

# PBF June 2026 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.velastegui@un.org](mailto:gabriel.velastegui@un.org)

Click Next below to start

### » Report Submission

Type of report \*

Semi-annual

Annual

Final

Other

Date of submission of report \*

2026-06-17

Name and title of person submitting the report \*

Nadja Azra Uzunovic

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 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
- West Africa
- East Africa
- Latin America and the Caribbean

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
- 00141431: Partnerships for equality - No to hate speech and divisive narratives in Bosnia and Herzegovina
- 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 Caribbean

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) \*

2023-11-20

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
- AEDE
- 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.

<b>Recipients</b>	<b>Total Project Budget</b> (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars</i>	<b>Transfers to date</b> (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars</i>	<b>Expenditure to date</b> (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars</i>	<b>Implementation rate as a percentage of total budget</b> (calculated automatically)
<b>UNDP: United Nations Development Programme</b>	1575575	1575575	1160374.84	73.65%
				%



<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1575575</b>	<b>1575575</b>	<b>1160374.84</b>	<b>73.6</b>  <b>5%</b>
--------------	----------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------------------

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **73.65%**. 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 \*

611237.5

Amount expended to date on efforts contributing to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US \$ 450109.4**. Is this correct? \*


Correct
  Incorrect

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

481789.28

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE. \*

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

Current level of expenditure commitment\_June 2026-12\_57\_49.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*

**Although the formal Peacebuilding Committee (PBC) has not been officially established through a Council of Ministers (CoM) of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) decision due to political constraints, the project maintains an active strategic coordination and oversight mechanism in practice.**

**Pending the CoM's decision and the formal endorsement of the PBC, the Strategic Peacebuilding Consultations in BiH serve as an interim strategic coordination mechanism under the joint leadership of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and the United Nations Resident Coordinator (RC).**

**The consultations bring together key stakeholders originally foreseen under PBC, including key state institutions, the EU, bilateral ambassadors, major PBF donors, UN agencies, and civil society representatives. They serve as a platform for strategic coordination, oversight, policy dialogue, and guidance on peacebuilding priorities and PBF-supported initiatives, including reconciliation, transitional justice, youth engagement, Women, Peace and Security (WPS), and other related areas.**

**With the support of the RC, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs continues to work closely with partners to advance the formalization of the PBC through a Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina decision and strengthen the strategic coordination of peacebuilding initiatives in the country.**

**As reported in the previous period, the latest Strategic Peacebuilding Consultations were held on 26 November 2025 and co-chaired by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of BiH, Elmedin Konaković, and the UN RC in BiH, Arnhild Spence. The Consultations brought together senior representatives from key BiH institutions from the level of BiH Council of Ministers, including Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Civil Affairs, Ministry of Communications and Transport, and the BiH Presidency, alongside representatives of the EU, bilateral ambassadors and donors (Germany, Switzerland, Japan, Egypt, the Netherlands and Sweden), the Folke Bernadotte Academy (FBA), UN agencies (UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, UN Women and IOM, and OHCHR).**

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

*Please limit your response to 3000 characters*

**Over the past six months, the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) Secretariat, under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator (RC), continued to engage closely with government institutions at the state, entity, cantonal and local levels to advance peacebuilding priorities and strengthen national ownership of PBF-supported initiatives in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH).**

**At the state level, the Secretariat maintained close cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of BiH, including through the deployment of a Policy Expert embedded within the Ministry until February 2026. Engagement focused on advancing the formalization of the Peacebuilding Committee through a Council of Ministers decision, while navigating the country's complex political and institutional environment. The Ministry continued to co-chair the Strategic Peacebuilding Consultations with the RC, providing an important platform for dialogue among domestic institutions, international partners, donors and UN agencies.**

**The Secretariat further engaged with key institutions involved in PBF-supported initiatives, including the Ministry of Communications and Transport through the No to Hate Speech project, and the Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees through the project Dealing with the Past for a Better Future. In addition to ministerial-level engagement, the Secretariat facilitated technical discussions to support project implementation, coordination and institutional ownership.**

**Engagement with education authorities remained a priority through Dialogue for the Future 3 and Building Trust through Transitional Justice Education and Youth Engagement. The Secretariat facilitated dialogue with education ministries, including meetings between the RC and cantonal ministers of education, to strengthen institutional support for peace education and youth engagement.**

**At the local level, the Secretariat continued supporting UN agencies and civil society partners working on reconciliation, social cohesion, youth engagement and the prevention of hate speech and divisive narratives. Local authorities, including mayors and municipal officials, actively participated in consultations, outreach activities and project implementation.**

**In May 2026, the Secretariat supported the field mission of the Peacebuilding Support Office consultant conducting the global evaluation of the UN Peacebuilding Strategy by facilitating consultations with government institutions, local authorities, civil society and academia.**

**In partnership with the Ministry of Security of BiH, work also continued on the production of a documentary highlighting the contribution of BiH police officers to UN peacekeeping operations. Initiated by the Ministry itself, the project represents a strong example of national ownership and institutional leadership within the PBF portfolio. Finally, the Secretariat, together with the RCO and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, supported preparations for the Multilateralism in Action conference, organized during Peacebuilding Week in June 2026. The conference aims to foster strategic dialogue on peacebuilding, reconciliation and multilateral cooperation in BiH.**

## 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
- Completed
- Initiated
- Not Applicable
- Partially Completed

Collection of baselines \*

- Not Started
- Completed
- Initiated
- Not Applicable
- Partially Completed

Identification of beneficiaries \*

- Not Started
- Completed
- Initiated
- Not Applicable
- Partially Completed

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 remained fully operational during the reporting period, comprising the PBF Manager, M&E Analyst, Communications Analyst and Finance/Admin Associate. Working closely with the Peace and Development Advisor (PDA), the Secretariat provided strategic coordination, political analysis and conflict-sensitive guidance to the Resident Coordinator (RC) and the wider portfolio, ensuring alignment between programme implementation and broader peacebuilding priorities in BiH.**

**The Policy Advisor embedded within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs completed her six-month engagement during the first quarter of 2026. The assignment contributed to advancing the formalization of the Peacebuilding Committee through work on the draft Council of Ministers Decision and stakeholder consultations.**

**A major milestone was the submission of the Dealing with the Past (DwP) Project Document to PBSO/DPPA on 6 June 2026. Supported by strong ownership from the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees, and aligned with EU and international partner priorities, the initiative evolved into a strategically important peacebuilding process. The Secretariat played a central convening role, facilitating dialogue among national institutions, UN entities and international partners.**

**Implementation of the joint UN programme Partnerships for Equality: No to Hate Speech and Divisive Narratives in BiH officially commenced in February 2026. The Secretariat provided strategic coordination and quality assurance support, strengthened government ownership through engagement with the Ministry of Communications and Transport, and facilitated Switzerland's participation in the Joint Steering Committee.**

**Portfolio-wide coordination continued through quarterly tracking, biannual reporting, field monitoring visits and analytical work. Findings from the Public Perception Survey and coordination with the SCORE initiative strengthened the evidence base for programming and informed reflection on trust, social cohesion and peacebuilding priorities.**

**The Secretariat supported learning initiatives for UN agencies and civil society partners on conflict sensitivity and adaptive monitoring, evaluation and learning approaches, including collaboration with Swisspeace. It also supported ongoing evaluation processes, including BiH's selection as one of five country case studies under the global evaluation of the PBF Strategy.**

**In April 2026, the RC convened ambassadors of major PBF donor countries to discuss peacebuilding priorities, the Peacebuilding Committee, the DwP process and efforts to counter hate speech and divisive narratives. The Secretariat also maintained active engagement in the EU-UN Strategic Dialogue on Peacebuilding.**

**Strategic communications remained a priority throughout the reporting period, with emphasis on showcasing results, strengthening engagement with partners and supporting portfolio coherence through Joint Project Steering Committees and regular coordination mechanisms.**

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*

**While substantial progress has been achieved across all planned outputs, the project will require a cost extension to ensure continued support to key peacebuilding processes that have evolved during implementation and remain critical for sustaining momentum and maximizing the impact of PBF investments in BiH.**

During the reporting period, the Secretariat's role expanded to support several strategic processes, including the development of new the Dealing with the Past (DwP) programme, initiation of the No Hate Speech initiative, strengthened engagement with national institutions and international partners, and increased demand for monitoring, evaluation, learning, communications and coordination support. These processes will continue beyond the current project end date and require dedicated Secretariat capacity to ensure effective implementation, coordination and strategic guidance.

This will include a number of strategic analytical and learning exercises initiated during the reporting period, including the Overview of Peacebuilding Interventions, the thematic review of peace education initiatives and preparations for the final portfolio evaluation. These are expected to generate critical evidence, lessons learned and recommendations that will inform future peacebuilding investments and strategic priorities.

Furthermore, BiH remains eligible for PBF support until the end of 2027. The requested cost extension will therefore enable the Secretariat to continue providing strategic coordination, quality assurance and technical support, monitoring and evaluation, donor engagement, and portfolio oversight until the end of the current Eligibility period. Maintaining PBF Secretariat's capacity throughout this period is essential to support existing (some projects' implementation period will be extended) and newly approved projects, strengthen national ownership and preserve institutional memory, and ensure continuity and coherence across the PBF portfolio. The extension will therefore provide the necessary time and resources to consolidate results, strengthen sustainability, capture emerging impacts and catalytic effects, and position the portfolio for continued strategic engagement beyond the current project cycle.

Also, BiH was selected as one of the country case studies under the global evaluation of the Peacebuilding Fund Strategy 2020-2026. Findings are expected by the end of 2026, and they will provide an important opportunity to strengthen current portfolio learning, assess catalytic effects, and inform future programming. Extending the Secretariat's support will ensure that these findings are adequately analyzed, disseminated, and integrated into strategic planning processes.

## Project progress summary \*

*Please limit your response to 6000 characters*

The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) Secretariat remained fully operational during the reporting period, comprising the PBF Manager, Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, Communications Analyst, and Finance/Admin Associate. Working closely with the Peace and Development Advisor (PDA) and the wider Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO), the Secretariat continued to provide strategic coordination, political analysis, and conflict-sensitive guidance to the Resident Coordinator (RC) and the wider PBF portfolio. Particular attention was given to the Peacebuilding Committee (PBC), donor engagement, the Dealing with the Past (DwP) process, the EU-UN Strategic Dialogue Peacebuilding Stream, and positioning of the portfolio within Bosnia and Herzegovina's complex political and institutional environment. Through regular engagement with government institutions, UN agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), donors, and development partners, the Secretariat ensured alignment between portfolio implementation and broader peacebuilding priorities.

The Policy Advisor embedded within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs completed her six-month engagement during the first quarter of 2026. The assignment contributed to advancing the formalization of the PBC through work on the draft Council of Ministers Decision and stakeholder consultations. The Advisor also strengthened the Ministry's leadership role in peacebuilding coordination through policy advice, analytical inputs, and support to engagement with national and international partners.

A major milestone during the reporting period was the submission of the DwP Project Document to PBPSO/DPPA on 6 June 2026. The initiative evolved into a strategically important process characterized by strong ownership from the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees, close alignment with EU and international partner priorities, and a robust approach to managing political sensitivities. Under the RC's guidance, the Secretariat played a central convening role, facilitating dialogue among national institutions, UN entities, civil society, and international partners. Supported by political analysis and conflict-sensitive guidance from the PDA, the process resulted not only in a project document but also in complementary strategic products, including a contingency plan and conflict analysis, strengthening preparedness for implementation.

Implementation of the joint UN programme Partnerships for Equality: No to Hate Speech and Divisive Narratives in BiH officially commenced in February 2026. The Secretariat provided strategic coordination and quality assurance support, strengthened government ownership through engagement with the Ministry of Communications and Transport, and facilitated Switzerland's participation in the Joint Steering Committee.

The Secretariat continued strengthening portfolio-wide coordination through monthly portfolio meetings, quarterly tracking, biannual reporting, field monitoring visits, and analytical work. Findings from the Public Perception Survey continued to inform strategic reflection on trust, social cohesion, and peacebuilding priorities. Coordination was also strengthened with the SCORE initiative to improve the evidence base for programming and promote complementarity in data collection and analysis. Preparatory work was launched for a mapping of peacebuilding interventions in BiH and a thematic review of peace education initiatives to inform future programming and strategic positioning of PBF investments.

To strengthen portfolio quality and adaptive management, the Secretariat delivered capacity-building initiatives for UN agencies and CSOs focused on conflict sensitivity and adaptive Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning approaches, including collaboration with Swisspeace. Monitoring missions were conducted to collect evidence of results, strengthen learning, and support adaptive programming. Bosnia and Herzegovina's selection as one of five country case studies under the global evaluation of the PBF Strategy 2020–2026 represented another important milestone, with the Secretariat supporting the evaluation mission and stakeholder consultations.

Strategic coordination and oversight mechanisms remained active throughout the reporting period. While formal establishment of the PBC remains pending, the RC and Minister of Foreign Affairs continued convening Strategic Peacebuilding Consultations, bringing together key ministries, the EU, major donors, and UN agencies to discuss priorities and provide strategic guidance. In April 2026, the RC also convened ambassadors of major PBF donor countries to discuss peacebuilding priorities, the PBC, government engagement with the Peacebuilding Commission, the DwP process, and efforts to counter hate speech and divisive narratives.

The Secretariat maintained active engagement in the EU-UN Strategic Dialogue on Peacebuilding, strengthening coherence between UN and EU approaches to reconciliation and sustaining peace. It also continued supporting Joint Steering Committees and implementing partners to strengthen implementation quality, results communication,

and strategic coherence across the portfolio.

Strategic communications remained a priority throughout the reporting period. More than 130 communication activities were coordinated, including events, campaigns, media engagement, digital products, and human-interest stories highlighting peacebuilding impact. Social media content reached more than 300,000 users and generated over 400,000 views across UN in Bosnia and Herzegovina platforms. Communication efforts increasingly focused on showcasing results, highlighting synergies across the portfolio, supporting donor engagement, and strengthening public understanding of peacebuilding priorities. Preparations also commenced for UN Peacebuilding Week and continued collaboration with the Ministry of Security on a documentary highlighting Bosnia and Herzegovina's contribution to UN peacekeeping operations.

Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured by the project to date

*Please limit your response to 3000 characters*

The PBF Secretariat continued to ensure that Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) and Youth Inclusion remain integral components of peacebuilding programming across the portfolio. With 38.79% of the project budget contributing directly to gender equality and women's empowerment, the project remained on track to exceed the PBF minimum requirement of allocating at least 30% of resources to GEWE-related interventions. Throughout the reporting period, the Secretariat systematically promoted gender-responsive and youth-inclusive approaches through portfolio coordination, quality assurance processes, monitoring and evaluation systems, capacity-strengthening initiatives and strategic engagement with implementing partners. Gender and age considerations were integrated into portfolio monitoring frameworks, reporting tools and analytical processes, including the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data where available. Capacity-strengthening efforts delivered during the reporting period further reinforced the application of conflict-sensitive, gender-responsive and inclusive programming approaches. Through trainings delivered in partnership with Swisspeace, implementing partners strengthened their capacities to better integrate gender, inclusion and adaptive learning approaches into programme design, implementation, monitoring, and reporting. At the strategic level, the Secretariat continued supporting initiatives that promote women's leadership, youth participation, prevention of hate speech and divisive narratives, reconciliation, and social cohesion. Through its coordination role, the Secretariat helped ensure that women and young people are increasingly recognized not only as beneficiaries, but as active contributors and partners in sustaining peace efforts across the country.

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 Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is demonstrating increasingly visible outcome-level peacebuilding results through a gradual shift from isolated project interventions toward a more systemic, institutionalized, and people-centred approach. Through complementary initiatives implemented by UN agencies, institutions, civil society organizations (CSOs), educational actors, and local communities, the portfolio contributes to strengthening trust, inclusion, dialogue, resilience, and social cohesion. While individual results originate from specific projects, the portfolio increasingly generates collective effects through strengthened partnerships, institutional engagement, locally led action, and broader ownership of peacebuilding approaches.

The portfolio reflects a growing peacebuilding ecosystem linking education, dialogue, local governance, social services, policy development, evidence generation, and institutional capacity-building. Across the portfolio, more than 200 dialogue platforms, local initiatives, partnerships, and knowledge products have created opportunities for engagement across community and institutional divides.

Recent SCORE findings reinforce both the relevance and emerging impact of these efforts. While societal trust and perceptions of social cohesion remain fragile in many areas, findings indicate relatively strong public support for a more reconciliatory and inclusive future across BiH. Despite continued polarization and divisive narratives, there remains significant societal openness toward dialogue, coexistence, and reconciliation, providing an important foundation for sustaining peace efforts.

**Strengthened Dialogue, Trust, and Social Cohesion.** Dialogue platforms, community initiatives, youth exchanges, and locally driven interventions have created sustained spaces for engagement across administrative, ethnic, and social divides. More than 200 dialogue platforms facilitated interaction among citizens, institutions, youth, educators, and local stakeholders, supporting joint problem-solving and strengthening foundations for longer-term social cohesion. For many young participants, programme activities represented their first meaningful interaction with peers from different communities.

**Institutional Integration of Peacebuilding Approaches.** Peacebuilding principles are increasingly embedded within institutional structures and policy processes through curriculum development, policy engagement, service delivery reforms, and partnerships with ministries, municipalities, and educational institutions. Portfolio-wide advocacy contributed to maintaining key peacebuilding and Women, Peace and Security priorities on the institutional agenda, including continued support for the adoption of the Fourth National Action Plan on UNSCR 1325 and engagement around new initiatives such as Dealing with the Past and Countering Hate Speech.

**Strengthened Local Ownership and Partnerships.** More than 30 partnership agreements and over 50 locally led grants supported communities, CSOs, educational institutions, and local actors in developing context-specific responses to peacebuilding and social cohesion challenges. These interventions strengthened local ownership and expanded collaboration among stakeholders.

**Increased Community Resilience and Support Systems.** Through local service interventions and strengthened capacities among healthcare workers, police officers, educators, CSOs, and local institutions, communities increasingly benefit from improved support services, referral mechanisms, and institutional responsiveness. Collectively, these efforts contribute to stronger resilience, increased trust in local systems, and more responsive institutions.

**Women and Youth as Peacebuilding Actors.** Outcome-level changes are increasingly reflected in the growing civic and policy influence of women, youth leaders, educators, and survivor advocates. Youth-led initiatives and women's networks are increasingly recognized by institutions and municipalities as credible partners in advancing dialogue, prevention, inclusion, and social cohesion objectives.

**Evidence Informing Policy and Practice.** The portfolio continues to strengthen the peacebuilding evidence base through research, perception surveys, policy frameworks, educational resources, and analytical products. Coordination with broader initiatives, including SCORE, has further strengthened evidence-informed approaches to trust, intergroup relations, and social cohesion. This growing use of evidence supports more adaptive, informed, and sustainable peacebuilding programming.

Overall, the portfolio is evolving toward a more coherent and sustainable peacebuilding architecture characterized

**by stronger national ownership, cross-sectoral cooperation, local engagement, and evidence-informed decision-making. Collectively, these interventions contribute to peacebuilding outcomes that extend beyond individual project cycles and create conditions for longer-term institutional and societal transformation.**

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.*

<https://app.scoreforpeace.org/en/bosnia/score/2025/1/map?row=tn-3-0&map=v2>

File attachment

pbf\_spsc\_iom\_undp\_final\_evaluation\_report-14\_11\_4.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

O C 1	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	TBC	On track	On track	The results will be drawn from the regular PBF administered survey in November 2026.
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 <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 1. 1	<b>PBF Secretariat set up and its capacity is strengthened.</b>	<b>No PBF Secretariat</b>	<b>PBF Secretariat established and fully functional</b>	<b>PBF Secretariat established and fully functional</b>	<b>PBF Secretariat established and fully functional</b>	
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 <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	<b>Support to strategic interventions related to peacebuilding in BiH.</b>	n/a	TBD by the JSC	Ongoing	Ongoing	
1. 2. 2	<b>At least 30% of total PBF funds are dedicated to gender and/or women empowerment related issues.</b>	0%	At least 30%	54.57%	54.57%	<b>All projects within the portfolio check this box.</b>
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 <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	<b>Monthly meetings between UN agencies implementing PBF projects, to ensure coordination.</b>	<b>Not established</b>	<b>12 per year</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>Regular monthly meetings ongoing.</b>
1. 3. 2	<b># of capacity building trainings, workshops led by PBF Secretariat and RCO on improving conflict and gender sensitive approaches to programming, M&amp;E</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Swisspeace was contracted and delivered Conflict-sensitive programme management and M&amp;E trainings for PBF portfolio in March and April 2026.</b>
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 <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	<b>Peacebuilding Committee is established.</b>	<b>No Committee</b>	<b>Committee established</b>	<b>High level meeting with donors held.</b>	<b>High level meetings and strategic consultations held on bi-annual basis.</b>	<b>Efforts are invested into forming a self-standing JSC, however Council of Minister decision is still pending.</b>
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: Improved result tracking, learning and communications on PBF portfolio progress and impact**

O C 2	<b>Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>Indicator Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project Indicator Target</b>	<b>Indicator progress for reporting period</b>	<b>Indicator progress since project's start</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance/Delay (if any)</b>
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: portfolio level Communications strategy, 6 newsletters, 10 stories	•Implementation of the Comm. Strategy ongoing; •130+ communication and visibility activities coordinated and supported; • 10+ human-interest stories and multimedia storytelling products developed;	•Implementation of the Comm. Strategy ongoing; •130+ communication and visibility activities coordinated and supported; • 10+ human-interest stories and multimedia storytelling products developed;	
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.	Ongoing	Ongoing	
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 <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2.1.1	<b>M&amp;E of the PBF Strategic Result Framework in place and data is collected against the indicators.</b>	<b>Not established</b>	<b>M&amp;E Plan of PBF Strategic Result Framework is in place and used to collect data</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>	<b>M&amp;E Framework focused on progress tracking is in place and is regularly updated.</b>
2.1.2	<b>Improved availability of data on social cohesion and peacebuilding, disaggregated by sex and age groups.</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Reliable data available</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>	<b>M&amp;E Framework focused on progress tracking is in place and is regularly updated. Additional cooperation ongoing with SCORE. Mapping and thematic reviews in the pipeline.</b>
2.1.3	<b>PBF projects baselines in place within 6 months of project start.</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>6 projects</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>No Hate Speech to establish baselines in Q3 - capacity building focused on NHS project, as a case study</b>

2. 1. 4	<b>% of active projects which submit their report within the PBSO deadline</b>	n/a	100%	100%	100%	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 <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 2. 1	<b>Number of visibility stories on PBF projects developed and published.</b>	<b>No structured visibility approach established</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10 stories developed and published across the UN in BiH website, social media, newsletter, and shared to media in the form of press material</b>	<b>25 stories developed and published across the UN in BiH website, social media, newsletter, and shared to media in the form of press material</b>	
2. 2. 2						
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. 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)
<b>Event 1</b>	RC and Ambassadors Field Visits	June-September 2026	Across the country	Donors and institutions	Planned RC and ambassadorial field visits will showcase the impact of PBF-supported initiatives on the ground, strengthen donor engagement and portfolio visibility, and enable direct exchanges with local institutions, civil society partners and beneficiaries. The visits will highlight local ownership, results achieved, opportunities for scaling successful approaches, and potential for future partnerships and support.
<b>Event 2</b>	UN Peacebuilding Week in BiH	22-26 June 2026	Sarajevo / Brčko / countrywide	BiH Institutions, UN agencies, CSOs, youth, donors, academia and partners	Marking of the first UN Peacebuilding Week in BiH will combine substantive events, visibility products and social media amplification to showcase PBF-supported peacebuilding efforts and their contribution to prevention, inclusion, dialogue and social cohesion. Activities will highlight partnerships, national ownership, lessons learned and local impact, while linking BiH experiences to the global PBF@20 milestone and the theme of innovation, inclusion and impact.

<b>Event 3</b>	Promotion and Screening of Documentary on BiH Police Contributions to UN Peacekeeping Missions	September 2026 - Throughout the year	Sarajevo, and other locations to be considered	Institutions, police agencies, donors, youth, media and partners, general public, HQ	Promotion and screening of a documentary highlighting the contribution of BiH police officers to UN peacekeeping missions, accompanied by a communication campaign to showcase BiH contribution to global peacebuilding and promote dialogue on peacebuilding, multilateralism, and international solidarity.
<b>Event 4</b>	DwP Findings Presentation - Trust-Building Working Group	June - July 2026	Sarajevo	Advisers of major PBF donor countries and representatives of key international organizations.	Present key findings related to the DwP initiative and discuss implications for future trust-building and reconciliation efforts in BiH.

### Human Impact

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

- i. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implementation
- ii. The impact of the project in their lives
- iii. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group

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

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

<b>3</b>			
----------	--	--	--

<b>4</b>			
----------	--	--	--

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**

Videos-14\_44\_57.docx



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**

<https://us13.campaign-archive.com/?u=d1b86bc2ba1d016266065bcf0&id=a3e96988ba>

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 portfolio strengthened adaptive and evidence-informed peacebuilding approaches through coordinated portfolio management, peacebuilding mapping, structured learning initiatives, standardized monitoring tools and strengthened alignment between projects and broader peacebuilding priorities. Coordination with SCORE and the use of analytical tools and perception data also contributed to more integrated and data-driven programming approaches.**

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

**The Secretariat supported implementing partners and stakeholders through continuous technical assistance, portfolio coordination, field learning visits and dedicated capacity-strengthening initiatives. Trainings delivered during March and April 2026 focused on adaptive Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL), conflict sensitivity, and peacebuilding programming approaches, including collaboration with Swisspeace. Capacity strengthening also extended to harmonized reporting, quality assurance, communications and evidence-based programming across the portfolio.**

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

**The Secretariat sustained strategic engagement through a government and RC co-chaired peacebuilding platform, facilitated donor consultations, strengthened EU-UN alignment around the DwP as well as recently initiated No Hate Speech project.**

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 portfolio continued strengthening collaboration among UN agencies through joint programming, coordinated implementation and communications, shared monitoring and evaluation processes and strategic alignment on peacebuilding priorities. Inter-agency coordination mechanisms contributed to stronger portfolio coherence and collective peacebuilding impact.**

**The portfolio maintained extensive engagement with local civil society organizations, through dialogue platforms, locally led grants, community initiatives, consultations and implementation partnerships supporting social cohesion, inclusion and peacebuilding.**

**Partnerships with universities, schools, educators, and research actors supported peace education, analytical work, knowledge production, dialogue initiatives, and evidence-informed peacebuilding approaches across the portfolio.**

**The portfolio engaged municipalities, cantonal institutions, educational and healthcare institutions, and community-level stakeholders in implementation, dialogue processes, service delivery improvements and locally driven peacebuilding initiatives.**

**State, entity and cantonal level ministries, institutions and authorities continued to engage in programme steering, policy processes, peacebuilding consultations and implementation arrangements, contributing to strengthened ownership and sustainability of interventions**

---

## 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 January–June 2026, the PBF Secretariat continued implementing structured monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) activities aimed at strengthening oversight, adaptive management, evidence generation, and strategic coherence across the Peacebuilding Fund portfolio.**

**Regular portfolio coordination meetings were held with implementing partners, participating UN agencies, and key stakeholders, with a focus on progress tracking, monitoring and evaluation, risk management, reporting, communications, visibility, and portfolio-level learning. These meetings also provided a platform for identifying synergies, strengthening coordination across interventions, and supporting adaptive programming approaches.**

**During the reporting period, the Secretariat finalized and operationalized Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) developed in consultation with PBF programmes and UN agencies to strengthen harmonized approaches to monitoring, reporting, coordination, quality assurance, communications, and visibility across the portfolio. The Secretariat also continued applying the standardized monitoring template developed in consultation with PBSO to improve consistency in evidence collection, learning, and reporting.**

**Field monitoring and learning visits continued to support beneficiary feedback collection, identification of emerging issues, and assessment of catalytic impact. Following the operationalization of the SOPs, monitoring visits were conducted under the Dialogue for the Future 3 programme using the harmonized monitoring approach. Findings informed ongoing portfolio learning and adaptive management efforts.**

**The Secretariat continued implementing quarterly portfolio tracking processes and supporting biannual reporting cycles to monitor progress against portfolio outputs and outcomes. Analytical reviews of project performance strengthened evidence-informed decision-making and oversight of implementation trends, risks, and results.**

**Building on findings from the Public Perception Survey finalized during the previous reporting period, the Secretariat continued using perception and analytical data to inform reflection on peacebuilding priorities, trust dynamics, and social cohesion trends. Coordination with the SCORE initiative was strengthened to promote complementarity in data collection, perception tracking, and analysis of intergroup relations and social cohesion. Preparatory work also commenced for a thematic review of peace education initiatives in BiH to inform future programming and strategic positioning of PBF investments.**

**Capacity-strengthening activities identified through previous assessments were operationalized through trainings and thematic learning sessions on conflict sensitivity, adaptive monitoring, evaluation and learning approaches, and peacebuilding programming. Delivered in collaboration with Swisspeace, these initiatives aimed to strengthen analytical capacities, improve data quality, and support more adaptive and evidence-informed peacebuilding programming across the portfolio.**

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 remain embedded within the PBF Strategic Framework developed and approved as part of BiH eligibility process. During the reporting period, the Secretariat continued strengthening the portfolio's evidence base through analytical, perception, and evaluation processes aimed at improving outcome-level tracking of peacebuilding results. Building on findings from the 2025 Public Perception Survey, the final evaluation of the SPSC project, and the ongoing mid-term evaluation of the WPS portfolio, the Secretariat also strengthened coordination with the SCORE (Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index) initiative to identify opportunities for complementarity and alignment in perception tracking, social cohesion analysis, and broader evidence generation efforts related to trust, intergroup relations, and peacebuilding dynamics in the country. These combined analytical processes are expected to inform a potential review and refinement of outcome indicators and the establishment of corresponding targets to ensure continued relevance, strategic alignment, and more evidence-informed tracking of peacebuilding outcomes 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.*

**2025 Public Perception Survey, the final evaluation of the SPSC project, and the ongoing mid-term evaluation of the WPS portfolio, the Secretariat also strengthened coordination with the SCORE (Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index) initiative**

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, trust, and intergroup relations—the PBF Secretariat continued strengthening its evidence and analytical base during the reporting period through coordination with perception and social cohesion measurement initiatives. Building on the Public Perception Survey finalized in the previous reporting period, the Secretariat strengthened coordination with the SCORE (Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index) initiative, a large-scale social cohesion and perception measurement tool tracking trust dynamics, intergroup relations, perceptions of security, social distance, civic participation, and reconciliation trends across BiH. Coordination efforts focused on identifying opportunities for complementarity and alignment in methodology, perception tracking, and analytical approaches in order to strengthen coherence across peacebuilding evidence-generation efforts and avoid duplication in data collection processes. The Secretariat also continued ensuring alignment between portfolio-level analytical work and project-specific baselines, evaluations, and monitoring frameworks. The Public Perception Survey findings continue to demonstrate persistent societal distrust, polarization, and limited civic participation across BiH, while also identifying important entry points for peacebuilding and social cohesion interventions. Findings indicate that generalized distrust remains high, with many respondents expressing caution toward others and limited confidence in institutions and broader societal relations. Interethnic interactions are often perceived as functional at the interpersonal level; however, deeper trust across ethnic groups remains constrained by persistent stereotypes, political polarization, and divisive narratives. Both the Public Perception Survey and broader SCORE analytical findings highlight low levels of civic participation, particularly among youth, alongside perceptions of limited opportunities for meaningful engagement in public life and community decision-making processes. At the same time, findings suggest that locally led dialogue initiatives, community engagement mechanisms, and opportunities for direct interaction continue to positively influence perceptions, trust-building, and willingness for cooperation across group lines. The analytical processes also continue to highlight the under-recognized role of women in peacebuilding and social cohesion efforts, despite their active engagement at community level, as well as the continued intention of many young people to migrate due to perceptions of political instability, limited economic opportunities, and lack of long-term prospects. SCORE findings and related analytical outputs are expected to further complement and refine the current evidence base and outcome-level analysis across the PBF portfolio, including informing future reviews of outcome indicators, peacebuilding priorities, social cohesion programming, and the development of new initiatives focused on youth engagement and sustaining peace in BiH.

\*

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.*

**Preparations for the upcoming portfolio evaluation are on track and are being strategically aligned with the final phase of the PBF eligibility period in BiH. During the reporting period, the Secretariat continued strengthening analytical, evidence-generation, and learning components necessary to support a comprehensive end-of-cycle portfolio assessment focused on peacebuilding outcomes, strategic coherence, sustainability, and catalytic impact. The Secretariat is currently in the process of selecting a consultant to conduct an Overview of Peacebuilding Interventions in BiH. The exercise aims to update and consolidate existing overviews of peacebuilding actors, interventions, partnership ecosystems, and funding streams across the country. The mapping will provide a clearer overview of key stakeholders, thematic priorities, geographic coverage, gaps, complementarities, and opportunities for stronger coordination and strategic positioning of PBF investments implemented since BiH became eligible for the Peacebuilding Fund in 2022. The initiative is also expected to support future programming priorities related to social cohesion, youth engagement, and sustaining peace. In parallel, the Secretariat is in the process of publishing Terms of Reference (ToR) for a National Consultant to conduct a thematic review of peace education initiatives in BiH. The review will combine strategic mapping, analytical assessment, and forward-looking recommendations to strengthen future peacebuilding programming and support evidence-informed positioning of PBF investments. The review will assess both PBF-supported and non-PBF initiatives across formal and non-formal education systems, focusing on their contribution to dialogue, trust-building, social cohesion, reconciliation, and broader peacebuilding outcomes, while also identifying good practices, gaps, and opportunities for future investment and scaling. In addition, the country was selected as one of the country case studies under the global evaluation of the PBF Strategy, and the evaluation field mission and stakeholder consultations took place during the reporting period. Findings from the global evaluation are expected in November 2026 and are anticipated to further inform portfolio learning, strategic positioning, and preparation for the final portfolio evaluation. Together, these analytical and evaluative processes are expected to provide a strong foundation for the final portfolio evaluation planned toward the end of the eligibility process, while also strengthening the broader evidence base for peacebuilding and sustaining peace efforts in BiH. This will all help prepare the groundwork for portfolio evaluation to be conducted at the end of the eligibility process.**

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 or grants 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 Secretariat contributed to strengthening portfolio-wide learning, coordination and evidence generation through harmonized monitoring approaches, analytical work, peacebuilding mapping efforts, and coordination with broader perception and social cohesion measurement initiatives, including SCORE. These efforts are expected to further support the development of a new accelerator at the UN level focused on social cohesion and youth engagement.**

**In parallel, the Secretariat continued advancing strategic processes related to DWP, including support to the finalization of the DWP project document and coordination around national consultations and priorities. These efforts have contributed to unlocking processes and policy discussions that had remained stalled for years, while generating renewed momentum for dialogue, institutional cooperation and future peacebuilding partnerships likely to continue influencing sustaining peace efforts in BiH beyond the duration of individual project cycles.**

## 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 duration of individual projects, the PBF Secretariat in Bosnia and Herzegovina has focused on strengthening national ownership, institutional capacities, and coordination mechanisms that can continue functioning after PBF-funded interventions conclude.**

During the reporting period, the Secretariat, under the leadership of the RC, maintained close engagement with government institutions at the state, entity, cantonal, and local levels to anchor peacebuilding priorities within existing governance structures.

Particular attention was given to strengthening partnerships with key state institutions. Their active participation in project governance structures, including Steering Committees and strategic consultations, has contributed to stronger institutional ownership.

A key sustainability mechanism has been the continued support to multi-stakeholder coordination platforms. The Strategic Peacebuilding Consultations, co-chaired by the MFA and the RC, are expected to serve as the foundation for the future Peacebuilding Committee, a central-level (state-owned) coordination mechanism that would provide long-term strategic guidance and oversight for peacebuilding efforts. The platform brings together government institutions, UN agencies, donors, civil society, and international partners to discuss peacebuilding and trust-building priorities, coordinate interventions, and promote collective action. At the project level, Steering Committees and thematic working groups have further strengthened inter-institutional cooperation and helped embed peacebuilding approaches within regular government processes.

The Secretariat, together with the entire RCO team, including the PDA, has also placed strong emphasis on aligning peacebuilding efforts with the country's EU accession agenda and broader reform priorities. This approach is particularly visible in new programme initiatives and forums, such as the UN-EU Peacebuilding Dialogue, which are closely linked to EU priorities related to reconciliation and peacebuilding.

By positioning peacebuilding within long-term reform processes, the Secretariat aims to increase the likelihood that project results will be sustained through future domestic and international investments.

In addition, engagement with key donors and international partners has been intensified to promote continuity of support beyond PBF funding. The increased involvement of the EU and key PBF donors, both in strategic consultations and programme discussions, has further strengthened prospects for long-term support and policy continuity.

Looking ahead, the Secretariat will continue exploring opportunities to connect peacebuilding priorities with larger-scale UN, EU, and other existing mechanisms, ensuring that peacebuilding considerations remain integrated into governance, education, social cohesion, and development efforts. Through these measures, the Secretariat is helping create an enabling environment in which peacebuilding gains can be sustained, institutionalized, and expanded over time.

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.*

**During the reporting period, the overall implementation of the portfolio remained on track, with continued strong engagement from implementing partners, participating UN agencies and civil society organizations. At the same time, several cross-cutting implementation considerations and capacity needs continued to emerge across the portfolio.**

**As the portfolio increasingly evolves toward more integrated, adaptive and outcome-oriented peacebuilding programming, implementing partners continue to require sustained technical support in areas such as adaptive Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL), conflict-sensitive programming, evidence generation, outcome-level peacebuilding analysis and reporting on peacebuilding impact. While significant progress has been achieved through trainings and learning initiatives delivered during the reporting period, further support is needed to strengthen capacities related to measuring social cohesion, trust-building, and longer-term peacebuilding outcomes.**

**The Secretariat also identified the continued need for stronger analytical and evidence-generation capacities across the portfolio, particularly related to perception tracking, social cohesion analysis, and the use of data to inform adaptive programming and strategic decision-making. Ongoing coordination with SCORE and other analytical initiatives is expected to further strengthen the evidence base for future programming and policy engagement.**

**In parallel, increasing interest among institutions, civil society organizations, youth actors and development partners in peacebuilding, social cohesion, and dialogue initiatives has created opportunities for expanded partnerships and scaling of locally led approaches. However, many grassroots and smaller civil society organizations continue to face capacity constraints related to project management, reporting, strategic communications and access to longer-term and flexible funding. Continued support to local actors remains important for strengthening ownership, sustainability, and inclusion within peacebuilding processes.**

## 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 Grantee M&E system	Support provided to strengthening the monitoring and evaluation system for BIRN grantees, including alignment of reporting practices, indicator tracking and evidence collection related to peacebuilding outcomes and social cohesion initiatives.	Strengthened consistency in grantee reporting and improved tracking of qualitative peacebuilding outcomes, community engagement, and dialogue-related activities.

<b>Event 2</b>	War Childhood Museum final evaluation	Support provided to the final evaluation process of the War Childhood Museum component under the Peace Story project, including coordination, quality assurance and learning integration.	Findings will be available in September 2026.
<b>Event 3</b>	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 2026.
<b>Event 4</b>	SCORE synergy	Strengthened coordination with the SCORE (Social Cohesion and Reconciliation Index) initiative to align perception tracking, analytical approaches, and evidence-generation efforts related to trust, social cohesion, and intergroup relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina.	Identified opportunities for complementarity in data collection and analytical work, contributing to a stronger evidence base for peacebuilding programming and strategic decision-making.
<b>Event 5</b>	Capacity building	Capacity-strengthening activities delivered for implementing partners and stakeholders through thematic two-day trainings and learning sessions during March and April 2026, including collaboration with Swisspeace.	Identified and addressed two priority capacity areas: and 1) conflict-sensitive programming and management approaches, and 2) adaptive Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) for peacebuilding projects,
<b>Event 6</b>	Quality assurance of TOR's for DFF3 final evaluation and perception survey.	Technical support and quality assurance provided for the preparation of the Dialogue for the Future 3 (DFF3) final evaluation process and portfolio-related perception and analytical work. ToR has been published in June 2026 and the evaluation is expected to start in September 2026.	

<p><b>Event 7</b></p>	<p>Field visits</p>	<p>Field monitoring visits conducted to support learning, beneficiary feedback collection, monitoring of implementation progress and assessment of catalytic impact. Field visit under DFF3 was conducted in March and June 2026 using the harmonized monitoring approach.</p>	<p>Field engagement strengthened adaptive learning, identification of emerging issues, and consistency in monitoring and reporting practices across the portfolio.</p>
<p><b>Event 8</b></p>	<p>Strategic evaluation – Global PBSO strategy</p>	<p>Bosnia and Herzegovina was selected as one of the country case studies under the global evaluation of the PBF Strategy. The evaluation field mission and stakeholder consultations took place during the reporting period.</p>	<p>Findings are expected in November 2026 and are anticipated to contribute to portfolio learning, strategic positioning, and future peacebuilding programming.</p>

**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.