presentations	21 advocacy activities implemented across 9 counties, addressing issues such as budget transparency, service delivery, and gender-responsive governance	Slight delay due to rainy season disruptions and scheduling conflicts with local authorities. Activities are expected to accelerate in the next quarter.

1. 2. 3	% of the advocacy activities on integrity and accountability undertaken by CSOs and citizens that resulted in the desired change	0%	60%	58% of advocacy actions led to tangible outcomes, including policy responses, infrastructure rehabilitation, and increased transparency	58% on tracked advocacy efforts have resulted in measurable change, such as the establishment of a safe home in Gbapolu, bridge rehabilitation in Grand Bassa, and improved drug delivery tracking in Lofa	Some advocacy outcomes are still in progress or pending government response. Full impact will be clearer in subsequent reporting cycles.
1. 2. 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 cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 3. 1						
1. 3. 2						
1. 3. 3						
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 cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 5. 1						
1. 5. 2						
1. 5. 3						
1. 5. 4						
1. 5. 5						

» **Outcome 2: Communities and CSOs demand increased transparency, inclusivity and accountability of county planning processes and service delivery**

2. 1	The percentage of men, women, and youth (m/f) on the County Council as prescribed by the Local Government Act.	Men =88% women=11 .4% Youth =0.6%	40%	There is progress in increased number of women representations from 39% to 40%. With UN Women's support, the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) documented and shared data on women's and youth representation in County Councils with CENTAL, which used the information in its community awareness and advocacy activities to inform citizens about their County Council composition and promote transparency in local governance.	Women now hold an average of 40% of seats in County Councils nationwide. Representation is highest in Grand Bassa (56%), followed by Montserrado, Grand Cape Mount, Grand Gedeh, Bong, Lofa, and Margibi (44%). Sinoe, Maryland, Rivercess, Grand Kru, and River Gee each record 33%, while Nimba remains lowest at 22%. Youth representation averages 29%, though Maryland County still lacks the required youth representatives. With UN Women's support, the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) documented and shared data on women's and youth representation in County Councils with CENTAL, which used the information in its community awareness and advocacy	N/A
---------	--	---	-----	--	--	-----

				activities to inform citizens about their County Council composition and promote transparency in local governance.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

2.	# of CSO and community led initiatives demanding inclusivity and accountability related to the county planning processes and service delivery (by type of initiative).	2023 (20)	60	<p>A total of 41 CSO- and community-led initiatives were implemented across Bong, Gbarpolu, Grand Gedeh, and Nimba Counties by CENTAL and WONGOSOL. These comprised 16 town-hall meetings, 25 school and community awareness forums, and one joint national press statement on 24 June 2025 advocating against amendments to the Local Government Act (2018) that threatened decentralization and inclusivity. In addition, a radio jingle campaign aired throughout July 2025 across three counties, promoting citizen participation, transparency, and gender inclusion. These initiatives reached 627 citizens (336 women, 291 men) and enhanced civic engagement, accountability, and community</p>	<p>A total of 68 CSO- and community-led initiatives were implemented nationwide with UN Women's technical and financial support., advancing civic participation, transparency, and accountability in county planning and service delivery. Key initiatives implemented by UN Women through CENTAL and WONGOSOL included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eleven capacity-building workshops that trained over 330 CSO, CBO, and community representatives (around 63% women, 44% youth) on gender, participation, anti-corruption, and the Local Government Act (LGA).</li> <li>• Sixteen town-hall dialogues and twenty-five community awareness forums that engaged over 1,600 citizens (56% women, 44% men).</li> </ul>	
----	--	-----------	----	---	---	--

				advocacy in local governance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seven county-level radio talk shows and one national broadcast used to amplify citizen awareness on decentralization, inclusion, and the functions of County Service Centers.</li> <li>One national advocacy action, where CSOs and community actors issued a joint press statement rejecting proposed amendments to the LGA (2018).</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------	--	--

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

**Social accountability/accountability mechanisms within County Councils and County Service Centers are enhanced**

Output 2.2

**Citizen participation in decentralized political processes, including development planning and budgeting and service delivery, is strengthened**

---

Output 2.3

---

Output 2.4

---

Output 2.5

---

Other Outputs

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

---

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

» **Output 2.1: Social accountability/accountability mechanisms within County Councils and County Service Centers are enhanced**

2. 1.	Gender responsive planning and budgeting tool kit developed and adopted by county service centers and county councils	0	15	All 15 County Development Planning Units (CDPUs) are now operational, trained, and equipped to apply gender-responsive planning and budgeting tools in coordination with County Service Centers. The introduction and application of the GAP Guidelines mark a significant step in institutionalizing gender-responsive planning within local government systems, ensuring that decentralization reforms translate into equitable and accountable service delivery for all citizens.	All fifteen (15) County Development Planning Units (CDPUs) are now operational, trained, and equipped to apply gender-responsive planning and budgeting tools in coordination with County Service Centers. This marks the completion of a nationwide institutional milestone under the Local Government Act (2018), ensuring that every county now has a functional technical planning unit capable of integrating gender equality, inclusion, and accountability in local governance. Between	None. Implementation is on track and target fully achieved. Next phase will focus on extending capacity-building to County Service Centers to ensure operational alignment with planning units.
----------	---	---	----	--	--	---

2.	# of County Service Centers and County councils with capacities to apply gender responsive planning and budgeting tools in the budget	0	15	No new trainings were conducted during the reporting period. Preparatory work was completed for the next phase of gender-responsive planning and budgeting capacity-building, which is scheduled for Q4 2025. This phase will extend support to the remaining ten County Service Centers (CSCs) and County Councils in line with the Government of Liberia's decentralization and gender equality priorities.	Since project inception, five (5) County Service Centers (CSCs) in Bong, Grand Bassa, Lofa, Grand Gedeh, and Nimba have been capacitated to apply gender-responsive planning and budgeting tools in their operations. A total of 67 stakeholders (28 women and 39 men) participated in two targeted gender-focused training sessions conducted jointly by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) and the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (MGCSP), with technical and financial support from UN Women. The sessions were held in Buchanan for CSC staff from Bong and Grand Bassa and in Sanniquellie for those from Lofa, Grand Gedeh, and Nimba, with participation from Ministries,	N/A
----	---	---	----	---	--	-----

					<b>Agencies, and Commissions (MACs) represented in the centers.</b>	

2.						
1.						
3						

  

2.						
1.						
4						

  

2.						
1.						
5						

» **Output 2.2: Citizen participation in decentralized political processes, including development planning and budgeting and service delivery, is strengthened**

2. 2. 1	# of citizens (disaggregated by age and gender) consulted in development of county development plans disaggregated by types	Gender Men =51% Women =43%  Youth =40% Age Youth (18- 34 years) =40%; Adults (35- 54 years) =52%; Elders (55+ years) =46%	600	<p>This indicator was achieved in the previous reporting period.</p> <p>During the reporting period, a perception survey across 12 counties showed that 47% of respondents (812 of 1,739) participated in county-level public planning or decision-making processes within the past year. While this reflects moderate civic engagement, more than half (53%) of citizens remain excluded from formal consultations. Participation was higher among men (51%) than women (43%), highlighting ongoing gender gaps linked to access to information, social norms, and competing domestic responsibilities. Among participants, 72% were satisfied with the quality of their engagement,</p>	<p>A perception survey across 12 counties showed that 47% of citizens (812 of 1,739) participated in county-level planning or decision-making processes. While this reflects moderate civic engagement, over half (53%) remain outside formal consultations, mainly due to lack of awareness or information. Since the start of the project, a total of 3,204 citizens has taken part in County Development Agenda (CDA) processes nationwide—2,217 during county consultations and 987 during validation workshops. Women's participation increased from 24% (551/2,217) at the consultation stage to 34% (337/987) at validation, following targeted inclusion measures. Youth</p>	<p>This indicator is achieved. The project raises citizens awareness to participate in development plans through awareness raising.</p>
---------------	---	---	-----	---	--	---

suggesting that when citizens are included, they find the process meaningful. Among non-participants, the main barrier was lack of awareness or information (34%), followed by personal or logistical constraints. represented 19%, and persons with disabilities 6% of validation participants.

2.	# persons accessing youth and gender responsive services at the County Service Centers disaggregated by sex and age	125 (2022)	400	0	In 2024, a total of 9,891 individuals accessed services at County Service Centers across 12 counties (6,052 men and 3,839 women), marking a significant increase from 2,773 users in 2023. Across the counties, participation was highest in Margibi (2,188), followed by Grand Gedeh (1,236), Grand Kru (1,172), Gbarpolu (1,148), River Gee (1,048), and Bong (1,059). Moderate participation was recorded in Grand Cape Mount (855), Maryland (480), Sinoe (464), and Lofa (241). No participants were reported in Nimba, Bomi, Grand Bassa, River Cess, and Montserrado. Complementing these figures, the citizen perception survey found that 71% of respondents accessed CSC services in the past year, with men (72%) and women (70%) reporting	N/A
----	---	------------	-----	---	--	-----

					<p>nearly equal usage. The most used services included documentation (42%), national ID cards (28%), and health services (8%). While 65% were satisfied or very satisfied, 21% faced challenges, mainly delays (66%) and extra payments (19%).</p>	
2. 2. 3						
2. 2. 4						
2. 2. 5						

» Output 2.3:

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						
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

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

---

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

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

---

For each output, and using the project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against 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 cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 3. 1						
4. 3. 2						
4. 3. 3						
4. 3. 4						
4. 3. 5						

» Output 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	Gender and inclusion capacity-building training for County Council members, local leaders, and County Security Council members	21-23 November 2025	Gbarnga, Bong County	County Council representatives, local leaders, and County Security Council members from Bong, Nimba, and Lofa (19 participants).	The training aims to strengthen gender-responsive leadership at the local level by improving participants' understanding of gender equality, inclusion, and their responsibilities under the Local Government Act. It will support county authorities to better recognize and address barriers faced by women, girls, and other underrepresented groups, and to apply gender considerations in county planning, coordination, and decision-making processes. The training also promotes inclusive participation and stronger accountability in local governance structures.

<b>Event 2</b>	<p>Gender-focused consultation with women, youth, persons with disabilities, civil society, and local authorities to identify barriers to gender equality, gather community priorities, and strengthen inclusive participation in local governance. The consultation supports implementation of the Local Government Act and promotes gender-responsive planning and service delivery at the county level.</p>	21-23 November 2025	Gbarnga, Bong County	Local women's groups, youth representatives, persons with disabilities, County Gender Coordinators, female members of County Councils, local stakeholders, and women-led CSOs (22 participants from six counties).	<p>The consultation aims to strengthen women's voices and participation in local decision-making by identifying key barriers to gender equality and social inclusion and collecting insights on community needs and priorities. It will create space for dialogue among local leaders, women, youth, persons with disabilities, and civil society to co-develop practical recommendations for improving gender-responsive governance. The consultation also supports duty-bearers to understand their roles under the Local Government Act and to apply gender-inclusive approaches in county planning and service delivery.</p>
<b>Event 3</b>					
<b>Event 4</b>					

## 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*

<b>Human Impact</b>	<b>Type of stakeholder</b>	<b>What has been the impact of the project on their lives?</b>	<b>Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from the stakeholder</b>
1	Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)	<p>Prior to the project, many CSOs lacked the technical capacity, tools, and coordination mechanisms to effectively monitor public service delivery or engage with government institutions. Their advocacy efforts were often fragmented, with limited access to public data and minimal influence in governance processes. Through the project, CSOs received targeted training, revised manuals, and digital tools that enhanced their ability to track government projects and engage citizens. The deployment of County Accountability and Advocacy Teams (CAATs) enabled real-time monitoring and strengthened their role as watchdogs. As a result, CSOs are now more confident, better organized, and actively contributing to transparency and accountability at the county level.</p>	<p><b>“Before this project, we struggled to access public records and mobilize communities. Now, we’re equipped to hold institutions accountable and amplify citizen voices in ways we couldn’t before.”</b></p> <p>— CSO Representative, Bong County</p>

2	<b>Social Accountability Monitors and Youth Volunteers</b>	<p>Monitors and youth volunteers initially faced challenges such as limited digital literacy, inconsistent reporting tools, and lack of structured platforms for civic engagement. The project addressed these gaps through refresher trainings, deployment of digital tools like COMM CARE and TALKAY, and mentorship support. Monitors now collect and report data in real time, engage with over 2,000 citizens, and facilitate county-level dialogues. Youth inclusion has been mainstreamed, empowering young people to take leadership roles in governance and anti-corruption efforts.</p>	<p>“This initiative gave us the skills and confidence to speak up and track development projects in our communities. We’re no longer bystanders we’re part of the solution.”</p> <p>— Youth Monitor, Grand Gedeh</p>
3	<b>Media Practitioners and Journalists</b>	<p>Journalists previously lacked access to investigative training, digital tools, and legal knowledge, and often faced safety risks when reporting on corruption. The project’s national media training, led by LACC, equipped them with ethical frameworks, digital tools, and knowledge of the Freedom of Information Act. As a result, a new cohort of investigative journalists has emerged, producing corruption-focused stories and expanding public awareness</p>	<p>“The training changed how I approach stories. I now use digital platforms to uncover facts and protect my sources. It’s made me a better journalist.”</p> <p>— Journalist, Nimba County</p>

4	Local Government Officials	<p>Local officials had limited exposure to anti-corruption laws, procurement compliance, and community engagement strategies. The project's regional trainings improved their understanding of integrity frameworks and operational transparency. These sessions fostered collaboration between national and sub-national institutions and promoted a culture of accountability.</p>	<p>"We now see accountability not just as a mandate, but as a shared responsibility with our communities. The training helped us understand how to lead with integrity."</p> <p>— County Official, Sinoe</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.*

**The establishment and operationalization of County Development Planning Units (CDPUs) in all 15 counties have strengthened the technical and institutional capacity of local government staff to lead inclusive and accountable planning. Over 130 officers (30 women, 100 men) were trained by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), in collaboration with MFDP, MGCSP, the Governance Commission, and the Internal Audit Agency, on development planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, and gender-responsive governance. County officers now apply tools such as the Gender Action Plan Guideline and gender-responsive budgeting checklist to ensure that local priorities and service delivery reflect the needs of all citizens, particularly women and youth. This has improved coordination, data management, and accountability across county structures and enhanced local ownership of development processes.**

**The establishment of the CDPUs is a major step in ensuring that counties can plan, coordinate, and monitor development at their level," said Assistant Minister Roosevelt Jayjay of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, highlighting how the new structures are transforming decentralization from policy to practice**

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

**OPTIONAL**

File 1

**OPTIONAL**

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 2

**OPTIONAL**

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 3

**OPTIONAL**

SAP Baseline and Perception Survey Report\_fina-0\_31\_50.pdf



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

**OPTIONAL**

Link 1

**OPTIONAL**

<https://frontpageafricaonline.com/opinion/press-release/undp-and-pbf-empower-citizen-led-governance-in-liberia/>

Link 2

**OPTIONAL**

<https://frontpageafricaonline.com/news/liberia-naymote-reports-major-progress-in-citizen-led-oversight-of-county-development/>

Link 3

**OPTIONAL**

<https://liberianinvestigator.com/news/naymote-undp-expand-citizen-oversight-375-projects-liberia/>

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 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.*

**During the reporting period, the project prioritized digital transformation to strengthen transparency, citizen engagement, and institutional efficiency. Key achievements included the rollout of digital monitoring tools for civil society organizations, enabling real-time tracking of corruption cases and public contract awards. Integrity institutions were supported to digitize complaint intake systems and streamline data collection processes. These innovations have reduced administrative bottlenecks and improved access to information for both citizens and oversight bodies.**

Please explain one of the selected options

*Please limit your response to 3000 characters.*

**The project contributed to significant policy reforms aimed at enhancing accountability and governance. Notably, technical support was provided for the amendment of the Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission (LACC) Act and the development of a whistleblower protection law. These frameworks were informed by multi-stakeholder consultations and aligned with international best practices. The reforms have strengthened institutional mandates, clarified investigative powers, and created legal safeguards for citizen participation in anti-corruption efforts.**

Please explain one of the selected options

*Please limit your response to 3000 characters.*

**Strategic partnerships with grassroots CSOs and women/youth-led groups were central to implementation. These organizations were trained and mobilized to monitor national commitments, track corruption investigations, and produce credible reports. Their involvement has amplified community voices, enhanced local ownership, and fostered inclusive oversight. Through scorecards, public forums, and media engagement, CSOs have played a pivotal role in holding institutions accountable and promoting civic trust.**

## 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*

The project fostered collaboration among UNDP, UN Women, and other UN entities to ensure integrated support to national partners. Joint planning, shared M&E frameworks, and coordinated field missions enabled efficient resource use and harmonized messaging. This synergy has strengthened the UN's collective impact on governance, gender equity, and peacebuilding outcomes. During the reporting period, the project actively partnered with a diverse range of local civil society organizations (CSOs), including women-led groups, youth networks, media coalitions, and grassroots accountability platforms. These partnerships were instrumental in advancing inclusive governance, anti-corruption monitoring, and civic engagement across multiple counties. The project worked closely with national integrity institutions including the LACC, PPCC, IAA, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, and the Ministry of Justice to strengthen investigative capacity, policy coherence, and inter-agency coordination. Engagements included technical assistance, joint planning sessions, and support for the National Integrity Forum. These partnerships have reinforced institutional leadership and advanced Liberia's anti-corruption reform agenda. Local volunteers were deployed across multiple counties to support social accountability initiatives. These volunteers received training in monitoring, reporting, and community mobilization, and have been instrumental in bridging the gap between citizens and institutions. Their contributions have enhanced grassroots vigilance, promoted civic education, and expanded the reach of integrity programming.

## 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.*

**During the July–October 2025 reporting period, the Social Accountability Project implemented a robust set of monitoring activities to ensure timely delivery, quality assurance, and adaptive learning across all 15 counties. These activities were coordinated by the Programme Management Support Unit (PMSU) in collaboration with implementing partners Accountability Lab Liberia (ALAB), Naymote Partners for Democratic Development, and the Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission (LACC).**

**Key monitoring activities included:**

- **Deployment of County Accountability and Advocacy Teams (CAATs):** Naymote mobilized and supervised CAATs in all counties to track 375 government projects. These teams conducted field visits, facilitated citizen engagement sessions, and submitted monthly monitoring reports that informed project adjustments and stakeholder feedback loops.
- **Use of digital platforms for real-time reporting:** The project scaled up the use of COMM CARE and the TALKAY app to enhance data collection and reporting accuracy. These tools enabled monitors to log corruption cases, service delivery gaps, and citizen feedback directly from the field, improving responsiveness and transparency.
- **Monthly data validation and synthesis:** PMSU conducted monthly reviews of partner reports and field data to verify progress against output indicators. This included triangulating citizen engagement figures, training attendance, and corruption case tracking with partner submissions and digital logs.
- **Stakeholder feedback and perception tracking:** The initial Project Perception Survey was completed and reviewed by consortium members. This survey captured citizen perspectives on transparency, service delivery, and institutional accountability, and will inform future programming once finalized.
- **On-site supervision and spot checks:** UNDP and LACC conducted joint monitoring visits during regional trainings in Ganta and Buchanan. These visits assessed training quality, participant engagement, and logistical coordination, and provided real-time feedback to facilitators.
- **Media monitoring and content tracking:** LACC monitored corruption-related media outputs following its national journalism training. This included tracking investigative stories published by trained journalists and assessing public discourse trends on governance issues.
- **Indicator tracking and reporting:** Progress against key indicators such as corruption cases reported via TALKAY, justice actors trained, and citizen engagement levels.

These monitoring activities ensured that implementation remained evidence-based, inclusive, and responsive to evolving field realities. They also reinforced accountability across partners and contributed to adaptive management and strategic learning.

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.*

**The Social Accountability Project's baseline and perception survey, conducted between May and August 2025, was specifically designed to establish benchmark data for its outcome indicators. These indicators span across corruption, accountability, decentralization, service delivery, and citizen participation in governance. The survey reached 1,739 respondents across all 15 counties of Liberia using household interviews, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews, complemented by desk reviews of relevant literature and policies. Baseline data was collected to support the two core outcomes of the project: Outcome 1: Strengthened national anti-corruption and integrity institutions enabling inclusive citizen participation and gender-responsive service delivery • Baseline indicators include:** o Awareness of anti-corruption laws and institutions (e.g., LACC, PPCC): Only 45% of respondents were aware, with significant gender gaps (53% men vs. 38% women). o Reporting of corruption cases: Only 12% of respondents had ever reported a case, and fewer than 10% received follow-up. o Trust in anti-graft institutions: Trust levels were low, with civil society organizations enjoying relatively higher credibility than state institutions. o Experience with bribery: 62% of respondents had either personally experienced or knew someone who faced bribery in the past year. Outcome 2: Increased transparency, inclusivity, and accountability in county planning and service delivery • Baseline indicators include: o Access to County Service Centers (CSCs): 71% of respondents accessed services in the past year, with nearly equal usage by men and women. o Satisfaction with services: 65% expressed satisfaction, while 11% were dissatisfied due to delays, bribery, and documentation issues. o Participation in governance: 47% participated in county-level planning; 73% in community meetings. However, only 19% felt their voices were always heard. o Gender and social inclusion: Women and persons with disabilities faced subtle but persistent barriers, including longer wait times, discrimination, and limited infrastructure accessibility. These baselines provide a foundation for tracking progress against the project's results framework and inform midline and endline evaluations. They also guide adaptive management and policy reforms aimed at improving transparency, accountability, and inclusive governance in Liberia.

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

*Please limit your response to 3000 characters.*

**The Social Accountability Project's baseline and perception survey utilized a diverse set of evidence sources to report on indicators. The household survey engaged 1,739 respondents across all 15 counties of Liberia through Computer-Assisted Personal Interviews (CAPI), capturing quantitative data on demographics, service access, corruption perceptions, institutional trust, and governance participation. Raw datasets, cleaned files, and summary statistics are available upon request. Complementing this, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with women, youth, and persons with disabilities provided qualitative depth, exploring lived experiences around service delivery and accountability; transcripts and thematic analyses are documented for validation. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with County Service Center administrators, government officials, and civil society leaders offered institutional insights into decentralization and anti-corruption enforcement, with interview notes archived for review. A comprehensive desk review of national policies and global indices, including the Local Government Act and Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, helped triangulate findings with governance benchmarks, and annotated bibliographies are accessible. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework guided data collection through a structured results matrix, with indicator tracking sheets maintained by the project team. Gender and social inclusion analysis was conducted using disaggregated data by sex, age, and disability status to assess equity in access and participation, supported by detailed charts and summaries. Finally, County-Level Service Data from administrative records validated citizen-reported experiences, with service logs and fee schedules available for reference. These sources collectively ensure that reported indicators are grounded in credible, triangulated evidence and can be made available upon request for transparency and learning.**

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.*

**Yes, the project has launched outcome-level data collection initiatives, including a formal perception survey. The Baseline and Perception Survey conducted between May and August 2025 meets the criteria of a formal perception survey. It involved a randomly selected sample of 1,739 respondents across all 15 counties of Liberia, using Computer-Assisted Personal Interviews (CAPI) and standardized questionnaires. The survey collected data on citizens' lived experiences and perceptions related to corruption, accountability, service delivery, decentralization, and participation in governance, providing robust baseline evidence for outcome-level indicators.**

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 used and is in the process of strengthening community feedback mechanisms. As part of its outcome on enhancing transparency and accountability at the local level, the Social Accountability Project has supported the establishment and use of community-based monitoring systems. These include citizen participation in community meetings, county-level planning forums, and anti-corruption initiatives, where individuals especially women, youth, and persons with disabilities are encouraged to voice their concerns and provide feedback on public service delivery. The baseline survey itself served as a foundational feedback tool, capturing citizens' perceptions and lived experiences across all 15 counties. Moreover, the project promotes feedback loops by recommending mechanisms that ensure citizens receive updates on how their inputs are used in planning and decision-making. These efforts are complemented by the involvement of civil society organizations, which act as intermediaries to channel community feedback to decision-makers through dialogue platforms, citizen scorecards, and participatory research. These mechanisms are designed not only to collect feedback but also to empower communities to influence governance processes and hold institutions accountable.**

## » 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.*

Contact information	Name	Organization	Job title	Email
Please mention the focal person responsible for sharing the final evaluation report with the PBF:				

## » 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.*

**Yes, the Social Accountability Project has demonstrated a catalytic effect beyond its direct outputs, contributing to longer-term peacebuilding and governance transformation in Liberia. The project has fostered a culture of civic engagement, institutional accountability, and inclusive governance that continues to influence national and sub-national dynamics.**

**By equipping civil society organizations, youth monitors, journalists, and local government officials with tools, training, and platforms for oversight, the project has strengthened trust between citizens and duty bearers. The emergence of investigative journalism cohorts, the deployment of County Accountability and Advocacy Teams (CAATs), and the integration of digital tools like TALKAY and COMM CARE have created sustainable mechanisms for transparency and citizen participation.**

**These interventions have not only improved service delivery monitoring but also contributed to a shift in public discourse where corruption is increasingly challenged, and communities are empowered to demand accountability. The project's alignment with national decentralization efforts and its emphasis on gender equity and youth inclusion further reinforce its peacebuilding relevance.**

**As the project requests a non-cost extension through December 31, 2025, this additional period will allow for consolidation of gains, deeper institutional uptake, and continued mentorship of stakeholders. It will also support the finalization of the perception survey, expanded regional trainings, and strategic dissemination of results ensuring that the project's impact endures beyond its formal implementation window.**

## 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 ensure the sustainability of peacebuilding gains beyond the project's formal duration, the Social Accountability Project has embedded a range of institutional, community-based, and digital mechanisms that reinforce inclusive governance, transparency, and citizen engagement.**

**At the institutional level, the project strengthened the operational capacity of the Liberia Anti-Corruption Commission (LACC), Naymote Partners for Democratic Development, and Accountability Lab Liberia (ALAB) through training, technical support, and regional coordination. These institutions now serve as anchors for continued anti-corruption advocacy, civic education, and oversight. The integration of anti-corruption modules into local government trainings reaching 120 officials across six counties has fostered a culture of integrity and legal compliance that will persist through decentralized governance structures.**

**Community-level sustainability is supported through the deployment of County Accountability and Advocacy Teams (CAATs) in all 15 counties. These teams, composed of trained youth and civil society monitors, continue to track public projects, facilitate citizen dialogues, and engage local authorities. Their presence ensures ongoing grassroots oversight and responsiveness, even after project closure.**

**Digital platforms such as the TALKAY app and COMM CARE have been institutionalized to enable real-time reporting, data collection, and citizen feedback. TALKAY, in particular, has become a trusted channel for reporting corruption cases, with 20 cases logged and 17 investigated during the reporting period. These tools are designed for long-term use by both citizens and institutions, promoting transparency and accountability through accessible technology.**

**The project also fostered durable media accountability by training a nationwide cohort of investigative journalists. These practitioners now produce corruption-focused stories and leverage the Freedom of Information Act to access public records. Their continued reporting contributes to public awareness and institutional scrutiny, reinforcing democratic norms and civic participation.**

**Partnerships have been a cornerstone of sustainability. The project cultivated networks among civil society organizations, media institutions, traditional leaders, and government agencies. These relationships have led to inter-county collaboration, peer learning, and shared ownership of governance reforms. The perception survey, once finalized and disseminated, will further inform policy dialogue and programming, ensuring that citizen voices shape future interventions.**

**Gender-responsive and youth-inclusive practices were embedded throughout, ensuring that marginalized groups remain central to governance processes. By prioritizing local ownership, digital innovation, and institutional resilience, the project has laid a foundation for sustained peacebuilding impact that extends well beyond its implementation timeline.**

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

*Please limit your response to 3000 characters.*

**No, not now.**

## 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
<b>Event 1</b>	Regional Governance Trainings (Ganta & Buchanan)	Conducted by LACC and UNDP for 120 local government officials from six counties, focusing on anti-corruption laws, procurement compliance, and community engagement.	Improved legal awareness and operational transparency; participants demonstrated increased understanding of integrity frameworks and peer collaboration.
<b>Event 2</b>	County Accountability and Advocacy Team (CAAT) Deployment	Naymote deployed CAATs across all 15 counties to monitor 375 government projects and engage over 2,000 citizens.	Real-time monitoring enhanced citizen oversight: monthly reports informed adaptive planning and revealed gaps in service delivery.
<b>Event 3</b>	National Media Training (Ganta)	LACC convened journalists from all counties for training on investigative journalism, ethics, and digital access to public records.	Emergence of a nationwide cohort of investigative reporters; increased corruption-related media coverage and use of FOI tools.
<b>Event 4</b>	Digital Monitoring via TALKAY and COMM CARE	Partners used digital platforms to collect and report field data, including corruption cases and citizen feedback.	20 cases reported via TALKAY, 17 investigated: digital tools improved data accuracy and reporting efficiency.
<b>Event 5</b>	Project Perception Survey Review	Initial draft of the perception survey was completed and reviewed by consortium members.	Survey captured citizen perspectives on transparency and governance; final version to guide future programming.

<b>Event 6</b>	<b>Financial Oversight and Tranche Disbursement</b>	PMSU monitored liquidation and disbursement and tranche implementing partners.	Financial execution aligned with workplan; 79% delivery rate achieved, with continued monitoring for final liquidation.
<b>Event 7</b>			
<b>Event 8</b>			

### 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](mailto: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.