

PBF June 2026 Project Progress Report



**PEACEBUILDING
FUND**



PROJECT OVERVIEW

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

Click Next below to start

» Report Submission

Type of report *

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

Date of submission of report *

2026-07-28

Name and title of person submitting the report *

Ksenia Glebova - Senior Programme Manager

E-mail of person submitting the report *

ksenia.glebova@un.org

Name and title of person who approved the report *

Gillian Sheehan - Senior Partnership Advisor

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

☒ Not Applicable

» Project Information and Geographical Scope

Is this a cross-border project? *

☐ Yes ☒ No

Please select the geographical region in which the project is implemented

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

Country of project implementation *

- ☒ United Nations
 ☐ Other, Specify

Other, please specify *

Project Title *

- ☒ 00117260: Humanitarian-Development-Peacebuilding and Partnership Facility" (HDPP Facility)
☐ 00124862: PBF Programming and M&E Surge Support
☐ 00125606: The Saving Lives Entity (SALIENT) – A Transformative Armed-Violence-Reduction Agenda for Sustainable Development
☐ 00121358: Local Peacebuilding in the Sahel
☐ 00140114: Innovative Financing and Private Sector Engagement for Peacebuilding
☐ 00140683: Peacebuilding Impact Hub
☐ 00140685: Country Support for Design Monitoring Evaluation and Learning
☐ 00141225: CSO-UN Dialogue on Peacebuilding
☐ Other, Specify

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please select the countries where this project is being implemented *

Other, Please specify *

Project Start Date (Date of first transfer) *

2019-09-10

Project End Date *

2026-09-30

Has this project received an extension? *

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

Will this project be requesting an extension? *

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

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| ☐ January | ☐ February | ☐ March |
| ☐ April | ☐ May | ☐ June |
| ☐ July | ☒ August | ☐ September |
| ☐ October | ☐ November | ☐ December |

Is the current project end date within 6 months? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, please select which *

- ☐ National Trust Fund
- ☐ Regional Trust Fund

Recipients

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

- ☒ UN entity
- ☐ Non-UN Entity

Please select the convening agency recipient *

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

Other, Please specify *

Are there other recipients for this project? *

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

Please select other UN recipients

Select all that apply

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

Other, Please specify

Please select other non-UN recipients

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

Other, Please specify

Implementing Partners

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

1

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)*

1

Please list all of the project's implementing partners and the amounts (in USD) transferred to each, both since the project's start, and specifically during this calendar period

Please select the type of organisation which best describes the type of implementing partner *

- ☐ National youth CSO
☐ National women's CSO
☐ Other National CSO
☐ Subnational youth CSO
☐ Subnational women's CSO
☐ Other subnational CSO
☐ Regional CSO
☐ Regional Organisation
☐ International NGO
☐ Governmental entity
☐ National women's and youth CSO
☐ Subnational women's and youth CSO
☒ Other

Other, Please specify

UNOPS

What is the name of the Implementing Partner *

UNOPS

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

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

19051045

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

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

11612126

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

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

2516024.36

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

Please limit your response to 1500 characters

Implementation of the projects and management of Operations such as HR, Procurement, Finance, Travel, etc.

Financial Reporting

» Delivery by Recipient

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

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

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

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

Recipients	Total Project Budget (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars</i>	Transfers to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars</i>	Expenditure to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars</i>	Implementati on rate as a percentage of total budget (calculated automatically)
UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services	19051045	19051045	13389776	70.28%
				%

	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%

TOTAL	19051045	19051045	13389776	70.2 8%
--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **70.28%**. 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? *

30

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 \$ 5715313.5**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

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

Amount expended to date on efforts contributing to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US \$ 4016932.8**. Is this correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

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

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE. *

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

Financial Progress Report - Partnership Facility - June 2026-12_38_37.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

Partners' meetings are convened regularly, with an upcoming meeting planned for September 2026. During the reporting period, the Facility convened its partners in February and April 2026.

The Facility co-hosted together with UNOPS an additional partners' meeting in June 2026 to showcase the first year of its rebooted three tier-model in operation through an interactive overview of the model for Facility partners and broader practitioner audience following the World Bank Group Fragility Forum and ahead of the first Peacebuilding Week.

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

Engagement with governments is led at the country level by Partnership Facility grant recipients, notably with Ministries of Planning and Economy in respective targeted countries. National prevention strategies supported by the Facility were anchored at the level of the Prime Minister's Office in some cases, eg Papua New Guinea. During the reporting period, the Peacebuilding Commission chair visit to the Central African Republic, where the Facility has invested in tier 1 embedded UN-IFI liaison capacity in the RCO, was marked by a high-level of Government engagement. The Facility also supported Headquarters dialogue with Governments in multilateral fora, including at the World Bank Group Fragility Forum in June 2026 in Washington DC and at the Peacebuilding Week in New York also in June 2026.

PART I: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS

NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

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

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

Contracting of partners *

☐ Not Started

☐ Initiated

☒ Partially Completed

☐ Completed

☐ Not Applicable

Staff Recruitment *

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

Collection of baselines *

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

Identification of beneficiaries *

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

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The first half of 2026 represented further consolidation of the “rebooted” operational model of the UN-IFI Partnership Facility launched in April 2025 in response to the findings of a comprehensive independent evaluation completed in 2024.

For the current cycle from 1 April 2025 through 30 September 2026, the Facility’s three-tier model focused on delivery through:

Tier 1 - Embedded capacity for UN-IFI coordination and liaison in high-priority contexts;

Tier 2 - Expert advisory and technical support to UN-IFI partnership in medium-priority contexts, including short-term surge deployments;

Tier 3 - An enhanced knowledge management offer, facilitating access by UN clients to relevant innovations, good practice and lessons in respect of UN-IFI partnership, including through written products, peer exchange opportunities and policy dialogue.

Country projects supported UN-IFI collaboration in contexts including the Central African Republic (CAR), Chad, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Haiti, Papua New Guinea, Somalia, and Sudan, while regional work advanced in the Euphrates-Tigris Basin.

Under Tier 1, during the reporting period, the Facility continued investing into embedded UN-IFI liaison and advisory capacities in priority settings in the Resident Coordinators (RCs) in Chad, the DRC, and Haiti; deploying additional capacities in the CAR and in Papua New Guinea in early 2026.

Under Tier 2, since its launch in October 2025 and the kickoff workshop in New York, the Surge Advisory Team (SAT) has seen rapid uptake, receiving 38 expressions of interest from Resident Coordinators within 48 hours. The Team of five experts in key UN-IFI partnership areas began supporting a pipeline of remote and hybrid short-term deployments. During the reporting period, SAT support has been provided to RCs in Colombia, Honduras, Libya, oPt and Sri Lanka with several SAT assignments ongoing and knowledge products under development before the end of the pilot cycle in September 2026.

Under Tier 3, the UN-IFI Partnership Facility significantly advanced its knowledge management and learning agenda, strengthening institutional collaboration, knowledge sharing, and capacity-building across the UN system and IFIs. Key achievements included progress towards finalising the biennial UN-World Bank Partnership Monitoring Report; deepening engagement with the African Development Bank (AfDB); and advancing analytical mapping of major regional development banks.

Overall, implementation arrangements are fully operational and the project remains well positioned to deliver results. The Facility continued to be managed as a dedicated project by PBPSO, implemented by UNOPS. All UNOPS-contracted Facility personnel positions were filled throughout the reporting period.

The Facility cost extension through December 2027 was approved by PBPSO and UNOPS in June 2026.

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

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

If no, please provide an explanation *

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Project progress summary

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility maintained strong implementation momentum during the reporting period, supporting Resident Coordinators (RCs) and UN Country Teams (UNCTs) to strengthen collaboration with international financial institutions (IFIs) in fragile and conflict-affected settings.

Country-level projects advanced technical cooperation across prevention, recovery planning, data and analytics, climate resilience, land governance, and UN-World Bank coordination. Key achievements included establishment of a technical data platform in Haiti to support implementation of the Medium-Term Recovery and Development Plan; continued support to prevention strategy implementation in Papua New Guinea; strengthened UN-IFI coordination mechanisms in Chad, the Central African Republic (CAR), and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC); completion of analytical work on multidimensional risks in Sudan; and progress on regional cooperation to address climate-related risks in the Euphrates-Tigris Basin. In Colombia, substantial progress was made in developing legal and methodological tools for intercultural multipurpose cadastre implementation in partnership with the World Bank.

Demand for the Facility's Surge Advisory Team (SAT) remained high. Following the launch of a call for expressions of interest, 38 requests for support were received from RCs within 48 hours. The SAT provided expertise on UN-IFI partnership issues beyond the embedded liaison and advisory capacities deployed in Chad, CAR, DRC, Haiti, and Papua New Guinea. Where needed, support was complemented by in-house expertise or external specialists. As of June 2026, RCs in Colombia, Honduras, Libya, and the occupied Palestinian territories reported strong positive feedback on SAT support.

During the reporting period, SAT deployments included support to the UN-WB-EU Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment update in Gaza, incorporating a gender lens, and facilitation of IFI expertise for the economic track of Libya's peace process. The team also delivered coaching and peer-learning sessions for RCOs engaging with the World Bank's FCV envelope across ten country contexts, advised on national prevention strategies in Honduras, and supported development of a blended-finance prevention facility in Sierra Leone. Ongoing engagements include support to a private sector engagement strategy and blended-finance pilot on subnational peace-positive financing in Colombia, implemented with UNCDF and CAF; work on peace-aligned financing options in Sri Lanka; and development of guidance on operational alignment with the African Development Bank (AfDB).

Additional assignments under consultation include Côte d'Ivoire, Kyrgyzstan/Tajikistan, and Syria. Several guidance products are being developed, including a joint UN-World Bank note on country-level alignment for prevention, guidance on integrating women, peace and security considerations into UN-IFI partnerships, a note on collaboration with the AfDB, and a "Private Sector Engagement 101" resource with UNSSC. A review of the SAT pilot year will inform adjustments for 2026-2027.

Private sector engagement expanded considerably during the period. Activities included developing conflict-sensitive approaches to financing MSMEs, supporting RC engagement with domestic private sector actors, fostering partnerships with African entrepreneurs, universities, and financial institutions, and contributing to major international events such as the World Bank Fragility Forum and Peacebuilding Week. Consistent with its focus on strengthening field-HQ feedback loops, the Facility supported active participation of field practitioners in key policy discussions, particularly the World Bank's 2026 Fragility Forum.

The Facility also strengthened knowledge management, learning, and knowledge sharing across the UN system and partner institutions. Efforts focused on capturing lessons from UN-IFI partnerships, supporting UNCTs and RCOs, disseminating knowledge products, building communities of practice, and facilitating exchange among UN entities and IFI partners. An active Community of Practice continued to share lessons across field settings.

A significant portion of knowledge management efforts supported development of the UN-AfDB strategic partnership. This included drafting and consultations on the UN-AfDB Letter of Intent on Strategic Cooperation on Peace and Resilience and planning for its five-year implementation framework. Expected to be signed before year-end, the Letter places strong emphasis on institutional collaboration, knowledge exchange, country-level cooperation, joint learning, and the dissemination of lessons learned.

Work also progressed on analytical mapping exercises to identify comparative advantages, operational footprints, and partnership opportunities with major regional development banks. Mapping of the AfDB and Asian Development Bank (ADB) advanced, although finalization took longer than anticipated. In South Sudan, joint analysis with the World Bank provided a foundation for future collaboration on documenting the peace impact of IDA-financed initiatives.

The Facility continued developing the UN-IFI 101 training course, a joint initiative of PBPSO, DCO, and UNSSC, with

contributions from OHCHR, UN Women, and OCHA. The modular course aims to strengthen the capacity of RCOs, UNCTs, and UN personnel to engage more effectively with IFIs and is expected to be completed by the end of 2026. The Facility also continued documenting country experiences to capture practical lessons from UN-IFI partnerships. Work progressed on case studies in Mauritania and the DRC, highlighting operational innovations and good practices.

A core knowledge management product remained the weekly UN-IFI News Roundup, which provides curated updates on IFI developments. Recognized by members of the UN-IFI Working Group as a valuable resource, the newsletter was produced throughout the reporting period and reached approximately 900 recipients per edition.

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Gender equality and inclusion continue to be integrated throughout the Facility's programming by ensuring that analysis, planning processes and partnerships reflect the needs and perspectives of women, youth and marginalized communities. Several country projects explicitly incorporate gender-responsive and inclusive approaches into their analytical work and stakeholder engagement. Overall, 30 per cent of the allocated budget since the establishment of the Facility has contributed to gender equality or women's empowerment (GEWE) as per the project document. For example, the Colombia project in partnership with the World Bank incorporates intercultural and inclusive approaches that recognize indigenous, Afro-descendant and peasant territorial rights within land governance and cadastral reforms. Haiti's data platform is designed to improve evidence-based decision-making that supports equitable access to recovery and stabilization efforts. In fragile settings such as CAR, DRC, Somalia and Chad, projects promote inclusive dialogue between governments, UN entities, IFIs and local stakeholders to strengthen nationally owned prevention and peacebuilding processes. The UN-WB partnership in Papua New Guinea supported the nationally-owned prevention strategy, including a strong gender lens and outcomes related to improving support for survivors of SGBV as well as women's access to justice and community security.

At the global level, the UNSSC training programme and accompanying knowledge products are expected to strengthen UN system capacity to apply inclusive approaches in UN-IFI engagement. In addition, the Facility's growing work on private sector engagement promotes more inclusive economic opportunities by exploring support to MSMEs, local entrepreneurs and conflict-sensitive economic recovery, with particular attention to fragile and conflict-affected contexts.

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 Facility aims to improve the amount and effectiveness of global peacebuilding resources, by facilitating UN-IFI partnerships that target development efforts towards addressing drivers of conflict and fragility.

Through its continued advisory and grant support to PRA/TAA eligible settings, the Facility supports greater coherence between the World Bank and the UN at the institutional level in accompanying nationally-led prevention and peacebuilding efforts.

For example, in Haiti, the project has contributed to establishing a Government-UN-IFI technical coordination platform that is expected to evolve into a permanent coordination mechanism supporting implementation of the country's Recovery and Development Plan. The project has also operationalized a national data platform that improves shared analysis and coordination between government, the UN and IFIs, strengthening institutional capacity for anticipatory decision-making.

In Papua New Guinea, the project supports implementation and monitoring of the National Prevention Strategy by strengthening government accountability mechanisms and enhancing coordination between national institutions, the UN and the World Bank.

In Colombia, the project is strengthening institutional capacity for equitable land governance by developing legal analysis tools, promoting intercultural participation, and supporting policy implementation that recognizes indigenous, Afro-descendant and peasant territorial rights. These efforts contribute to addressing structural drivers of conflict related to land and governance.

Across several country projects—including CAR, Chad, DRC, Somalia and Sudan—the Facility has strengthened sustained dialogue and coordination between governments, Resident Coordinator Offices, UN Country Teams and IFIs. These partnerships have improved joint analysis, aligned programming, enhanced prevention planning and created institutional mechanisms that are expected to continue beyond the duration of individual grants.

For example, in CAR, during the reporting period, efforts focused on consolidating the implementation of the first jointly financed PBF-AfDB initiative. The official launch of the initiative marked a significant milestone in operationalizing the partnership, and preparations were underway in July for the first Joint Steering Committee meeting. At the same time, engagement with the AfDB's Transition Support Facility (TSF) has gained momentum through the preparation of two multi-agency Prevention Envelope submissions focused on Food Security and Private Sector Development. This process has generated interest in deepening collaboration between the AfDB, the World Bank and the IMF, including support for institutional capacity-building of civil servants. These engagements were expected to provide a strong foundation for policy dialogue to support national commitments in CAR. The Ministry of Economy, Planning and International Cooperation has already expressed interest in leveraging the UN-IFI Liaison capacity to support coordination of the working committee established for the World Bank's PRA process, and the World Bank has similarly recognized the added value of this technical coordination role.

At the global level, the UNSSC training programme, ADB mapping study and private sector engagement initiatives are strengthening institutional knowledge and creating new partnerships that will improve future UN-IFI collaboration in fragile and conflict-affected settings. Together, these efforts are contributing to more coherent prevention and peacebuilding architecture across the UN system.

If yes, please provide sources or references (including links) as evidence of peacebuilding results, or submit them as additional attachments.

Evidence may be quantitative or qualitative but needs to demonstrate progress against outcome indicators in the project results framework. Sources may include project surveys (such as perception surveys), monitoring reports, government documents, or other knowledge products that have been developed by the project.

File attachment

[Click here to upload file. \(< 10MB\)](#)

PART II: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

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:

UN Resident Coordinators and field presences in complex settings (including peace operations, special political missions and Country Team with a Peace and Development Advisor) are effectively equipped to engage with International Financial Institutions on strategies to tackle the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict and enable the acceleration of the SDG

Outcome 2:

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: UN Resident Coordinators and field presences in complex settings (including peace operations, special political missions and Country Team with a Peace and Development Advisor) are effectively equipped to engage with International Financial Institutions on strategies to tackle the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict and enable the acceleration of the SDG**

O C 1	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
1. 1	% of UN field leadership serving in crisis-affected situations reporting strategic partnership between the UN, the World Bank and International Financial Institutions	13 are reporting joint strategic priorities in prevention/HDP collaboration (27%) (Partnership Monitoring Report, 2020)	at least 30% reporting joint strategic priorities in prevention/HDP collaboration	28 out of 47 RCOs (60%) have reported UN-WB collaboration in prevention and peacebuilding (Partnership Monitoring Report, 2021-2022)		Next Partnership Monitoring Report to be finalized in 2026.
1. 2	% of UN field leadership reporting a shared understanding of risks and drivers of conflict including those associated with women, youth, and marginalized segments, with the World Bank and other IFIs.	0	at least 15% reporting a shared understanding of risks and drivers of conflict	22 RCOs out of 47 (46%) reported some level of better consensus around drivers of fragility and alignment (Partnership Monitoring Report, 2021-2022)		Next Partnership Monitoring Report to be finalized in 2026.
1. 3						

1. 4						
1. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 1 have?

12345more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 1

Output 1.1
UN Resident Coordinators and UN field presences in high-priority contexts benefit from embedded UN-IFI partnership capacities in-country

Output 1.2
UN Resident Coordinators in medium-priority prevention and peacebuilding settings benefit from advisory support and surge deployments to advance the collaboration with IFIs

Output 1.3

Output 1.4

Output 1.5

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

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

» **Output 1.1: UN Resident Coordinators and UN field presences in high-priority contexts benefit from embedded UN-IFI partnership capacities in-country**

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	% of UN staff reporting improved capacity to partner with IFIs	38% since 2019	At least 45%	Of 41 teams reporting in Q2 2024, comprising UNHQ DPPA-DPO and RCOs, 84% conveyed that their team has "some internal capacity" or "good internal capacity" to partner with the World Bank on prevention and peacebuilding issues, 56% with the IMF, and 72% with the Multilateral Development Banks. Knowledge Management Survey 2024	Of 41 teams reporting in Q2 2024, comprising UNHQ DPPA-DPO and RCOs, 84% conveyed that their team has "some internal capacity" or "good internal capacity" to partner with the World Bank on prevention and peacebuilding issues, 56% with the IMF, and 72% with the Multilateral Development Banks. Knowledge Management Survey 2024	Next Knowledge Management Survey is planned for Q4 2026.

1. 1. 2	Number of evidentiary products by IFIs with UN contribution and vice versa that are gender and youth responsive	analyses, assessments, and processes	At least 13 evidentiary products demonstrating UN and IFI contributions, that are gender and youth responsive	5	15	
1. 1. 3						
1. 1. 4						
1. 1. 5						

» **Output 1.2: UN Resident Coordinators in medium-priority prevention and peacebuilding settings benefit from advisory support and surge deployments to advance the collaboration with IFIs**

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	% of UN staff reporting improved knowledge related to IFIs in the context of emerging thematic areas	0	30% staff reporting improved knowledge related to IFIs (KM survey in 2024)	Data to be collected at the end of the project.	Data to be collected at the end of the project.	Facility team defining survey questions for data to be collected at the end of the project.
1. 2. 2						
1. 2. 3						
1. 2. 4						
1. 2. 5						

» Output 1.3:

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

» Output 1.4:

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

» Output 1.5:

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

» Outcome 2:

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

Output 2.2

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:

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						
2. 1. 2						
2. 1. 3						
2. 1. 4						
2. 1. 5						

» Output 2.2:

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						
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 cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3.1.1						
3.1.2						
3.1.3						
3.1.4						
3.1.5						

» Output 3.2:

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

» Output 3.3:

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

» Output 3.4:

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

» Output 3.5:

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

» Outcome 4:

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

How many outputs does outcome 4 have?

1 2 3 4 5 more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 4

Output 4.1

Output 4.2

Output 4.3
Output 4.4
Output 4.5
Other Outputs <i>If Outcome 4 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here</i>

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

» Output 4.1:

4. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4.1.1						
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)
Event 1	Joint PBF-Facility partner visit	November 2026 (tbc)	Central African Republic	Facility funding partners and potential partners	UN-IFI Partnership Facility partner visits are intended to showcase and strengthen strategic collaboration between the UN Country Team, international financial institutions and national stakeholders, promoting joint analysis, coordinated financing and innovative approaches that address the root causes of conflict and fragility while advancing sustainable peace and development outcomes. The visit is expected to showcase how the UN, World Bank, African Development Bank and national partners can work together to address the root causes of fragility and conflict and demonstrate the value of the UN-IFI Partnership Facility's catalytic role.
Event 2	Monitoring mission to Haiti	October 2026 (tbc)	Haiti		Monitoring mission for tier 1 Facility embedded capacity in the Haiti RCO; lessons learnt and potential for deeper collaboration with IDB

Event 3					
Event 4					

Human Impact

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

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

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

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

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

Please limit your response to 4000 characters.

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility primarily delivers impact through institutional strengthening. Its added value lies in enabling governments, Resident Coordinator Offices, United Nations Country Teams and international financial institutions to work together more effectively in addressing the structural drivers of conflict and fragility.

During the reporting period, the Facility strengthened institutional capacity across multiple countries by supporting joint analysis, integrated planning, prevention strategies and recovery frameworks. These efforts have improved the quality of evidence available for decision-making, enhanced coordination between national authorities and development partners, and increased opportunities for mobilizing development finance in support of nationally owned peacebuilding priorities.

Several country projects demonstrate this catalytic role. In Haiti, the Facility supported the establishment of a Government-UN-IFI technical platform and an integrated data platform that strengthen coordination around the country's Recovery and Development Plan. In Papua New Guinea, support to implementation of the National Prevention Strategy has strengthened government accountability and coordination mechanisms. In Colombia, technical assistance is improving land governance through more inclusive legal and policy tools, while projects in CAR, Chad, DRC, Somalia and Sudan continue to strengthen institutional collaboration around prevention and recovery priorities.

Beyond country-level support, the Facility has expanded system-wide capacity through the development of the UN-IFI 101 training programme, strategic analytical work on partnerships with the Asian Development Bank, and strengthened engagement with the private sector. These initiatives are helping equip UN practitioners with practical tools and knowledge to build more effective partnerships that can unlock greater investment for prevention, resilience and sustainable peace.

While the Facility's contribution to human impact is largely indirect, its work strengthens the institutional foundations necessary for more effective peacebuilding interventions, better coordinated development investments and ultimately improved outcomes for people living in fragile and conflict-affected settings.

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

OPTIONAL

File 1

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 2

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 3

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

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

OPTIONAL

Link 1

OPTIONAL

Link 2

OPTIONAL

Link 3

OPTIONAL

Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative.

How we worked:

*

Please select up to 3.

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

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The Facility contributed to leveraging additional resources toward national prevention and peacebuilding priorities such as in CAR, PNG, DRC, Chad

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Chad, work with Ministry of Planning on nexus

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

MDBs, AfDB and ADB deep dives, AfDB, ADB, IDB joint workplans, UN-AfDB mapping 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

1 - WB, IMF, MDBs

2 - Regular coordination with UN Agencies on joint position and engagement with the IFIs, particularly through UN-IFI Working Group

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.

The Facility maintains regular coordination meetings to track progress and has bi-annual reporting cycles for grantees/RC requests for support. In addition to these formal steps, the Facility organizes regular “check ins” with grantees to monitor progress and challenges in delivery and support real time learning and troubleshooting. Following a review of its monitoring and learning framework, the Facility decided not to conduct its standalone knowledge management survey in 2025, instead relying on data collected through the UN Country Team Annual Information Management System (AIMS). However, the experience demonstrated that AIMS does not fully meet the Facility’s monitoring and learning needs. Thus, the Facility will reintroduce a dedicated UN-IFI KM survey in late 2026 to gather more tailored information on how UN entities engage with IFIs, utilize knowledge products, and benefit from Facility’s support.

Do outcome indicators have baselines? *

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The outcome indicator will be revised in the next project cycle starting on 1 October 2026. The revised indicator dataset will include baseline, target and source of evidence.

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.

UN-WB Joint Monitoring Report Biannual PBF progress reports Biannual Facility grantee progress reports Resident Coordinators' Survey undertaken by the UN Development Coordination Office Facility Knowledge Management Survey

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.

The latest UN-World Bank Joint Monitoring Report covering 2023-2025 reporting period, in the context of the joint 2017 Framework for Partnership in Crisis-Affected Settings, shows the richness of UN-WB partnerships in these contexts. While rooted in complementary mandates, the partnership evolved toward closer strategic and operational collaboration, joint analysis, better-aligned financing, and more integrated support to nationally led priorities. The fourth Joint Monitoring Report places particular emphasis on conflict prevention, food security, forced displacement, and women's empowerment, contexts where the UN and the World Bank leveraged their comparative advantages to strengthen national systems, reinforce government leadership, and build resilience rather than relying on parallel delivery mechanisms. During the reporting period, joint prevention approaches helped align political, peacebuilding, and development efforts around nationally owned priorities in Papua New Guinea and the Central African Republic. Innovative financing instruments enabled faster, more coherent joint action in Sudan, while in Afghanistan the partnership supported women's equitable access and participation.

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.

The internal UN-IFI Community of Practice continued to serve as a practitioner network connecting UN colleagues engaged with IFIs, promoting peer learning and the exchange of practical experiences and resources. During the reporting period, the Community hosted two learning sessions: one on lessons from the working-level mission to the AfDB, and another on Mauritania's National Prevention Strategy and engagement with IFIs. Between formal meetings, members continued to exchange information, good practices, opportunities, and contacts through the network's communication channels.

» 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

147084

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.

An external evaluation covering project activities and results from 2019 to 2024 was completed in late 2024. The report’s recommendations were analyzed and directly informed the next phase of the Facility. A thematic evaluation of UNOPS partnerships with UN entities conducted between October and December 2025 highlighted the effective partnership between UNOPS and PBPSO. The evaluation found that the respective roles of the two organizations are clear and complementary, with each leveraging its comparative advantages effectively. Under this arrangement, UNOPS leads operational implementation while PBPSO provides strategic direction, creating a well-balanced collaboration. As a result, the partnership establishes a strong enabling environment that supports the effective delivery of the Facility’s goals.

Contact information

Name

Organization

Job title

Email

Please mention the focal person responsible for sharing the final evaluation report with the PBF:

Marija Vareikaite

PBPSO Partnership Facility

Knowledge Management Officer

vareikaite@un.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.

An external evaluation covering project activities and results from 2019 to 2024 was completed in late 2024. The report's recommendations were analyzed and directly informed the next phase of the Facility.

A thematic evaluation of UNOPS partnerships with UN entities conducted between October and December 2025 highlighted the effective partnership between UNOPS and PBPSO. The evaluation found that the respective roles of the two organizations are clear and complementary, with each leveraging its comparative advantages effectively. Under this arrangement, UNOPS leads operational implementation while PBPSO provides strategic direction, creating a well-balanced collaboration. As a result, the partnership establishes a strong enabling environment that supports the effective delivery of the Facility's goals.

In DRC, collaboration between the UN, World Bank and the African Development Bank, facilitated by the project, is enabling more effective joint support to the Government across the HDP nexus, helping build momentum to tackle deep-rooted conflict factors. For example, the Government recently requested support from the African Development Bank to improve management of the artisanal mining sector, building on analysis and policy exchanges facilitated as part of the project.

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.

Facility projects are designed to be catalytic, with extensions granted on an exceptional basis upon compelling justification with a focus to accompany efforts to leverage additional IFI resources, deepen the partnership on emerging thematic areas, and/or institutionalize a good practice. In cases where initiatives are likely to exceed 18 months in duration, project teams are requested to either rescope activities to remain achievable during this timeframe or seek additional, parallel resources. For example, the UN-WB Liaison Officer in DRC is cost-shared by the World Bank and the Facility will bridge one additional year which will enable locally mobilized UN resources to carry this function forward in 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.

Implementation of the project implementation remained subject to political upheavals in recipient country settings, affecting IFI strategies and engagement as well as UN capacities. The Facility remains a risk tolerant and agile instrument that aims to accompany country-driven opportunities as they emerge. Opportunities for new partnerships with new IFIs (MDBs) opened at the policy level with MDB reform and renewal of related fragility strategies but require significant upfront investment in liaison and advisory support before translating into country-specific partnership opportunities. Limited capacities in RCOs as well as the planned contraction of the global PDA network continued to impact pipeline development and project implementation, resulting in longer lead-times to identify strategic and achievable programmatic entry points for the Facility's catalytic support. Lingering operational delays related to the delinking of the RC system with UNDP continue to drive delays in some specific contexts, as agency-specific activities tend to take precedence over system-wide initiatives enabled by UNDP. This bottleneck is mainly addressed during the monitoring check-ins and in the diversification of implementing partners, including directly through UNOPS. These are lessons, captured in the external evaluation, were incorporated in the design of the new phase of the Partnership Facility.

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	Libya	As part of the tier 2 SAT response, the Facility supported a mission to Tripoli in February-March 2026 to facilitate IFI expertise to the economic track of the peace process in Libya.	The mission produced recommendations for the RCO on the scope, purpose, and strategy of the economic track of the political peace process building on UNSMIL's existing work.
Event 2	Sri Lanka	As part of the tier 2 SAT response, the Facility supported a mission to Colombo, together with UNCDF, in February 2026 to support the RCO in advancing the peace finance and peace-positive private sector development agenda.	The mission built on prior consultations with RCO, aimed to engage national and international partners on options for peace positive innovative financing and private sector development in the Northern and Eastern regions of Sri Lanka, aligned with Sri Lanka's post-crisis recovery, governance reform, and national unity agenda. The mission confirmed two potential options are worth considering: a debt for recovery and development swap; a thematic bond to finance SMEs.
Event 3	Côte d'Ivoire	As part of the tier 2 SAT response, the Facility undertook a mission to Abidjan in March 2026 to development of knowledge products for RCOs on operational alignment entry points for the UN Country Teams with the African Development Bank.	The mission strengthened the partnership with the African Development Bank and the ongoing development of the Letter of Intent expected to be signed by end 2026 as well as produced guidance documents for RCOs on entry points for partnering with AfDB and specifically on engaging with the Transition Support Facility (TSF) prevention envelope.

Event 4	Somalia	The Facility undertook a scoping mission together with PBF to Nairobi-Mogadishu in May 2026 to engage with IFIs and private sector stakeholders.	The mission to Somalia engaged IFIs, financing partners, and private sector stakeholders to identify practical opportunities for aligning recovery and resilience investments with peacebuilding priorities in Somalia, strengthening UN-IFI partnerships, and exploring the private sector's role in supporting sustainable peace.
Event 5			
Event 6			
Event 7			
Event 8			

Final Steps

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

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

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

.....