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

Click Next below to start

» Report Submission

Type of report *
- ( ) Semi-annual
- (●) Annual
- ( ) Final
- ( ) Other

Date of submission of report *
2025-11-20

Name and title of person submitting the report *
Nadja Azra Uzunovic, M&E Analyst

E-mail of person submitting the report *
nadja.azra.uzunovic.jazvin@undp.org

Name and title of person who approved the report *
Jan Nemecek, Head of UN RCO

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
- (●) Europe and Central Asia
- ( ) Middle East and North Africa
- ( ) Central & Southern Africa
- ( ) Global
- ( ) East Africa
- ( ) Latin America and the Caribean
- ( ) West Africa

Country of project implementation *

- ( ) Albania
- ( ) Kyrgyzstan
- ( ) North Macedonia
- ( ) Uzbekistan
- (●) Bosnia and Herzegovina
- ( ) Moldova
- ( ) Serbia
- ( ) Other, Specify
- ( ) Kosovo (As per UNSCR 1244)
- ( ) Montenegro
- ( ) Tajikistan

Other, please specify *

Project Title *

- ( ) 00134115: Sustaining peace and social cohesion in Bosnia and Herzegovina through enhanced inter-municipal and inter-entity cooperation on local services (SPSC)
- ( ) 00140352: Women lead the way towards peace and security in Bosnia and Herzegovina
- (●) 00140395: Support to a PBF Secretariat in Bosnia and Herzegovina to enhance strategic direction coordination and peacebuilding impact
- ( ) 00140558: A more Equitable Society: Promoting Social Cohesion and Diversity in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Dialogue for Future 3 – DFF3)
- ( ) 00140815: PEACESTORY: Empowering Creative Peacebuilders & Educators
- ( ) 00140937: Building long lasting peace in BiH: Investment in the future
- ( ) Other, Specify

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

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

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

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

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

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) *

2023-11-30

Project End Date *

2026-11-30

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? *

( ) January	( ) February	(•) March
( ) April	( ) May	( ) June
( ) July	( ) August	( ) September
( ) October	( ) November	( ) 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

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

Other, Please specify

Implementing Partners

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

0

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)

0

Financial Reporting

» Delivery by Recipient

Please enter the total amounts in full US dollars allocated to each recipient organization
Please enter the original budget amount, amount transferred to date and estimated expenditure by recipient.
*Please make sure you enter the correct amount. All values should be entered in **US Dollars***

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

Recipients	Total Project Budget (in full US $) *Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars*	Transfers to date (in full US $) *Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars*	Expenditure to date (in full US $) *Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars*	Implementation rate as a percentage of total budget *(calculated automatically)*
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme	1575575	945345	723208.33	45.9%
				%
				%
				%
				%
				%
				%
				%
				%

		*	*	*
				%
		*	*	*
				%
		*	*	*
				%
		*	*	*
				%
		*	*	*
				%
		*	*	*
				%
		*	*	*
				%
TOTAL	**1575575**	**945345**	**723208.33**	**45.9%**

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **45.9%**. 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? *

38.79

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 $ 611165.54**. 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 $ 280532.51**. Is this correct? *

( ) Correct   (●) Incorrect

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

290386.69

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE. *
The templates for the budget are available here

Current level of expenditure commitment_November 2025-14_58_17.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

Over the past six months, the PBF Secretariat has maintained regular engagement with institutions at all levels of government, under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC). Cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) remains central, and has been further strengthened through the deployment of a Policy Expert to the MFA in September 2025. The Secretariat continues to support the MFA in advancing the Council of Ministers' decision on the Peacebuilding Committee (PBC), including through consultations with the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Brkić, who reaffirmed his support in a meeting with the RC in November 2025.

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The Secretariat also supported high-level visits that deepened government engagement in peacebuilding processes. During the June 2025 visit of PBSO Deputy Head, Ms. Awa Dabo, the RC and PBF Manager facilitated meetings with the Minister of Communications and Transport, Edin Forto, to discuss future initiatives on countering hate speech and potential cooperation with IFIs. Ms. Dabo additionally met with the Advisors to the BiH Presidency to exchange views on the political situation and peacebuilding priorities.

In October 2025, the Secretariat organized a field visit for the UN Regional Director for Europe and Central Asia, Gwi Yeop Son, to Mostar and Stolac—joined by MFA Assistant Minister Aida Hodžić. The visit highlighted persistent challenges related to divided education and inter-ethnic relations and showcased PBF-supported youth and social cohesion initiatives. Meetings were also held with all three Presidency Advisors to discuss trust-building efforts and the Presidency's engagement in the DFF3 Steering Committee.

Regular engagement continued with senior government leadership, including a January 2025 meeting between the RC and the Chairwoman of the BiH Presidency, Ms. Željka Cvijanović.

At the technical level, the Secretariat coordinated consultations with the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees, entity ministries, and local governments in Mostar and Prijedor to advance the Dealing with the Past (DwP) process. These consultations informed a DwP concept note fully aligned with the document Priorities for Enhancing Bosnia and Herzegovina's Path to Dealing with the Past, developed under the PBF Secretariat in summer 2025.

The Secretariat also supported major programme events, including the regional ministerial conference "Dialogue for the Future," which gathered foreign affairs ministers and deputy ministers from BiH, Croatia, Türkiye, North Macedonia, and Montenegro. Their joint declaration strengthened momentum for UNESCO's cultural-heritage-for-peace work and informed the 2026 focus on peace education. The Secretariat further contributed to the International WPS Conference (2025), which convened 150 participants from 25 countries under the WPS programme.

Additionally, the Secretariat facilitated a meeting between Assistant Minister Aida Hodžić and Ms. Awa Dabo at UN Headquarters on 26 September 2025, emphasizing the central role of women and youth in BiH's peacebuilding architecture. Finally, in partnership with the Ministry of Security, the Secretariat initiated the production of a documentary on the contributions of BiH police officers to UN peacekeeping—aligned with PBF communication priorities and coordinated with the WPS programme due to its gender focus.

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 PBF Secretariat has been fully operational since October 2024, with a team comprising the PBF Manager, M&E Analyst, Communications Analyst, and Finance/Admin Associate, ensuring effective coordination and continuous strategic support to the RC. In September 2025, the structure was strengthened through the recruitment of a national Policy Expert to support the MFA in advancing the peace and trust-building agenda.

In summer 2025, international consultants finalized Priorities for Enhancing Bosnia and Herzegovina's Path to Dealing with the Past, which became the basis for the new Concept Note (CN) on Dealing with the Past. Developed through consultations with the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees, the EU, and civil society—and supported by the Folke Bernadotte Academy via the EU–UN Dialogue (Stream 5 – Reconciliation)—the CN has been shared with DPPA/PBSO and is expected to be approved by the end of 2025.

The Secretariat coordinated the development of the joint programme Partnerships for Equality: No to Hate Speech and Divisive Narratives in BiH, prepared by UNESCO, UN Women, and UNDP in consultation with government and media actors. The programme received PBSO endorsement in May 2025 and is awaiting fund transfer.

A nationwide Public Perception Survey, completed in August 2025, collected data from 1,000 respondents and six focus groups across BiH. Its findings will inform the PBF Strategic Framework, guide future programming, and support decision-making by the RC and Secretariat.

To sustain donor engagement, the RC and Secretariat organized multiple bilateral and multilateral meetings, including an outreach event with Arab ambassadors, aimed at strengthening dialogue, mobilizing support, and aligning understanding of peacebuilding priorities and PBF impact.

The Secretariat continued active engagement in the EU–UN Dialogue Stream on Peacebuilding, particularly on transitional justice. The 2025 DwP study has been fully embraced by the EU and now underpins joint efforts linked to EU Accession Key Priority 5 (reconciliation), strengthening coherence between UN and EU strategies.

The Secretariat contributed to Project Steering Committees for both UN-implemented and CSO-led initiatives, advising partners on implementation, communication, and results presentation to improve overall strategic coherence.

Communication remained central to the Secretariat's work. Visibility was strengthened through campaigns such as 12 Days of Peace and 30 Years of Peace, as well as several editions of the Peacebuilding Highlights newsletter. Joint EU–UN communication further amplified shared achievements. The Secretariat also supported high-level visits, including those of USG DiCarlo, Awa Dabo, and Regional Director Gwi Yeop Son, as well as events such as the Sarajevo Call for Peace and BiH youth participation at WPS Week in New York.

Finally, the Secretariat launched procurement for capacity-building on conflict-sensitive programming and M&E (to begin in early 2026) and initiated development of SOPs to strengthen coherence and transparency in coordination, reporting, and communication across the PBF portfolio.

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

Outcome 1: The PBF portfolio is well-coordinated to ensure synergies and greater impact for peacebuilding in BiH

Output 1.1 – PBF Secretariat is established and functional
The Secretariat is fully operational with a team of four (Manager, M&E Analyst, Communications Analyst, Finance/Admin Associate) and 50% Development Coordination Associate (until Aug 2025). It works in close coordination with the RC and PDA and participates in the EU–UN Dialogue Stream on Peacebuilding launched in January 2025, enhancing political leverage and alignment with EU priorities.

Output 1.2 – PBF programs meet PBF quality criteria
All PBF projects undergo regular quality checks through monthly Portfolio Meetings and bilateral consultations with RUNOs. The Secretariat reviewed project designs to ensure conflict sensitivity, including extensive co-creation support for the "Countering Hate Speech" programme. The Secretariat also led the development of the Dealing with the Past (DwP) position paper, endorsed by national and international partners, which now informs a new DwP Concept Note.

Output 1.3 – Coordination mechanisms strengthened
Coordination across PBF projects is supported through:
• Monthly Portfolio Meetings on programmatic alignment, M&E, and communications.
• Field visits using a standardized PBSO template, conducted to:
   – PEACESTORY (Sept 2025)
   – WPS Programme (Sept 2025)
   – DFF3 (Oct 2025)
   – BIRN/Premise of Facts project (Nov 2025)
• A Letter of Exchange signed with the Folke Bernadotte Academy (Aug 2025) to support strategic peacebuilding efforts.
• Draft SOPs developed to clarify Secretariat roles, harmonize reporting, M&E, and communications across all RUNOs.

Output 1.4 – Support to Joint Steering Committee and oversight mechanisms
The inaugural PBF Joint Steering Committee met in February 2024. A COM decision proposed by the EU could not advance due to the 2024–2025 political and constitutional crisis. To maintain momentum, an International Partners Meeting was co-chaired by the RC and MFA in November 2024. High-level Strategic Peacebuilding Consultations involving state ministers, Presidency advisors, key donors, regional partners, and Heads of UN Agencies are scheduled for 26 November 2025.

Outcome 2: Improved result tracking, learning, and communication on PBF impact

Output 2.1 – Quality M&E of the PBF portfolio
A structured M&E framework with quarterly updates is operational. The 2025 Public Perception Survey provided key insights: low interethnic trust, limited civic engagement among youth, and under-recognized roles of women in peacebuilding. Two rounds of assessments revealed M&E and conflict-sensitivity gaps among RUNOs; procurement of a service provider for capacity-building is underway, with training planned for early 2026. The Secretariat contributed to evaluations of the SPSC (final) and WPS (mid-term), identifying strong relevance but sustainability risks linked to youth outmigration and political uncertainty.

Output 2.2 – Strengthened communication and visibility of the PBF portfolio
In 2025, communication efforts were significantly expanded to build public understanding, donor confidence, and national ownership:
• Portfolio-wide communication was coordinated centrally through UN BiH channels, ensuring coherence.
• Cross-project visibility was enhanced through collaboration with the UN Youth Advisory Board and the EU-funded Možemo bolje initiative.
• Major events supported: 25th anniversary of UNSCR 1325, International WPS Conference, SPSC closure events, DFF3 activities.
• A unified Communication Strategy and Action Plan guided all RUNOs.
• Four editions of the Peacebuilding Highlights newsletter were issued, with a fifth planned for December 2025.
• Joint EU–UN communication was strengthened, including an editorial by the EU Ambassador and coordinated outreach during the 30th anniversary of the Srebrenica genocide.
• Collaboration with youth resulted in video stories for the "30 Years of Peace" campaign (324,000+ views).
• The "12 Days of Peace" campaign (21 Sept–2 Oct) featured youth stories, events, music camps, Odyssey of Peace activities, and was highlighted in the UN DCO Bulletin and ECA Newsletter.
• The Secretariat supported preparation of a documentary on BiH police contributions to UN peacekeeping, initiated by the Ministry of Security and involving all police structures.
• High-level visit support was provided for missions of Gwi-Yeop Son, Awa Dabo, USG DiCarlo, and events such as the Sarajevo Call for Peace and WPS Week (where BiH youth representative Nia Abadžić participated at UNHQ).

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
N/A

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

The PBF portfolio in BiH demonstrates a shift from isolated, project-based interventions toward more systemic, institutional and people-centred peacebuilding. Through complementary initiatives implemented by UN agencies and civil society partners, the portfolio is increasingly contributing to environments where trust-building, inclusion and social cohesion can develop. While results stem from the work of individual projects, the Secretariat observes growing national co-ownership and a more integrated approach to peacebuilding across sectors. All PBF-funded projects engage government counterparts through programme steering committees involving state and/or entity representation, helping embed peacebuilding approaches into existing governance structures.

Overall, the PBF portfolio in BiH is evolving into a more coherent and sustainable peacebuilding architecture, characterized by national ownership, cross-sectoral cooperation and a broadening ecosystem of engaged peace actors. While achievements derive from individual projects, collectively they contribute to systemic approaches that extend beyond project cycles and strengthen the foundations for long-term peace and social cohesion in BiH.

1. Strengthened Dialogue, Trust, and Inter-Institutional Cooperation
The establishment and regular functioning of Local Dialogue Platforms and inter-municipal cooperation frameworks have created new, sustained spaces where local authorities and communities engage on shared challenges. These mechanisms have improved communication across administrative boundaries and helped reduce tensions around sensitive issues such as returnee integration, youth mobility and service delivery. In several municipalities, joint problem-solving between authorities and citizens has become a normalized practice rather than an ad-hoc intervention.
2. Institutional Integration of Peacebuilding Principles
Peacebuilding, inclusion and equality are increasingly embedded within institutional arrangements at both state and local levels. This is evident in the development of the 4th National Action Plan on UNSCR 1325, which reflects the largest and most inclusive WPS consultation process undertaken in BiH to date. Ministries of education, gender equality agencies, health institutions and social service providers are increasingly incorporating gender equality, violence prevention and inclusion into their mandates, demonstrating behavioural and policy-level change that will outlast project cycles.
3. Shifts in Public Narratives and Increased Societal Resilience
Through partnerships with cultural institutions, youth groups and media actors, the portfolio has supported initiatives that challenge divisive narratives and promote shared understanding of historical events, empathy and critical thinking. Public engagement around transitional justice, court-determined facts, peace education and creative storytelling has contributed to a more open societal dialogue. Resonance is visible in increased demand for fact-based content, positive audience feedback, and stronger participation of youth and women in public discussions on reconciliation.
4. Increased Cross-Entity and Regional Connectivity
Youth exchanges, volunteer programmes and regional peace dialogues have strengthened networks across entity lines and within the wider Western Balkans. Participants report improved perceptions of "the other," reduced prejudice and a greater sense of shared identity. For many young people, these programmes represent their first meaningful interaction with peers from other communities. These engagements have generated durable relationships, with several youth-led initiatives continuing independently beyond the scope of project funding.
5. Enhanced Support Systems for Survivors and Vulnerable Groups
Structural improvements in local service delivery—such as safe accommodation for survivors of domestic violence, youth-friendly community spaces and strengthened psychosocial support services—have increased the confidence of citizens in local institutions. Survivors are reporting improved access to protection and support, while municipalities that co-finance these services are demonstrating a shift from external dependence to co-ownership and long-term sustainability. This denotes institutional behavioural change and strengthened accountability to communities.
6. Women and Youth as Recognized Actors in Peacebuilding
Outcome-level change is visible in the expanded civic and policy influence of women peacebuilders, survivor advocates and youth leaders. Women's networks formed through WPS initiatives are now engaging directly with government in policy processes. Youth-led groups that emerged from PBF-supported innovation challenges and community actions are increasingly recognized by municipalities and educational institutions as credible partners on social cohesion, culture and prevention. These developments represent a shift in norms around inclusion, agency and leadership.
7. Evidence Informing Policy and Public Debate
Analytical outputs—such as the Database of Court-Determined Facts, the Peace Education Roadmap 2030 and the 15 Years of WPS Assessment—are being used by policymakers, educators and civil society to shape programming and public debate. Their uptake illustrates behavioral change in institutions that increasingly rely on evidence to guide decisions, while contributing to a more informed and fact-based societal discourse on peace and reconciliation.

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.
SPSC Evaluation report: https://www.unevaluation.org/member_publications/final-evaluation-project-sustaining-peace-and-social-cohesion-bosnia-and

---

File attachment

PBF SPSC IOM UNDP_Final Evaluation Report-15_23_3.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: *
The PBF portfolio is well-coordinated to ensure synergies and greater impact for peacebuilding in BiH.

Outcome 2: *
Improved result tracking, learning and communications on PBF portfolio progress and impact

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: The PBF portfolio is well-coordinated to ensure synergies and greater impact for peacebuilding in BiH.

OC1	Outcome Indicators	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	Level of coordination between the PBF portfolio and key government, NGO and development partners	Limited	Regular meetings between PBF projects and key stakeholders, including through the JSC and improved awareness of key stakeholders of PBF portfolio.	Regular meetings between PBF Secretariat and PBF-funded projects held.	Regular monthly meetings between PBF Secretariat and PBF-funded projects held. Also ad hoc meetings are organised on need basis.	
1.2	Level of satisfaction of key UN, government, and NGO stakeholders with PBF Secretariat support	TBC (after 1 year of operation, to be undertaken through an online survey)	TBC	On track	On track	This will be administered following the implementation of capacity building activities for PBF recipients.
1.3						
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
The PBF Secretariat is established and is functional.

Output 1.2
PBF portfolio programs respond to PBF programming quality criteria

Output 1.3
Coordination mechanisms between projects and keys partners are created to achieve strategic results of the PBF portfolio and ensure coherence/synergies between PBF projects and activities.

Output 1.4
Establishment and support to the functioning of the PBF Joint Steering Committee and other relevant oversight committees.

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: The PBF Secretariat is established and is functional.

1.1	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.1.1	**PBF Secretariat set up and its capacity is strengthened.**	**No PBF Secretariat**	**PBF Secretariat established and fully functional**	**PBF Secretariat established and fully functional**	**PBF Secretariat established and fully functional**	
1.1.2						
1.1.3						
1.1.4						
1.1.5						

» Output 1.2: PBF portfolio programs respond to PBF programming quality criteria

1.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.2.1	**Support to strategic interventions related to peacebuilding in BiH.**	n/a	**TBD by the JSC**	**Ongoing**	**Ongoing**	
1.2.2	**At least 30% of total PBF funds are dedicated to gender and/or women empowerment related issues.**	n/a	**at least 30%**	**On track**	**On track**	
1.2.3						
1.2.4						
1.2.5						

» Output 1.3: Coordination mechanisms between projects and keys partners are created to achieve strategic results of the PBF portfolio and ensure coherence/synergies between PBF projects and activities.

1.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.3.1	**Monthly meetings between UN agencies implementing PBF projects, to ensure coordination.**	**Not established**	**12 per year**	**On track**	**On track**	
1.3.2	**# of capacity building trainings, workshops led by PBF Secretariat and RCO on improving conflict and gender sensitive approaches to programming, M&E**	n/a	**2 trainings**	**Ongoing**	**Ongoing**	**Planned for the beginning of 2026.**
1.3.3						
1.3.4						
1.3.5						

» Output 1.4: Establishment and support to the functioning of the PBF Joint Steering Committee and other relevant oversight committees.

1.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.4.1	**Peacebuilding Committee is established.**	**No Committee**	**Committee established**	**Ongoing**	**Ongoing**	**Inaugural Peacebuilding Committee held in Feb. 2024, the official endorsement by the Council of Ministers is pending. Instead PB consultations that include all foreseen actors are organized.**
1.4.2						
1.4.3						
1.4.4						
1.4.5						

» Output 1.5:

1.5	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.5.1						
1.5.2						
1.5.3						
1.5.4						
1.5.5						

» Outcome 2: Improved result tracking, learning and communications on PBF portfolio progress and impact

OC2	Outcome Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
2.1	Increased impact and visibility of the PBF programme monitored and communicated to stakeholders, donors and members of the public.	Limited awareness and fragmented, project-based communication approach	Systematic implementation of a comprehensive strategic communications framework, including: • 1 portfolio level Communications strategy, • 6 newsletters, • 10 stories.	Systematic implementation of a comprehensive strategic communications framework, including: 1 portfolio level Communications strategy, 5 newsletters, 15 stories.	Systematic implementation of a comprehensive strategic communications framework, including: 1 portfolio level Communications strategy, 5 newsletters and 15 stories.	
2.2	Initial catalytic effects registered and communicated to donors.	Limited structured donor interaction with other potential donors	Regular structured engagement established with IFIs, donors and new donors, through events and tailored communications materials and systematic engagement showcasing the PBF achievements	On track	On track	
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
Ensure quality monitoring and evaluation of the PBF portfolio.

Output 2.2
Ensure strong communication and visibility of the PBF Portfolio, including on its progress, best practices, and lessons learned.

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: Ensure quality monitoring and evaluation of the PBF portfolio.

2.1	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.1.1	**M&E of the PBF Strategic Result Framework in place and data is collected against the indicators.**	**Not established**	**M&E Plan of PBF Strategic Result Framework is in place and used to collect data**	**Ongoing**	**Ongoing**	**M&E Framework focused on progress tracking is in place and is regularly updated.**
2.1.2	**Improved availability of data on social cohesion and peacebuilding, disaggregated by sex and age groups.**	**limited**	**Reliable data available**	**Ongoing**	**Ongoing**	**M&E Framework focused on progress tracking is in place and is regularly updated.**
2.1.3	**PBF projects baselines in place within 6 months of project start**	**n/a**	**All**	**Ongoing**	**Ongoing**	
2.1.4	**% of active projects which submit their report within the PBSO deadline**	**n/a**	**100%**	**On track**	**On track**	
2.1.5						

» Output 2.2: Ensure strong communication and visibility of the PBF Portfolio, including on its progress, best practices, and lessons learned.

2.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.2.1	**Number of visibility stories on PBF projects developed and published.**	**No structured visibility approach established**	**12**	**15 stories developed and published across the UN in BiH website, social media, newsletter, and shared to media in the form of press material**	**15**	
2.2.2						
2.2.3						
2.2.4						
2.2.5						

» Output 2.3:

2.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.3.1						
2.3.2						
2.3.3						
2.3.4						
2.3.5						

» Output 2.4:

2.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.4.1						
2.4.2						
2.4.3						
2.4.4						
2.4.5						

» Output 2.5:

2.5	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.5.1						
2.5.2						
2.5.3						
2.5.4						
2.5.5						

» Outcome 3:

OC3	Outcome Indicators	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 *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.1.1						
3.1.2						
3.1.3						
3.1.4						
3.1.5						

» Output 3.2:

3.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.2.1						
3.2.2						
3.2.3						
3.2.4						
3.2.5						

» Output 3.3:

3.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.3.1						
3.3.2						
3.3.3						
3.3.4						
3.3.5						

» Output 3.4:

3.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.4.1						
3.4.2						
3.4.3						
3.4.4						
3.4.5						

» Output 3.5:

3.5	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.5.1						
3.5.2						
3.5.3						
3.5.4						
3.5.5						

» Outcome 4:

OC4	Outcome Indicators	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 *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.1.1						
4.1.2						
4.1.3						
4.1.4						
4.1.5						

» Output 4.2:

4.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.2.1						
4.2.2						
4.2.3						
4.2.4						
4.2.5						

» Output 4.3:

4.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.3.1						
4.3.2						
4.3.3						
4.3.4						
4.3.5						

» Output 4.4:

4.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.4.1						
4.4.2						
4.4.3						
4.4.4						
4.4.5						

» Output 4.5:

4.5	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.5.1						
4.5.2						
4.5.3						
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	**30 Years of Peace Campaign**	**November – December 2025**	**Digital**	**General public, youth, policymakers, international partners, donors, media**	**This flagship public campaign will mark 30 years since the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement and the country's broader peace journey, featuring storytelling, media outreach, and digital campaigns, it will celebrate peacebuilding achievements, elevate local voices, and reaffirm shared commitments to reconciliation, social cohesion, and sustainable peace.**
Event 2	**Presentation of the Database of Court-Determined Facts and the Teaching Manual**	**21 November 2025**	**Sarajevo**	**Educators, policymakers, academia, civil society, media**	**The public presentation of the Database of Court-Determined Facts on the War in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Manual "How to Teach and Learn About the War in BiH", developed within the PBF-supported project "Building Long-Term Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Investing in the Future", jointly implemented by BIRN BiH, the Srebrenica Memorial Center, and the Forgotten Children of War Association.**

| Event 3 | "Here and Now" theatre performance | 22 November 2025 | Sarajevo | Youth, cultural sector, educators, civil society, general public | Organized by the UNFPA through the PBF supported youth project, this theatre performance brings together young actors from across BiH to share personal stories and reflections on identity, coexistence, and the meaning of peace. Through drama, movement, and storytelling, "Here and Now" explores how the legacy of the past can be transformed into creativity, empathy, and dialogue. The performance emphasizes peace as everyday practice, and promotes youth voices as central to shaping a more cohesive and inclusive society. |
| Event 4 | Strategic Roundtable – "The Future of the WPS Agenda in Bosnia and Herzegovina" (5 December), implemented by the WPS Project | 5 December 2025 | Sarajevo | Government representatives, UN agencies, civil society, academia, cultural institutions, international partners | Following BiH accession to the global WPS – Humanitarian Action (WPS-HA) Compact, WPS project will host this roundtable to bring together key stakeholders to discuss national commitments and next-phase priorities. Co-hosted by the Agency for Gender Equality, the Embassy of Germany, the event will outline shared objectives under the Compact, reaffirm partnerships for inclusive and accountable peacebuilding, and feature a signing ceremony and reception marking BiH's renewed WPS leadership. |

Human Impact

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

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

Human Impact	Type of stakeholder	What has been the impact of the project on their lives?	Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from the stakeholder
1			
2			
3			
4			

In addition to the stakeholder specific impact described above, please use this space to describe any additional human impact that the project has had.
Please limit your response to 4000 characters.

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

File 1
OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 2
OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 3
OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

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

Link 1
OPTIONAL

Link 2
OPTIONAL

Link 3
OPTIONAL

Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative.

How we worked: *
Please select up to 3.

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

Please explain one of the selected options
Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The PBF Secretariat engages in continuous dialogue with political and institutional leaders to build consensus around sensitive topics such as transitional justice (in cooperation with the EU), social cohesion, hate speech prevention, and peacebuilding more broadly. Joint UN–EU efforts throughout the year have led to a common understanding and EU political support for the development of the new DwP programme, currently at the Concept Note stage.

The formalization of the relationship with the FBA in August 2025 further strengthened cooperation with the RCO/PBF Secretariat, providing technical and strategic support to peacebuilding processes in the country. This includes strengthening the PBC and offering expertise in thematic areas such as transitional justice, reconciliation, social cohesion, and related issues.
By leveraging the UN's convening power, the Secretariat supports efforts to depoliticize peacebuilding issues and ensure they remain on the national policy agenda.

Please explain one of the selected options
Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Please explain one of the selected options
Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

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

Within the PBF portfolio in BiH, significant progress has been made in fostering closer collaboration and synergy among UN agencies working on peacebuilding-related initiatives. Projects are increasingly designed and implemented jointly, drawing on the comparative advantages of different agencies—such as UNDP's expertise in governance, service delivery and transitional justice, UN Women's focus on gender equality and the WPS and YPS agendas, and UNESCO's mandate in the areas of culture and education. UN agencies and PBF programmes are improving collaboration abd increasingly working together on different events maximising results and exploring new areas of collaboration.
This coordinated approach ensures a more holistic and coherent response to the complex peacebuilding needs in BiH. Moreover, joint planning, monitoring, and evaluation mechanisms have been strengthened, reinforcing the "Delivering as One" principle and maximizing the impact of PBF investments.

Local ownership and inclusivity are key pillars of the PBF approach in BiH. Throughout the portfolio, UN agencies have established meaningful partnerships with a range of civil society organizations, particularly those working on transitional justice, Youth, marginalized communities, women affected by conflict. For example, partnerships with organizations like BIRN and War Childhood Museum and others have enabled deeper community engagement, more relevant programming, and greater trust-building at the grassroots level. Furthermore, projects DFF3 and WPS strengthened partnerships with civil society through grants awards for the relevant activities in local communities.

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 reporting period, the PBF Secretariat implemented a series of structured monitoring activities to strengthen oversight, learning, and adaptive management across the portfolio:
• Monthly Portfolio Coordination Meetings: Regular meetings were held with implementing partners, with a dedicated focus on monitoring and evaluation (M&E), progress tracking and portfolio-level learning. These sessions also supported alignment on communications, visibility, and programmatic priorities.
• Development and Operationalization of the PBF M&E Framework: A comprehensive M&E framework was developed to systematically track progress against quantitative indicators. The framework was populated for the first time in March 2025, with quarterly updates scheduled to ensure continuous data flow and analysis.
• Capacity Needs Assessment: Two rounds of capacity assessments were conducted in February and April 2025 to identify gaps in M&E and conflict sensitivity across project teams. Findings informed the design of targeted capacity-building interventions, including upcoming trainings and mentoring support.
• Finalization of the 2025 Public Perception Survey: The Secretariat completed a nationwide survey focused on social cohesion, trust, and civic engagement. The results provided critical insights into public attitudes toward interethnic relations, youth participation, perceptions of threat, and the role of women in peacebuilding, serving as a key evidence base for strategic planning.
• Field Visits: Field visits to PBF-supported projects commenced in September 2025, aimed at tracking implementation progress, capturing lessons learned and identifying opportunities for catalytic impact. A standardized reporting template, developed in consultation with PBSO, was used to ensure consistency. Four projects were visited during the period.
• These monitoring activities have contributed to improved portfolio-level oversight, strategic learning, and evidence-based decision-making, while also aiming to refine outcome indicators and targets under the PBF Strategic Framework.

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.

Outcome indicators are embedded within the PBF Strategic Framework, developed and approved as part of Bosnia and Herzegovina's eligibility process. Following the completion of the 2025 Public Perception Survey, as well as the final evaluation of the SPSC project and the ongoing mid-term evaluation of the WPS portfolio, the next anticipated step involves a potential review and refinement of outcome indicators and the establishment of corresponding targets. This process will ensure continued relevance, strategic alignment, and evidence-based tracking of peacebuilding results across the portfolio.

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.

BIH PBF Strategic Framework

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.

To deepen the understanding of peacebuilding dynamics in BiH—particularly in relation to social cohesion and trust—the PBF Secretariat has initiated a new round of public perception research. This survey builds on previous studies commissioned by the RCO in 2015, 2019, and 2022, ensuring comparability over time. It covered both Entities and Brčko District, utilizing face-to-face interviews with a representative sample of 1,000 respondents, as well as six focus groups in strategically selected locations. The methodology emphasized inclusivity, with deliberate efforts to capture perspectives of women, youth, the elderly, and marginalized communities to capture deeper public sentiments and serve to triangulate and validate the quantitative survey data. To maximize the value and coherence of this research, the Secretariat coordinated this process with other ongoing and planned data collection efforts—particularly those linked to project-specific baselines or evaluations—to ensure alignment and avoid duplication. The 2025 Public Perception Survey reveals deep-rooted societal distrust and limited civic engagement across the country: • Distrust in Society: Over 44% of respondents express general distrust, while 75.1% agree that "you can't be too careful when it comes to people." • Interethnic Relations: While everyday interpersonal interactions are described as functional, collective trust across ethnic groups remains low, hindered by persistent stereotypes and divisive political narratives. Contact between ethnic groups exists but is often limited; trust in one's own group is significantly higher than in others. • Dialogue & Civic Participation: A very small percentage of citizens report personal involvement in local initiatives promoting interethnic dialogue. Youth participation in civic initiatives is perceived as very low, attributed to apathy, distrust, and lack of opportunities. • Perceptions of Ethnic Threat: Views are mixed—some perceive their ethnic group as endangered, while others see such narratives as politically motivated. • Women in Peacebuilding: Women's contributions to peacebuilding are present but under-recognized, with structural barriers limiting visibility and impact. • Migration Intentions: Intent to migrate remains high, especially among youth, driven by political instability and limited prospects for personal and professional growth. (The public perception survey was conducted by an independent external service provider. The findings do not reflect the views or positions of the United Nations, the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), or any implementing partners.)

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.

» 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:	**Nadja Azra Uzunovic**	**PBF Secretariat**	**M&E Analyst**	**nadja.azra.uzunovic.jazvin@undp.org**

» Catalytic Effect

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

- ○ Yes
- ● No

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

Catalytic Effect (non-financial): Has the project enabled or created a larger or longer-term peacebuilding change to occur, in addition to the direct project changes? Please refer to PBF Catalytic Effect Guidelines for more information. *

- ● Yes
- ○ No

If yes, please select the relevant option below: *

- ● Some catalytic effect
- ○ Significant catalytic effect

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The PBF Secretariat in BiH has played a catalytic role by strengthening coordination, coherence, and strategic direction across the entire peacebuilding portfolio. Its facilitation of joint analysis, cross-agency collaboration, and government engagement has helped create conditions for longer-term institutional change that extend beyond individual projects. By supporting the establishment of dialogue platforms, promoting evidence-based planning, and ensuring alignment with national priorities and EU integration processes, the Secretariat has enabled broader peacebuilding effects—such as improved inter-institutional communication, including with state authorities but also through the EU–UN Dialogue on peacebuilding. These contributions, such as the development of the DwP priorities for the country, have unlocked processes that had been stalled for years and have generated momentum for reforms and partnerships that are likely to continue influencing peacebuilding efforts in BiH beyond the duration of any specific project intervention.

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 lifespan of individual projects, the PBF Secretariat in BiH has focused on strengthening institutional frameworks, enhancing national ownership, and promoting coordination mechanisms that outlast project cycles. Rather than delivering project results, the Secretariat's contribution lies in supporting conditions that enable peacebuilding approaches to be sustained within government institutions, local structures, and partner systems.

A key area of work has been the Secretariat's role in promoting institutionalization thorough PBF projects– it encourages the integration of peacebuilding principles into municipal and state-level policies, steering committee practices, and cross-sectoral cooperation. This includes supporting partners to embed their interventions within existing structures and budget lines, and promoting co-ownership through state and entity-level participation in project governance.

The Secretariat has also initiated strengthening multi-stakeholder coordination platforms that continue to function beyond individual project timelines. Through its convening role, the Secretariat supports inclusive engagement among ministries, local governments, civil society, youth networks, and women's organizations. These platforms, such as dialogue forums, thematic working groups, and inter-agency coordination spaces serve as ongoing mechanisms for joint collaborative problem-solving, analysis, conflict sensitivity thereby maintaining cooperation even after projects closure.

Looking ahead, the Secretariat is advancing efforts to increase the catalytic potential of peacebuilding by fostering stronger alignment with broader development and reform processes such as EU accession. This also includes preparing for targeted engagement with international financial institutions (IFIs) and the EU to encourage the integration of peacebuilding considerations into larger-scale investments in governance, social services, education, and economic development. The request for Surge Advisory Team support reflects this forward-looking approach, aiming to position peacebuilding priorities within national reform agendas and strengthen the institutional capacities needed to sustain them.

Overall, the Secretariat's contributions to sustainability, still in an early stage, are centered on coordination, strategic alignment, policy engagement, and strengthening the enabling environment—creating conditions under which the results of PBF-funded projects can endure and expand beyond their immediate duration.

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.

As previously mentioned, Secretariat is planning to organize capacity building trainings to PBF recipients.

Monitoring and Oversight Activities

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

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

Monitoring and oversight activities	Name of the Event	Summary	Key Findings
Event 1	**BIRN Monitoring and Evaluation Plan development**	**Quality assurance of BIRN's project M&E Plan.**	**It is crucial to develop M&E tools prior to project implementation, in order to ensure baseline is captured timely and which will allow for the Project to capture progress (or lack of).**
Event 2	**M&E Framework for progress tracking**	**Quarterly population of all relevant data on the activity level for the portfolio.**	**Regular progress tracking on the portfolio level – updated in March, June, September and December 2025.**
Event 3	**Public perception survey**	**Coordination of polling of 1,000 citizens and 6 focus groups focusing on trust and confidence levels of BiH citizens in the country.**	
Event 4	**Capacity needs assessment**	**Conducted capacity needs assessment within PBF funded projects and its staff in February and March 2025.**	**Identified 2 areas for trainings: 1) M&E focused on peacebuilding projects, 2) conflict-sensitive programming.**

| Event 5 | Quality assurance of SPSC' final evaluation and perception survey. | Coordination of 2 ongoing activities – evaluation (managed by IOM) and public perception survey (managed by UNDP). | Relevance: The project addressed core conflict drivers—segregated education, divisive narratives, unresolved trauma, and youth exclusion—through locally tailored interventions. It is aligned with national priorities, SDG 16, and EU Key Priority 5 on promoting reconciliation and overcoming war legacies, by fostering inter-ethnic dialogue, trauma-informed support, and collaborative civic engagement across entity lines.
Coherence: The project complemented ongoing peacebuilding efforts in BiH and addressed underserved communities. However, inter-agency coordination between IOM and UNDP weakened after the initial phase, leading to fragmented planning and M&E systems.
Efficiency: Despite financial and procurement delays, implementation was adaptive and cost-effective. Municipal co-financing, strong CSO partnerships, and over-delivery of outputs demonstrated high operational efficiency.
Effectiveness: The project met or exceeded most of its outcome level targets. Youth and veterans reported improved intergroup trust; municipal dialogues led to policy changes; and trauma-informed approaches helped address war-related and intergenerational trauma.
MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS
Design and Planning:
Future projects should begin with inclusive, participatory conflict analyses that engage youth, women, returnees, and marginalized groups. Jointly developing a theory of change among agencies and stakeholders will ensure shared understanding of peacebuilding pathways. Risk analysis and built - in flexibility should guide adaptive project design.
Implementation and Outreach:
Scale proven models like Sobičak and PRESTO by embedding them in schools and social institutions, with contextual adaptation. Expand outreach to underserved groups, rural youth, women survivors, and minority communities, through targeted engagement strategies. Improve internal coordination and ensure timely fund disbursement to partners, particularly CSOs.
Monitoring and Evaluation:
Establish a joint M&E system from the outset, with harmonized indicators, real - time tracking, and shared data use |

		time tracking, and shared data use across agencies. Incorporate both quantitative and qualitative tools, including perception tracking and participatory reflection. Build local M&E capacity to enhance learning and adaptive management. Sustainability and Institutionalization: Embed successful models in municipal budgets and national policy frameworks. Develop transition and exit strategies early, including handover to public institutions and peer mentorship networks. Strengthen inter-municipal cooperation mechanisms to ensure continuity of cross-entity collaboration beyond the project cycle.	
Event 6	**RfP for Capacity building of PBF recipients**	**https://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_negotiation.cfm?nego_id=38567**	**Procurement being finalized.**
Event 7	**Field visits – M&E Analyst**	**4 field visits were held, more details given above.**	
Event 8	**Field visit to Mostar and Stolac – Regional DCO Director, Gwi Yeop Son**	**The visit aimed to showcase UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) projects advancing the Youth, Peace and Security agenda in the Herzegovina region. Through engagement with youth, civil society, and local authorities, the delegation explored initiatives addressing long-standing challenges such as ethnic divisions and fragmented education. The visit provided an opportunity to hear directly from implementing partners and beneficiaries, discuss project impact, and reflect on lessons learned relevant to the PBF**	**The visit provided valuable insights into youth-led peacebuilding, creative approaches to reconciliation, and the importance of inclusive education and cultural engagement in sustaining peace across communities.**

Final Steps

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

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

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