SECRETARY-GENERAL'S PEACEBUILDING FUND
PROJECT DOCUMENT TEMPLATE

United Nations Peacebuilding

PBF PROJECT DOCUMENT

Country(ies): Global	
Project Title: The Humanitarian-Development-Peacebuilding and Partnership Facility **Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway (if existing project): 00117260**	
PBF project modality: IRF PRF	**If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund (instead of into individual recipient agency accounts):** Country Trust Fund Regional Trust Fund **Name of Recipient Fund: UNOPS**
List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed by type of organization (UN, CSO etc.): • United Nations Office for Project Services **List additional implementing partners, specify the type of organization (Government, INGO, local CSO):** • Implementing partners under sub-grants may include RCOs (via DCO), UN agencies, CSOs, individual consultants or firms.	
Initial Project commencement date: 10 September 2019 **Project duration in months[1] [2]:** New cost-extension duration: 15 months, from 1 October 2026 through 31 December 2027 Total duration including present cost-extension: 82+15 months **Geographic zones (within the country) for project implementation:** Global	
Does the project fall under one or more of the specific PBF priority windows below: Gender promotion initiative[3] Youth promotion initiative[4] Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions	

[1] Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

[2] The official project start date will be the date of the first project budget transfer by MPTFO to the recipient organization(s), as per the MPTFO Gateway page.

[3] Check this box only if the project was approved under PBF's special call for proposals, the Gender Promotion Initiative

[4] Check this box only if the project was approved under PBF's special call for proposals, the Youth Promotion Initiative

Cross-border or regional project
Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization): ~~**UNOPS:** $ 11,136,632~~ ~~Total: $ 11,136,632~~ UNOPS: $ 19,051,045 Total: $ 19,051,045 **PBF 1st tranche (100%): 2019 received** UNOPS: $ 4,405,507 Total: $ 4,405,507 **PBF 2nd tranche (100%): 2021 received** UNOPS: $ 3,230,396 Total: $3,230,396 **PBF 3rd tranche: 2023 received** UNOPS: $ 3,500,729 Total: $3,500,729 **PBF 4th tranche** ~~(to be transferred 15 days after signature of the project document)~~ UNOPS: $ 4,552,730 Total: $ 4,552,730 PBF 5th tranche (to be transferred 15 days after signature of the project document) UNOPS: $ 3,398,389 Total: $ 3,398,389 **The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBPSO's approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account. For payment of second and subsequent tranches the Coordinating agency needs to demonstrate expenditure/commitment of at least 75% of the previous tranche and provision of any PBF reports due in the period elapsed.* Any other existing funding for the project (amount and source): N/A
Provide a brief project description (describe the main project goal; do not list outcomes and outputs): The UN-IFI Partnership Facility (formerly the Humanitarian-Development-Peacebuilding and Partnership Facility) ~~will~~ provides advisory support and grant funding to foster stronger UN partnership with the World Bank and other IFIs including regional development banks, primarily at country level but also at regional and headquarters levels, *with the goal of improving coherence and shared effectiveness in support of peacebuilding and national prevention strategies*. In the 2026-2027 cycle, the Facility will expand its offer beyond advancing UN-IFI partnerships to support a more integrated approach, including engaging innovative financing and private sector partnerships to drive greater integration of tools for financing peace under the overall umbrella of **integrated peace finance**.

Specifically, the Facility will provide the following categories of support:

1. Embedding of dedicated capacity for UN-IFI coordination and liaison in high-priority country contexts;
2. Provision of advisory and technical support, including through short-term surge deployments, to advance UN-IFI partnership in medium-priority contexts, with a view to systematically capturing lessons learned;
3. Facilitating access by UN clients in prevention and peacebuilding contexts to relevant innovations, good practice and lessons learned in respect of UN-IFI partnership in crisis-affected settings, including through generation of knowledge products, peer exchange opportunities and policy dialogue.
4. NEW: Broaden substantive focus of Facility initiatives to include, in addition to UN-IFI partnerships, engagement with innovative financing, private sector and digital technology to support integrated and inclusive approaches to financing peace.

Gender equality, women's empowerment, and youth inclusion will be promoted across project outputs. Country and policy priorities will be determined by PBPSO leadership in consultation with relevant field and HQ stakeholders, and will be regularly reviewed.

This Project Document incorporates lessons and recommendations from ~~an~~ external evaluations conducted in 2024 and 2025 as well as policy developments and orientations, such as the Pact for the Future, 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review resolutions, planned expansions of MDB lending, the World Bank's mid-term review of the FCV Strategy and IDA21 replenishment, and is informed by the evaluation of the PBF Strategy (2020-2026) and the development of the next PBF Strategy for 2027-2030.

Summarize the in-country project consultation process prior to submission to PBPSO, including with the PBF Steering Committee, civil society (including any women and youth organizations) and stakeholder communities (including women, youth and marginalized groups):

The Partnership Facility is global in nature and, therefore, consulted at the global level with the ASG for Peacebuilding and Peace Support and Senior Management Team of PBPSO. Further consultations took place with the donors supporting this initiative, and the UN's Peacebuilding Contact Group. Further, the present Project Document has been consulted internally within DPPA-DPO/PBPSO and externally with donors and stakeholders from December 2025 through May 2026.

Project Gender Marker score[5]: _1__

Specify % and $ of total project budget allocated to activities in pursuit of gender equality and women's empowerment: 30%

Briefly **explain through which major intervention(s) the project will contribute to**

---

[5] **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)
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 1 for projects that contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly (less than 30% of the total budget for GEWE)

[6] Please consult the **PBF Guidance Note on Gender Marker Calculations and Gender-responsive Peacebuilding**

gender equality and women's empowerment[6]:

The Facility will continue to actively integrate gender equality and women's empowerment in its portfolio of funded projects, knowledge management, and advisory support in line with the broader PBF strategy (through 2026) and next PBF strategy 2027-2030.

The World Bank's recommitment in its 2026 FCV refresh to roll-out of the 2024 Approach Paper on Gender and FCV and the exchanges between the UN and the World Bank on this topic create increased opportunities for collaboration, notably on GBV and women's empowerment in national plans supporting by the FCV Envelope. Women's empowerment has also been identified as an area for closer cooperation with the Asian Development Bank ~~development of 'inclusion lenses'~~.

Capacities and activities supported by the Partnership Facility will be required to meet a Gender Marker 2 level commitment in mainstreaming GEWE considerations through key outputs, such as Terms of Reference, advisory notes, end of assignment reports, analyses, deep dives, or policy dialogue.

Project Risk Marker score[7]: _1____

Select PBF Focus Areas which best summarizes the focus of the project *(select ONLY one)*[8]: 4.3 governance of peacebuilding resources

If applicable, UNSDCF/**UNDAF outcome(s)** to which the project contributes: N/A but will seek synergies and catalytic links between Facility activities, PBF portfolios and IFI engagements.

Sustainable Development Goal(s) and Target(s) to which the project contributes: The activities of the Facility support the achievement of the SDGs in crisis-affected contexts – particularly SDG 16 and 17.

Type of submission: **New project** **Project amendment**	**If it is a project amendment, select all changes that apply and provide a brief justification:** **Extension of duration:** Additional duration in months (number of months and new end date): addition of 15 months (approximately) with the new end date of 31 December 2027. **Change of project outcome/ scope:** UN Resident

[7] **Risk marker 0** = low risk to achieving outcomes
Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes
Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

[8] **PBF Focus Areas** are:
(1.1) SSR, (1.2) Rule of Law; (1.3) DDR; (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)

	Coordinators and field presences in complex settings (including peace operations, special political missions and Country Teams with a Peace and Development Advisor) are effectively equipped to engage with International Financial including regional MDBs, as well as with other peace finance ecosystem partners on strategies to tackle the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict and enable the acceleration of the SDGs. **Change of budget allocation between outcomes or budget categories of more than 15%:** x **Additional PBF budget:** Additional amount by recipient organization: UNOPS $ 3,398,389 **Brief justification for amendment:** *Note: If this is an amendment, show any changes to the project document in RED colour or in TRACKED CHANGES, ensuring a new result framework and budget tables are included with clearly visible changes. Any parts of the document which are not affected, should remain the same. New project signatures are required.* This Project Document was amended on 17 September 2020, 13 May 2021, 25 May 2023 and 19 March 2025 for cost extensions. The Project Document is, hereby, amended and extended in order to: 1. Reflect the incoming financial contributions; 2. ~~Update the name of the Facility to: The UN-IFI Partnership Facility~~ 3. Update the results framework to reflect the expanded substantive focus on integrated peace finance ~~refined focus and service lines,~~ incorporating external evaluation recommendations; 4. Continue to add UNOPS overhead~~s~~ costs through 31 December 2027 to account for grantee project duration in line with their regulations.

PROJECT SIGNATURES:

Recipient Organization(s)[9]	Peacebuilding and Peace Support Office (PBPSO)
Émilie S. Potvin [redacted]	Elizabeth Spehar [redacted]

[9] Please include a separate signature block for each direct recipient organization under this project.

Signature Director, Global Portfolios United Nations Office of Project Services *Date & Seal* 29 June 2026	*Signature* Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding and Peace Support *Date & Seal* 2 July 2026

I. Peacebuilding Context and Rationale for PBF support

a) Background Analytical Findings and Driving Factors

Creating sustainable development solutions for countries affected by crisis, conflict, and violence is a global responsibility.

~~More than one billion people have lifted themselves out of poverty in the past 25 years[10], yet due to a convergence of factors, we are seeing the first reversals in poverty gains in decades[11].~~ From 1990 to 2025, the number of people living in extreme poverty worldwide declined from around 2.3 billion to about 831 million[12]; yet over the last decade, a convergence of sluggish economic growth, high debt, the effects of COVID-19, conflict and fragility, and severe weather-related shocks has substantially slowed global poverty reduction[13].

The world is enduring the highest number of violent conflicts since 1946. ~~Nearly 2 billion people - one fourth of the world's population - live in conflict-affected countries[14].~~ Over 2.1 billion people – 25% of the world's population - currently living in fragile or conflict-affected contexts[15]. Conflict drives an estimated 80% of rising humanitarian needs,[16] including the number of ~~internally~~ forcibly displaced people which has reached ~~100~~ 123 million, including 83 million internally displaced, the highest absolute numbers on record.[17] Armed conflict also pushed ~~139~~ 140 million people into acute food insecurity in ~~2021~~ 2024[18].

These developments are taking place against the backdrop of the protracted effects of other crises with significant spillovers such as in Ukraine, further escalation in the Middle East, and Sudan, but also global challenges including pandemics, climate change, and the intensifying debt crisis facing developing countries that also intersect with domestic drivers of fragility, conflict and violence. Thus, if current trends persist, more than 86% of the world's poorest populations will live in fragile contexts by 2030, constituting a major obstacle to national development progress, as well as to global efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

---

10 ~~World Bank. 2018. Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2018: Piecing Together the Poverty Puzzle.~~

11 ~~World Bank. 2022. The Reversal Problem: Development Going Backwards~~

12 World Bank Group. 2025. WBG Poverty and Inequality Update – 2025.

13 World Bank Group. 2024. Poverty, Prosperity, and Planet Report 2024: Pathways Out of the Polycrisis.

14 The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2022.

15 OECD. 2025. States of Fragility 2025. Paris: OECD Publishing.

16 World Bank Fragility, Conflict and Violence Overview. ~~(worldbank.org)~~

17 ~~The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2022.~~ UNHCR. 2025. Global Trends 2024.

18 ~~WFP. 2022. Global Report on Food Crisis.~~ FSIN and Global Network Against Food Crises (GNAFC). 2025. Global Report on Food Crises 2025. Rome

At the same time, the external financing environment is deteriorating sharply: official development assistance (ODA) from OECD DAC members fell to USD 174.3 billion in 2025, a 23.1% decline in real terms from 2024 - the largest annual contraction to date - while humanitarian assistance fell by 35.8% and core contributions to the UN system declined by 27%. This sharp fall in ODA further constrains the capacity of fragile contexts to absorb shocks, sustain prevention and peacebuilding efforts, and protect hard-won development gains[19]. To date, Multilateral Development Banks have been relatively insulated from aid cuts, while continuing to pursue reforms that are expected to expand their lending capacity threefold between 2025 and 2030.

The global shifts in conflict and financing have made MDBs and the private sector, including innovative and blended finance arrangements, increasingly critical for national authorities working to finance sustainable peace.

Exclusion and Inequalities: These trends are exacerbating inequalities at the global and national level. Climate-related events are set to further increase poverty and inequalities in the near and long-term future. While always hampering sustainable development goals, they constitute acute risks for peace and stability when they exacerbate real and perceived grievances between groups. While structural inequalities, including gender inequalities, have existed before, given the sheer magnitude of girls and women pushed into extreme poverty in the last few years, it will take around another 132 years to achieve global gender parity[20]. As confirmed in the *2018 UN-WB Pathways for Peace* report, it is critical that the responses of national and international actors reflect a holistic approach to inclusion that encompasses women and youth as well as potential cleavages between ethnic and religious groups, economic classes, thereby capturing the full range of exclusion and inequalities that may be drivers of conflict in a given setting. The UN's normative mandates and field networks give it a comparative advantage with respect to the IFIs in supporting inclusive approaches to peace finance.

Trust in institutions and eroding social contract: In many societies, especially those affected by conflict and violence, trust in institutions has already been low or decreasing. Heightened fiscal pressures on many governments could further undermine their ability to respond and regain trust. Building trust requires both inclusive processes and outcomes, including in the arenas of power, opportunity, services, justice and security, as emphasized in the Pathways report. In many societies, public grievances against government's response to prevalent socio-economic impacts, such as through exaggerated restrictions on freedom of speech and assembly, further erode the social contract between the state and population. Divisive hate speech and misinformation are on the rise, and the democratic process, and with it, peaceful avenues of contestation of power, is weakened. In societies that have experienced patterns of exclusion even before the COVID-19 pandemic, perceived injustice and marginalization can lead to further tensions Unconstitutional changes of governments in a number of settings have also highlighted the importance of civic space, meaningful participation, and

---

[19] OECD. 2026. Preliminary official development assistance levels in 2025. Paris: OECD

[20] The World Bank in Gender 2023 https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/gender/overview

authoritarianism. Careful attention is required to both horizontal and vertical inequalities and also to the potential for repression and violence in the face of measures to up-end status quo arrangements that may privilege specific groups.

The UN-WB report *Pathways for Peace* (2018) built the case for investing in prevention and direct development responses to the underlying causes of conflict and violence. A recent IMF working paper (2025) builds on the *Pathways for Peace* report to show that investing in conflict prevention can generate significant long-run benefits. In countries that have not suffered recently from violence, returns can range from $26 to $75 per $1 spent on prevention, while for countries with recent violence, the rate of return could be as high as $103 per $1 spent on prevention.

Stronger partnerships remain a critical plank in a broader strategy for the UN to respond to the growing number and scale of crises today and the growing prevention risks on the horizon. The UN must work with partners based on comparative advantages and across humanitarian, development, human rights, and peace instruments. Within the broader array of partners, IFIs are playing increasingly active roles in fragile and conflict settings. They are both scaling up resources and developing differentiated approaches to conflict and prevention settings. Therefore, they represent particularly important multilateral partners for the UN in the field of prevention and peacebuilding, as reiterated in a number of resolutions and core policy documents (see specific references in section below).

This increasingly active role is evidenced in recent fragility strategies developed by IFIs, including the Bretton Woods Institutions and regional Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs):

- The ***WBG Strategy for Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV) 2020-2025*** is one of only three institutional strategies in the World Bank (along with those on gender and climate change). Building on the joint UN-WB Pathways for Peace study, it lays out the logic for the World Bank to invest in preventing violent conflict by supporting States to tackle root causes and remaining engaged throughout the conflict cycle. The Mid-Term Review of the Strategy in 2022 highlighted areas for further work, including the need to engage in upstream prevention, and better leverage partnerships to tackle gaps, including in respect of justice and the rule of law, and to engage the private sector. The FCV Strategy "refresh" was initiated in 2025 and was approved by the Board of Directors on 2 June 2026 before the WBG Fragility Forum 2026. The "refresh" is centred around four strategic shifts which are highly relevant for UN–World Bank collaboration: (1) "anticipate better and work with partners" calls for deepening joint work on risk awareness and anticipatory action, while also creating more deliberate space for engagement on justice and security as critical drivers of fragility; (2) "adopt a differentiated approach" opens important opportunities for more upstream prevention, including the possible use of prevention compacts beyond the current FCV list, as well as next-generation approaches to third-party implementation; (3) "working better as One WBG on the jobs agenda" is an area where the UN can make a particularly valuable contribution through its comparative advantages at country level; (4) "enhancing the operational toolkit, partnerships, knowledge and talent" suggests practical scope for strengthened collaboration, including potential co-financing of staffing and other joint capacity arrangements. The "refresh" will also include, for the first time, an implementation plan and accountability framework.

- Under IDA19, the Bank introduced **specific financing instruments** for fragile settings, including the ***Prevention and Resilience Allocation*** (PRA) and ***Turn Around Allocation*** (TAA) that significantly uplifted ~~existing~~ IDA19 allocations for eligible countries that committed to addressing drivers of violence and conflict. Under IDA19, World Bank support for FCV settings accounted for 41% of total financing, while in IDA20 nearly 40% of new financing was directed to FCV contexts[21]. Financing for the FCV Envelope ~~will be~~ has been extended under IDA21, with a new "expanded data" pathway creating the option for support to national prevention strategies at an earlier stage of the conflict cycle.
- In 2024, the World Bank ~~meanwhile~~ rolled out a Gender and Fragility, Conflict and Violence (FCV) Approach Paper and updated its Gender Strategy (2024-2030), creating enhanced opportunities for collaboration among PBPSO, UN Women, and World Bank Gender and FCV Group.
- In 2022, the IMF introduced its **Strategy for Fragility and Conflict-Affected States (FCS Strategy).** Noting the significant role of the IMF in enhancing resilience, and reducing fragility while contributing towards macro-economic stability, governance and inclusive growth, the strategy involves tailoring IMF engagement, instruments, and policy advice in line with the country-specific inherent fragility and conflict risks[22]. As part of its FCS Strategy, the IMF has been rolling out Country Engagement Strategies (strategic planning and analytics tools) and use the WB's Risk and Resilience Assessments (RRA) as a basis for analysis (this highlights the strategic importance of collaboration around RRA as an analytic foundation for both the WB and IMF programmes).
- The African Development Bank (AfDB) has developed a **Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience 2022-2026**, which includes country resilience and fragility assessment tools to identify and analyze drivers of fragility and sources of resilience. ~~An ongoing mid-term review is expected to benefit from UN contributions, notably through a UN-IFI Partnership Facility grant made under a previous budget cycle.~~ Since assuming office in September 2025, AfDB President Dr Sidi Ould Tah has taken the AfDB's commitment to a new level, stressing the "centrality of peace" to development, committing to a "prevention lens" across AfDB operations, and expressing his intention to deepen strategic partnerships.
    - Based on the discussions between AfDB and PBPSO at the 2025 Africa Resilience Forum, an agreement has been reached to enhance country-level partnership through a dedicated **UN-AfDB joint framework on peace and resilience** in the format of a "Letter of Intent". Drawing on the similar 2017 UN-WB Strategic Partnership Framework, the letter articulates UN and AfDB's shared commitment to country-level cooperation in support of national priorities for peace and resilience, in line with common principles and a right-based approach.

---

[21] World Bank Results Brief, June 2023.

[22] IMF Policy Paper: IMF Strategy for Fragility and Conflict-Affected States (FCS) (2022).

It envisages systematic cooperation on (i) country-level analysis; ii) mobilization of financing and iii) coherence of country-level engagements, backed by shared learning and policy dialogue. It aims to create an architecture for systematic support to country-level partnership, centering the strategic role of RCs alongside SPMs where applicable, and leveraging a joint UN-AFDB Secretariat to support innovation and capture good practices. Roll-out of the new framework is expected in late 2026.

- The Asian Development Bank has developed an **Approach for Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and Small Island Developing States (2021).** In 2025, a study of UN-ADB collaboration in fragile settings was commissioned by PBPSO through the UN-IFI Partnership Facility, in close collaboration with the Asian Development Bank's Fragility and Engagement Division (FED) to take stock of the current collaboration in fragile and conflict-affected situations, distill good practices and lessons learned, and identify opportunities for enhanced cooperation with a view to better align on policy.
- The Islamic Development Bank has developed a **Fragility and Resilience approach (2019)** and held its first Resilience Forum in June 2026 including to launch a new dedicated financing instrument for recovery and resilience.
- The **Inter-American Development Bank** has also finalized its Framework for Populations in Situations of Fragility, Conflict and Criminal Violence (FCCV) (2024-2027) and the Operational Guidelines for the Framework Implementation and is finalizing a pilot methodology to identify subnational FCCV pockets.

b) Project Alignment with and/or Support to Existing Governmental and UN strategic frameworks, ensuring National Ownership

In addition to the **UN-WB Partnership Framework for Crisis-Affected Situations** signed on 22 April 2017, the importance of the UN-IFI collaboration has been recognized in policy commitments across humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding policy domains, including the following:

- In the **Pact for the Future,** adopted in September 2024, Member States decided to "*Pursue stronger alignment between the United Nations, **international and regional financial institutions** and the needs of Member States affected by armed conflict and violence and the impacts of regional conflict, to support their economic stability, national prevention and peacebuilding efforts, in line with their respective mandates and in full conformity with national ownership*."
- In a joint press release on 23 September 2024, the **UN Secretary-General and leaders of eight multilateral development banks (MDBs) agreed to enhance collaboration** in support of the SDGs, highlighting the importance of country-level partnership especially in fragile and conflict-affected countries;
- The **Secretary-General's Executive Committee of 20 June 2024** highlighted DPPA/PBSO's focal point role in supporting UN-IFI partnership as a good practice and reinforced its value to the wider UN system.

- Within the **UN Development System,** the 2024 UNGA Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) of operational activities for development of the United Nations System (QCPR) resolution A/RES/79/226 in its paragraph 43 "Reaffirms the central role of Governments in contributing to the work of the United Nations development system, while recognizing that [...] relevant stakeholders, [including] **international financial institutions**, [...] can positively support national development efforts and contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, and ***requests the United Nations development system to continue supporting programme countries to leverage robust partnerships***, ***in accordance with national development policies, plans, priorities and needs***, with a view to achieving the scale and pace of progress needed to realize the Goals by 2030." The resolution in its paragraph 46 : "Also calls upon the entities of the United Nations development system to leverage their comparative advantages, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to continue to enhance cooperation, collaboration and coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies, including complex emergencies, and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations"**.**
- The significance of partnership and engagement of UN and IFIs is recognized through the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture (**A/RES/70/262 and S/RES/2282 (2016))**[23], which, was further stressed in the twin resolutions **(A/RES/75/201 and S/RES/2558 (2020))**[24].
- In its resolution (**A/RES/76/305**) on Financing for Peacebuilding of 8 September 2022, the General Assembly ~~in 2022~~: "*Recognizes the important role of international and regional financial institutions in peacebuilding and sustaining peace, and encourages the implementation of the strategies adopted by the African Development Bank, the Islamic Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, as well as the relevant strategies adopted or being developed by other regional and international*

[23] *Requests the Secretary-General to explore options for strengthening the United Nations–World Bank collaboration in conflict-affected countries in order to: (a) assist such countries, upon their request, in creating an enabling environment for economic growth, foreign investment and job creation, and in the mobilization and effective use of domestic resources, in line with national priorities and underscored by the principle of national ownership; (b) marshal resources, and align their regional and country strategies, to promote sustainable peace; (c) support the creation of enlarged funding platforms bringing together the World Bank Group, multilateral and bilateral donors and regional actors to pool resources, share and mitigate risk, and maximize impact for sustaining peace; (d) enable and encourage regular exchanges on priority peacebuilding areas."*

[24] *"Welcomes the progress made in the implementation of the resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace by Member States, including through the relevant intergovernmental bodies of the United Nations, and by the entire United Nations system, including through the reforms of the United Nations, and in particular at the field level through the work of peacekeeping operations, special political missions and United Nations country teams, and the important work of the Peacebuilding Fund, and encourages Member States and the entire United Nations system, in partnership with relevant stakeholders, including regional and subregional organizations,* ***international financial institutions****, civil society organizations, local peacebuilding stakeholders and, where relevant, the private sector, to continue to take action to implement the resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace, and to advance efforts to bring greater coherence to peacebuilding efforts, in support of national peacebuilding priorities, and in particular in conflict-affected countries"*

financial institutions focusing on operating in peacebuilding settings and conflict-affected countries and regions, including addressing drivers of conflict, and further ***encourages continued efforts towards strengthened partnership and strategic cooperation between the United Nations and international financial institutions at headquarters and field levels*** *and consideration of joint initiative and analysis, where applicable, and shared priority-setting towards collective outcomes, complementarity and coordination in implementation, in line with national priorities."*

- *The most recent twin General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the Peacebuilding Architecture Review* **(A/RES/80/11 and S/RES/2805 (2025))** *further underscore that support to peacebuilding should be anchored in "voluntary and nationally owned prevention and peacebuilding strategies". The resolutions invite "international financial institutions and regional development banks" to engage in country-specific discussions and recognize the role of the private sector in supporting national peacebuilding priorities. The resolutions reconfirm a central role to the Resident Coordinator system, encouraging UN country teams, "under the leadership and coordination of resident coordinators," to strengthen coherence on peacebuilding and requesting resident coordinators to make "systematic use of partnership tools" to support joint analysis, coordination and programming with IFIs. The resolutions also introduce a new reporting requirement for PBPSO to provide "annual updates" on progress in advancing UN partnerships with IFIs" with examples of innovation, good practice and the catalytic effect of the Peacebuilding Fund.*
- The UN80 reform process launched by the UN Secretary-General in 2025 has had important – though still evolving - implications for UN peacebuilding as a system-wide shift that will affect how peacebuilding is organized, delivered, and integrated across the UN. UN80 has transformed the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) into the Peacebuilding and Peace Support Office (PBPSO) as of January 2026 integrating Security Sector Reform, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration as well as Justice and Corrections capacities reinforcing the Office with capacities in the areas of UN comparative advantages and complementarity for partnerships with IFIs and MDBs as well as broader peace finance ecosystem thus bringing new opportunities for collaboration and scale up.

II. Project Content, Strategic Justification, and Implementation Strategy

a) Project Focus and Approach

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility was initially designed and launched in 2019 to operationalize the 2017 **UN-World Bank Partnership Framework for Crisis-Affected Situations.** Working in coordination with the World Bank Group's FCV envelopes introduced under IDA19, the Facility has provided grant financing, advisory and knowledge management support to UN entities for the development and implementation of jointly agreed priorities addressing root causes of fragility, conflict, and violence in prevention and transition settings. Based on the guidance of the Pact for the Future and peacebuilding resolutions, the Facility expanded its offer to also facilitate engagement with regional MDBs since 2025.

Moving forward, in its present cost-extension, ~~along with its partnership with World Bank,~~ the UN-IFI Partnership Facility will **continue supporting partnerships, collaborations, and engagements with ~~other~~ IFIs and regional development banks**, in particular, those with fragility strategies and/or differentiated tools for conflict-affected settings, building on regular dialogue and joint work plans developed with these institutions. In response to increasing demand from UN clients for support to explore innovative financing and private sector partnerships, the Facility will also expand the scope of its support to facilitate engagement and pilot initiatives with a broader range of financing partners, under the overall umbrella of supporting **integrated approaches to peace finance.** Where appropriate in the context of these partnerships and building on UN comparative advantage, the Facility will support ethical use of digital technology to enhance inclusive approaches.

The objective of advisory and surge support being provided by the UN-IFI Partnership Facility remains to equip Resident Coordinators and field presences in complex settings (including peace operations, special political missions and Country Teams with a Peace and Development Advisor) to engage with International Financial Institutions and other peace finance partners – including MDBs, innovative finance and private sector - on strategies to tackle the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict, in order to enable the acceleration of the SDGs.

This forms the revised outcome statement of this present cost-extension. The statement has been adjusted to refine intended recipients of support, reflecting the expanded peacebuilding and prevention scope of this engagement in line with the New Agenda for Peace, the Pact for the Future, and its linkages with the 2030 Agenda; the 2025 Peacebuilding Architecture Review twin resolutions as well as to acknowledge the Facility's position as an *enabler* of field-led efforts. ~~(Previously: "The strategic partnership between the UN, the World Bank and other IFIs advances collective outcomes in crisis affected situations.")~~

In this slightly revised results framework, the Partnership Facility will further fine tune its UN-IFI partnership support based on internal and external reflections, lessons learned, and two external evaluations which delivered findings and recommendations, looking back at the lifetime of the project since 2019.

The 2024 evaluation noted a number of good practices to sustain. Notably, it found that the **Facility fills a gap in support to key peacebuilding finance partnerships** that is otherwise unaddressed in the UN system, representing a unique offer at a "strategic edge", which means it often "punches above its weight". The Facility grants and advisory support have enabled **bridging HQ policy with country practice**, and the prioritization of country engagements have been appropriately **aligned with organizational strategic priorities**. **Gender sensitivity** – a dedicated focus of the Facility to meet a Gender Marker 2 – was noted as a strength. Evaluators underscored that strategic alignment of UN-IFI efforts at key "touch points" can often be as effective as joint products in driving collaboration. The evaluators recommended priority be placed on **investing in advisory expertise and dedicated capacities to a country partnership over time**, expanding on the good models in place in Somalia, and more recently, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo where the Facility has financed and deployed a dedicated P4 IFI liaison officer under the DSRSG/RC/HC. (Similar recommendations were made by the 2024 audit of peacekeeping budgets, which noted the embedding of UN-IFI partnership capacity as a good practice.)

The evaluation also noted risks that could negatively impact the partnership such as the structural capacity gaps in the RC system, the reduced reach of the DPPA-UNDP Joint Programme on National Capacities for Conflict Prevention and noted the need for adequate PBPSO-UNOPS capacities to systematically extract lessons and follow-up on opportunities. It recommended to avoid 'three-way contracting' between PBPSO, RCOs, UNOPS, and to streamline the Facility's offer to reduce transaction costs associated with the COVID-era "fast track". Evaluators recommended providing more sustained support to fewer contexts than in past budget cycles, combined with more investment in knowledge management and analytics to help advance partnership in emerging areas.

The 2025 UNOPS external thematic evaluation of its partnership with the Peacebuilding and Peace Support Office (PBPSO) for the implementation of the UN-IFI Partnership Facility project under the Peacebuilding Fund found the UNOPS-PBPSO partnership to be effective, with clear and complementary roles that leverage each institution's comparative advantages. PBPSO was recognized for strategic direction, together creating a strong enabling environment for the achievement of the Facility's objectives while UNOPS was recognized for leading operational delivery. The evaluation highlighted the partnership's strong performance in enabling rapid deployments, efficient grant management, and strategic alignment with IFIs, supporting effective collaboration in fragile and conflict-affected settings.

The evaluation also concluded that the Facility delivers strong value for money, with relatively small catalytic investments helping unlock larger IFI and government-led financing for prevention, resilience, and peacebuilding priorities. It also confirmed the Facility's contribution to SDGs 5, 16, and 17 through strengthened national ownership, joint UN–IFI planning, and enhanced local capacities. Sustainability prospects were assessed as positive, contingent on continued investment in knowledge management to institutionalize lessons learned.

Based on these lessons learned and observations, the UN-IFI Partnership Facility will therefore continue with its three-tiered support model, as follows:

(1) **Embedding dedicated coordination and liaison capacities at field level** in high-priority contexts, co-financed with partners when possible/applicable.
(2) **Consolidate the standing advisory team building on the lessons learnt in the pilot stage,** that together with the Facility's core team and PBPSO-UNOPS integrated team, will continue providing advisory and technical support to the development of UN-IFI and integrated peace finance strategic and operational partnership in medium-priority settings, including through short-term

deployments, and facilitate systematic collection of good practices and lessons learned;

(3) **<u>Development of an enhanced knowledge management offer</u>** for UN clients in respect of UN-IFI partnership and broader peace finance ecosystem in crisis-affected settings, consisting of access to relevant information updates, knowledge products, and peer exchange opportunities; in addition to facilitating policy dialogue and development of institutional partnerships with IFIs on issues relevant in prevention and transitions settings;

By maintaining ~~focusing on~~ this more discrete "menu" of support, the Facility ~~expects~~ will continue to improve accessibility and impact of its support, focusing on the deployment of expertise to support field presences while reducing transaction costs associated with the design and vetting of proposals for individual settings. At the same time, the updated results framework also reflects growing opportunities for partnership, specifically for collaboration with regional development banks, innovative finance and private sector partners.

Theory of Change

Given that in crisis-affected settings strategic partnerships between the UN and International Financial Institutions (IFIs) including regional Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) as well as engagement with private sector and innovative finance partners are critical to improve coherence and resourcing of international support for peacebuilding and national prevention priorities ~~efforts~~ at country-level;

If (i) IFIs and regional MDBs as well as private sector and innovative finance partners (collectively peace finance partners), and UN entities, Resident Coordinators and field presences share a common understanding of root causes and drivers of violence and conflict in priority settings; and *if* (ii) UN Resident Coordinators and field presences have access to the necessary expertise, knowledge, and tools to foster sustained and mutually beneficial engagement with IFIs, regional MDBs as well as other peace finance partners in support of nationally owned peacebuilding priorities;

Then, (i) embedded partnership capacities will ensure that UN Resident Coordinators and field presences have the technical knowledge and ongoing advisory support to align UN and IFI and other peace finance partners' funding and interventions with nationally owned peacebuilding and prevention priorities; (ii) surge deployments will be mobilized quickly and effectively to meet field needs and will have a measurable impact on strengthening the dialogue and engagement between the UN and IFIs as well as other peace finance partners at the country level; and (iii) knowledge management tools will be effectively utilized by UN practitioners in the field, contributing to more informed and strategic engagement with IFIs and other peace finance partners and fostering a cycle of continuous learning and improvement.

Which will in turn contribute to enhancing the collaboration between the UN and IFIs and other peace finance partners to support strategies that address root causes of conflict and violence and unlock progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals.

b) **Description of Key Project Components**

Proposed revised outcome: UN Resident Coordinators and field presences in complex settings (including peace operations, special political missions and Country Teams with a Peace and Development Advisor) are effectively equipped to engage with International Financial Institutions, including regional MDBs, as well as with other peace finance partners on strategies to tackle the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict and enable the acceleration of the SDGs.

Output 1 (tier 1): UN Resident Coordinators and UN field presences in high-priority contexts benefit from embedded UN-IFI partnership and peace finance capacities in-country.

This activity will embed dedicated UN-IFI partnership and peace finance capacities in 4-5 high-priority settings, building on the model of such resources in Somalia and the Democratic Republic of Congo, which have been key to consolidate and deepen collaboration in these countries.

Embedded officers will develop an overview of the scope for UN-IFI and peace finance partnership in support of nationally led peacebuilding and prevention in the country context, guided by relevant national plans; advise senior UN leadership of opportunities and risks; regularly brief on trends, achievements, and delays; coordinate UN engagement in relevant analytic, planning and monitoring processes of IFIs and other peace finance partners; and advance/trouble-shoot operational collaboration. In all these strands, the embedded UN-IFI partnership and peace finance capacities will promote dialogue and engagement on cross-sectoral issues including conflict-sensitivity tools and approaches, gender equality and women's empowerment, youth inclusion, and climate-security; including by supporting the ethical application of digital technology and other innovative tools where applicable.

High-priority settings will be finalized in consultations with stakeholders, noting the guidance of Member States that UN-IFI partnerships shall be particularly prioritized in cases of: 1) transition and drawdown of a UN peace operation; 2) support to nationally-owned prevention or peacebuilding strategies, in the context of wider engagement of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture. Prioritization will also take into account such factors as: existing engagement of the SG's Peacebuilding Fund and UN Peacebuilding Commission; engagement of relevant IFI financing instruments e.g. the WB FCV Envelope; complementarity with existing field capacities, with a view to placing these scarce assets where they will most contribute to leveraging UN-IFI comparative advantages in support of nationally led efforts. Where possible and relevant, such positions may be co-financed with IFIs.

Embedded staff will be deployed to Resident Coordinators' Offices, with a matrix reporting line to DPPA/PBPSO to ensure overall coherence, technical support and knowledge sharing. Contracting will be undertaken via a UN-to-UN agreement modality between UNOPS and DCO/RCOs, or other arrangements as needed.

<u>Output 2 (tier 2):</u> UN Resident Coordinators in medium-priority prevention and peacebuilding settings benefit from advisory support and surge deployments to advance the collaboration with IFIs and peace finance ecosystem partners.

In this new budget cycle, the UN-IFI Partnership Facility will ~~phase out of proposals previously known as "fast track". Instead,~~ continue supporting medium-priority settings ~~will be supported~~ through advisory and surge support from a standing team of experts, supplementing the advisory functions of the existing PBPSO-UNOPS integrated team.

To this end, the project will leverage existing UNOPS modalities to establish a standing team of 4-6 experts with a range of geographical, thematic and technical experience relevant to UN-IFI partnership, including partnership with regional MDBs and pea ce finance more broadly. These pre-vetted experts will be retained to provide remote and in-country support to medium-priority settings.

With this pre-vetted team of experts, surge deployments will be simplified, requiring a request from Resident Coordinators with mission objectives and outputs. Surge deployments are expected to support initiatives previously supported via "fast track modalities", including scoping of opportunities for partnership; contributions to UN-IFI analysis and assessments; organization of partnership workshops and deep dives; harvesting of lessons learned; and other areas of work as informed by country or regional contexts. Experts will be expected to directly contribute to learning and knowledge management with the systematic recording of lessons learned.

Medium-term priority settings will be decided by PBPSO leadership on the basis of requests from RCs/field teams in consultation with relevant UNHQ entities and IFI/MDB partners, and informed by system-wide mechanisms including the Deputies and Executives Committees, the Regional Monthly Reviews, and the EU-WB-UN High Level Advisory Group on Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments.

<u>Output 3 (tier 3):</u> Knowledge products, mechanisms and policy dialogue on UN-IFI partnership and peace finance, are effectively used by practitioners and contribute to innovation.

Recognizing that since the establishment of the Facility, significant knowledge and good practices in UN-IFI partnership and peace finance have been generated, the Facility will put in place arrangements to more systematically capture and disseminate good practice and lessons learned across field and HQ practitioners. In doing so, it will build on knowledge management efforts from previous cycles while absorbing the lessons of the 2024 and 2025 evaluations.

Key activities in the new cycle will include: documenting and sharing country-level examples through good practices and lessons learned; maintaining a regular programme of peer learning events, and ~~establishing~~ maintaining a community of practice on UN-IFI partnerships in crisis-affected settings to facilitate collaboration and knowledge exchange among stakeholders. Stakeholder feedback will be actively integrated to ensure the Facility offerings remain relevant to practitioners' needs and aligned with evolving policy priorities.

In addition, the Facility will continue supporting new analysis and policy dialogue with WB, IMF and regional MDBs with a view to enabling innovation, improving peacebuilding impact, and establishing the evidence base in respect of new and emerging areas of work. This will be done through targeted activities such as collaborative UN-IFI assessments, the development of joint analytical products, and organization of dialogue between practitioners and policymakers. Priorities will be established through annual work planning processes with IFIs and MDBs and with a view to complementing existing PBPSO initiatives including the work of the Peacebuilding Impact Hub.

Use Annex C to list all outcomes, outputs, and indicators

c) **Project targeting**

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility will advance strategic objectives and priorities determined in consultation with the Steering Committee of the United Nations-World Bank Partnership Framework for Crisis-Affected Situations, and equivalent consultations with other IFIs and MDBs. The implementation strategy is in line with the PBF Strategic Plan (2020-2026) and a commitment to engage with the World Bank's and regional MDBs' support in fragile and conflict-affected countries through its FCV envelope and the Secretary-General's restructuring of the Peace and Security pillar of the United Nations which calls on the Peacebuilding and Peace Support Office to serve as a 'hinge' within DPPA and DPO connecting the peace and security pillar with the development system, humanitarian actors, and the human rights pillar in accordance with the call of the General Assembly and Security Council for the revitalization of PBPSO.

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility will operate in coordination with the Peacebuilding Commission Support and the Financing for Peacebuilding Branches as well as the former DPO branches that were added to PBPSO as part of the UN80 reform to leverage PBPSO's cross-branch approaches and added value. It will also engage with the shared structure of DPPA/DPO as well as other entities within the system, represented in the UN-IFI Working Group chaired by ~~DPPA/~~PBPSO.

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility will also closely coordinate with the Development Coordination Office~~r~~ to ensure that support deployed to country level presences, and more particularly Resident Coordinators, are fully aligned with the RC System rules and regulations and that the support provided and resulting enhanced partnerships with IFIs and peace finance partners are fully captured in the knowledge repository being constructed by DCO at the request of the Executive Committee.

III. Project management and Coordination

a) **Recipient organizations and implementing partners**

Agency	Total budget in	Key sources of	Location of in-country	No. of existing	Highlight any

	previous calendar year	budget (which donors etc.)	offices	staff, of which in project zones	existing expert staff of relevance to project
Convening Organization: PBPSO			**N/A**		
Recipient Organization: UNOPS	~~$4,346,293~~ $ $4,516,024.36	~~Canada, Netherlands, Switzerland, UK, Ireland,~~	**New York**	**3**	**4**

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility will be managed as a dedicated project by PBPSO, with operational implementation from UNOPS, on behalf of the UN system and will coordinate with relevant IFIs and other peace finance ecosystem partners.

Under PBPSO management, UNOPS will provide operational support to a grant giving mechanism, through which funds will be transferred to DCO or RCOs for the embedded capacities. UNOPS will also administer the advisory team as well as related retainer modality and travel. UNOPS may also contract through a possible pre-selection process contractors to advance policy initiatives that will be projectized. UNOPS is the implementing UN entity responsible for administration, transfer, coordination of reporting for grants and contracts, related fiduciary responsibilities, at the formal instruction of the ASG for Peacebuilding and Peace Support, unless otherwise delegated. UNOPS will contract three personnel to be housed in PBPSO under the supervision of the PBPSO Senior Partnership Adviser (see diagram "Partnership Adviser and support staff") as part of a PBPSO-UNOPS integrated team.

b) Project management and coordination

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility is managed by the Senior Partnerships Advisor (P5), who concurrently leads~~, located in the~~ Peacebuilding Strategy and Partnerships Branch of the Peacebuilding and Peace Support Office, and reporting through the regular mechanisms in place for accountability under the Peacebuilding Fund. S/he has direct responsibility for overseeing the Facility and ensuring that the project's outputs are achieved on time and on budget. S/he concurrently leads ~~the UN-IFI Partnership Team in~~ the Branch, ensuring alignment of the Facility's day-to-day work with strategic management of IFI and MDB partnerships at the Headquarters level as well as coordination with all relevant stakeholders.

The Facility will continue to fund three UNOPS-contracted personnel, who will ensure among other tasks:

a) P4: Advisory and liaison functions; coordination of surge capacities; design, appraisal, and oversight of grants and deployments, monitoring and communicating on results; partner engagement.
b) P3: Support strategic and systematic partnerships with WB and AfDB through implementation of agreed commitments; knowledge management and capacity development functions; foster community of practice; support policy development and innovation; ~~Documenting lessons learned and contributing to knowledge management efforts~~
c) G6: Supporting financial and operational management of the grants and tracking of financial delivery, and closure of the grant or respective project.

Additionally, an IICA-3 function ~~will be~~ contracted by UNOPS will continue to lead operational management and implementation of the programme, including operational liaison and oversight, and ensuring compliance with UNOPS rules and procedures.

The UNOPS-contracted personnel will work as one integrated team with PBPSO staff to ensure coherent engagement with clients in field and HQ, IFI and MDB partners consistent with existing frameworks. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) will guide the operational management of the Facility, both on its PBPSO interface and UNOPS interface, and will be updated yearly or as otherwise dictated.

With support from the Facility personnel, the Senior Partnership Adviser will regularly brief Member States partners on achievements, progress, opportunities, and risks, at least on a quarterly basis.

Broadly, the ~~UN-IFI~~ Senior Partnership Adviser will ensure:

- UN-system priorities – which are set in the bodies outlined below;
- availability of funds; and
- requirements agreed with the UN-IFI Working Group for Crisis-Affected Countries in the Guidance for applicants.

The Senior Partnership Adviser will have delegated authority to reallocate up to $50,000 per annum within the existing outputs identified in the workplan and in line with existing PBF guidance on budget deviation. Consistent with existing practice:

- Grants concerning embedded capacities are **formally** approved by the ASG for PBPSO and the Senior Project Approval Group.
- Approval for activities under Output 2 (surge advisory team and missions) and Output 3 (KM and policy initiatives) will be delegated for approval to the Deputy Head of PBPSO upon positive recommendation from the Senior Partnership Advisor.
- The Partnership Adviser and the UN-IFI Partnership Facility support staff will ensure coordination and coherence with the grants provided by the World Bank's State and Peacebuilding Fund – and ensure review in consultations with the FCV Group and other Global Practices as relevant, as outlined below, as well as other IFIs as relevant.
- All grants and activities will be managed according to the recipient entities' rules and regulations.

c) **Risk management** – Identify project-specific risks and how they will be managed, including the approach to updating risks and making project adjustments. Include a Do No Harm approach and risk mitigation strategy.

Risk	**Likelihood (High, medium, low)**	**Severity of impact (high, medium, low)**	**Mitigation Strategy**
There is limited focus on inclusivity and gender responsiveness in various outputs funded by the Facility.	Medium	High	The Facility will advise and pull in GEWE expertise to mainstream gender-responsiveness in line with its Gender Marker 2 commitments. Gender expertise forms part of the tier 2 Surge Advisory Team.
Poor coordination across humanitarian, development and peacebuilding operations increases tensions and inhibits the ability to formulate effective, efficient, and impactful country collaborations	Medium	High	The UN and the WB have put in place a joint UN-WB ASG/Senior Director-level Steering Committee on Crisis-Affected Situations to monitor and address bottlenecks in the implementation of the 2017 Partnership Framework for Crisis-Affected Situations. Deployment of dedicated expertise to enhance cross-pillar coordination and dialogue.
Changes in priorities of the World Bank and/ or the UN results in shift in focus away from partnership	Medium	High	The UN Secretary-General and World Bank President have signed a Partnership Framework for Crisis-Affected Situations capturing clear and monitorable commitments to advance the partnership and have agreed to an annual monitoring report to assess progress. The “refresh” of the World Bank’s Fragility, Conflict and Violence Strategy finalized in 2026 offers opportunity to recommit to “more systematic and strategic partnerships” and further operationalize partnerships at country-level as confirmed in the UN-WB Steering Committee meeting in February 2026. The formation of the new Peacebuilding and Peace Support Office (PBPSO) as a result of UN80 in January 2026 integrating Security Sector Reform, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration as well as Justice and Corrections capacities

			underscored the intersection with the World Bank FCV Strategy refresh as an opportunity to scale up collaboration on justice and security. Diversification of partnerships to increase engagement with MDBs affords new opportunities for collaboration on peacebuilding and prevention.
Engagement with regional development banks and other IFIs may be a steep learning curve, and the implementation of joint work plans may be lagging or uneven. As MDB partnerships deepen (ex. new partnership framework with AfDB), Facility will need dedicated capacity to maintain and steward MDB partnerships as well as document and disseminate lessons learnt.	Medium	Medium	The Facility will engage with the regional development banks at the HQ level and facilitate dialogue with UN field offices to enable UN to contribute to analysis led by them and identify clear entry points for more strategic collaboration. Joint work plans will identify incremental areas of collaboration. The deployment of experts with background and experience with regional development banks will support literacy and familiarization, as with HQ-to-HQ visits, deep dives, and other activities. Increased attention to collaboration with AfDB under the new partnership framework and support to RCs on this partnership will be mitigated by upgrading the Facility's capacity for dedicated AfDB partnership and knowledge management.
Insufficient capacity is dedicated to the partnership by HQ and country teams.	Medium	Medium	Deployment of surge capacity will prioritize settings with adequate capacity for follow-through on recommendations.
The compounded effects of the health, and socioeconomic repercussions of COVID-19 as well as recent climate shocks, and war in Ukraine, in countries of operation divert UNCT, WB and governments' attention from the peacebuilding and partnership conversation, as the emergency response diverts critical resources.	Medium	Medium	The UN-IFI Partnership Facility will respond to requests emanating from UN field leadership with a clear prevention and peacebuilding angle/lens and coordinate with other UN actors concerning broader IFI engagement such as on climate, data, financing for development, and others.
Surge advisory	Medium	High	Diversify and expand pool of experts from

team members may not be readily available for deployments or mission at short notice			the advisory team and offer additional workdays as needed to secure time commitment and availability. Create a roster of rapidly deployable experts with relevant expertise.
UN80 reform of the development coordination function and reconfiguration of the resident coordinator system as part of broader structural changes impacts the capacities of the system to sustain the support provided through the Facility.	Medium	High	The Facility will emphasize continued close collaboration and partnership with Development Coordination Office at HQ, regional and country levels on targeting Facility support, including joint identification of priority countries, surge advisory team profiles and deployments as well as targeting knowledge products. The Facility will encourage and support ethical use of digital technology where appropriate to facilitate inclusive approaches in the context of reduced UN footprint.
Inadequate resourcing of the Facility	Medium	High	Dedicated resource mobilization strategy for the Facility will target donor retention and diversification as well as continuity of in-kind resources such as Junior Professional Officer capacities as well as focus on the quality of funding in terms of multi-year agreements. The Facility will invest into communicating results and catalytic impact of its investments.

d) Monitoring and evaluation

The PBPSO Senior Partnership Adviser will manage this project and be accountable for it to the ASG for Peacebuilding and Peace Support.

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility will monitor effectiveness of grants and activities based on the outcome and output indicators described in the results framework. This monitoring will take place through:

1) Narrative project progress reporting every six months and regular check-ins;
2) Exit interviews to document lessons learned;
3) End of assignment reports;
4) Through the annual monitoring report on the implementation of the UN-World Bank Partnership Framework for Crisis-Affected Situations, conducted annually jointly by PBPSO and the World Bank's FCV Group
5) A stock-take at the end of this present extension period.

The Partnership Facility will continue to document lessons learned, and undertake knowledge management activities, through dedicated capacity within the PBPSO-UNOPS integrated team.

~~The Partnership Facility also will continue to co-author the annual UN-WB Partnership Monitoring Report which highlights 'good partnership' activities across 40+ countries affected by FCV. Similar undertakings may be replicated for other IFIs as relevant.~~ The Facility will collaborate with WB, MDBs and other partners to jointly document good practices and partnership lessons and make these publicly available where possible,

The Partnership Adviser will submit a bi-annual report to the PBF. All entities receiving UN-IFI Partnership Facility grants will be held accountable for the effective use of resources first and foremost in pursuant to their respective established rules and regulations.

The main purpose of reporting is to offer evidence, based on data, of progress against results to help with project implementation and learning. Whilst clients and grant recipients of the Facility will need to keep more detailed records of project implementation and progress in line with their own rules and regulations, the UN-IFI Partnership Facility's project reports need to be succinct and focused on results.

Reporting requirements of grantees (regular track)

Type of Report	Due When	Submitted by
Grantee Interim Financial report	6 months 12 months	Recipient of UN-IFI Partnership Facility grant
Grantee Final Financial report	18 months	Recipient of UN-IFI Partnership Facility grant
Grantee project progress report	6 months 12 months	Recipient of UN-IFI Partnership Facility grant
Grantee end of project report covering entire project duration	Within three months from the operational project closure (after 18 months)	Recipient of UN-IFI Partnership Facility grant

Grantees should inform the PBPSO Senior Partnership Adviser of any changes in the timeline and should request approval for any extension of the time limit or alteration in activities to be funded.

e) Project exit strategy/ sustainability

The Partnership Facility grants aim at deepening and operationalizing partnerships with IFIs and peace finance partners in support of national strategies which are medium-term or in support of the development of such strategies. The UN-IFI Partnership Facility also facilitates regional and global dialogue between the UN, WB, IMF, and other IFIs and peace finance partners, on priority country settings, both in formal fora such as UN-WB Steering Committee, global or regional events, as well as in more focused and ad hoc consultations, with field voices in the center of each discussion, to help establish common messages and narrative, and greater strategic coherence between HQ and the field and crucially, between the UN and IFIs.

At the end of the project, modalities for effective partnership with IFIs will be more developed and further integrated into the core financing, planning, and monitoring frameworks of the UN.

IV. Project budget

Provide brief additional information on projects costs, highlighting any specific choices that have underpinned the budget preparation, especially for personnel, travel, or other indirect project support, to demonstrate value for money for the project. Proposed budget for all projects must include sufficient funds for an independent evaluation. Proposed budget for projects involving non-UN direct recipients must include funds for independent audit. Fill out ***Annex A.2*** *on project value for money.*

The UN-IFI Partnership Facility funds core personnel at HQ level as well as consultants under an advisory team. Both core personnel and consultants are country/field-facing and directly contribute to project results.

Core personnel are responsible for the day-to-day delivery and management of UN-IFI Partnership Facility funded activities, such as knowledge management and backstopping country/regional files. Consultants under the advisory team feature as a significant niche "offer" that only the Facility currently fills within the UN system with regards to UN-IFI partnerships in crisis-affected settings.

The present budget includes: dedicated embedded capacities in 5-6 country settings for 15 months (including cost-extensions of one year for the existing UN-IFI embedded capacities in DRC and CAR) ~~Liaison Officer role in Kinshasa)~~, an advisory team roster ~~up to 8~~ of experts for an estimated 100 work-days over 15 months, and secretariat functions for 15 months, as well as travel, UNOPS operating costs and overheads.

The 2026-2027 cycle includes provision for a P-3 Knowledge Management Officer replacing the previous P-2 function. The upgrade of this post reflects the technical level required to support significantly increased volume and complexity of work in the context of expanded knowledge management efforts integrating new peace finance elements on innovative finance and private sector partnerships, as well as the growing demands of more structured partnership with the African Development Bank and World Bank. The upgraded P3 role will provide dedicated support to implement agreed partnership mechanisms with MDBs, in addition to maintaining and expanding knowledge management and capacity development functions, supporting HQ-field feedback loops, policy and innovation aligned with the new expanded scope of the Facility.

More details are included in the budget annex.

Fill out two tables in the Excel budget **Annex D**.

In the first Excel budget table in Annex D, please include the percentage towards Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) for every activity. Also provide a clear justification for every GEWE allocation (e.g. training will have a session on gender equality, specific efforts will be made to ensure equal representation of women etc.)

Annex A.1: Checklist of project implementation readiness

Question	Ye
Planning	
1. Have all implementing partners been identified? If not, what steps remain and proposed timeline	Ye
2. Have TORs for key project staff been finalized and ready to advertise? Please attach to the submission	Ye
3. Have project sites been identified? If not, what will be the process and timeline	Ye
4. Have local communities and government offices been consulted/ sensitized on the existence of the project? Please state when this was done or when it will be done.	
5. Has any preliminary analysis/ identification of lessons learned/ existing activities been done? If not, what analysis remains to be done to enable implementation and proposed timeline?	Ye
6. Have beneficiary criteria been identified? If not, what will be the process and timeline.	Y
7. Have any agreements been made with the relevant Government counterparts relating to project implementation sites, approaches, Government contribution?	
8. Have clear arrangements been made on project implementing approach between project recipient organizations?	Ye
9. What other preparatory activities need to be undertaken before actual project implementation can begin and how long will this take?	
Gender	
10. Did UN gender expertise inform the design of the project (e.g. has a gender adviser/expert/focal point or UN Women colleague provided input)?	Ye
11. Did consultations with women and/or youth organizations inform the design of the project?	

12. Are the indicators and targets in the results framework disaggregated by sex and age?	
13. Does the budget annex include allocations towards GEWE for all activities and clear justifications for GEWE allocations?	Ye

Annex A.2: Checklist for project value for money

Question	Yes	No	
1. Does the project have a budget narrative justification, which provides additional project specific information on any major budget choices or higher than usual staffing, operational or travel costs, so as to explain how the project ensures value for money?	Yes		
2. Are unit costs (e.g. for travel, consultancies, procurement of materials etc.) comparable with those used in similar interventions (either in similar country contexts, within regions, or in past interventions in the same country context)? If not, this needs to be explained in the budget narrative section.	Yes		
3. Is the proposed budget proportionate to the expected project outcomes and to the scope of the project (e.g. number, size and remoteness of geographic zones and number of proposed direct and indirect beneficiaries)? Provide any comments.	Yes		
4. Is the percentage of staffing and operational costs by the Receiving UN Agency and by any implementing partners clearly visible and reasonable for the context (i.e. no more than 20% for staffing, reasonable operational costs, including travel and direct operational costs) unless well justified in narrative section?	Yes		
5. Are staff costs proportionate to the amount of work required for the activity? And is the project using local rather than international staff/expertise wherever possible? What is the justification for use of international staff, if applicable?	Yes		
6. Does the project propose purchase of materials, equipment, and infrastructure for more than 15% of the budget? If yes, please state what measures are being taken to ensure value for money in the procurement process and their maintenance/ sustainable use for peacebuilding after the project end.		No	
7. Does the project propose purchase of a vehicle(s) for the project? If yes, please provide justification as to why existing vehicles/ hire vehicles cannot be used.		No	
8. Do the implementing agencies or the UN Mission bring any additional non-PBF source of funding/ in-kind support to the project? Please explain what is provided. And if not, why not.	Yes		

Annex B.1: Project Administrative Arrangements for UN Recipient Organizations

(This section uses standard wording – please do not remove)

The UNDP MPTF Office serves as the Administrative Agent (AA) of the PBF and is responsible for the receipt of donor contributions, the transfer of funds to Recipient UN Organizations, the consolidation of narrative and financial reports and the submission of these to the PBPSO and the PBF donors. As the Administrative Agent of the PBF, MPTF Office transfers funds to RUNOS on the basis of the signed Memorandum of Understanding between each RUNO and the MPTF Office.

AA Functions

On behalf of the Recipient Organizations, and in accordance with the UNDG-approved "Protocol on the Administrative Agent for Multi Donor Trust Funds and Joint Programmes, and One UN funds" (2008), the MPTF Office as the AA of the PBF will:

- Disburse funds to each of the RUNO in accordance with instructions from the PBPSO. The AA will normally make each disbursement within three (3) to five (5) business days after having received instructions from the PBPSO along with the relevant Submission form and Project document signed by all participants concerned;
- Consolidate the financial statements (Annual and Final), based on submissions provided to the AA by RUNOS and provide the PBF annual consolidated progress reports to the donors and the PBPSO;
- Proceed with the operational and financial closure of the project in the MPTF Office system once the completion is completed by the RUNO. A project will be considered as operationally closed upon submission of a joint final narrative report. In order for the MPTF Office to financially closed a project, each RUNO must refund unspent balance of over 250 USD, indirect cost (GMS) should not exceed 7% and submission of a certified final financial statement by the recipient organizations' headquarters;
- Disburse funds to any RUNO for any cost extension that the PBPSO may decide in accordance with the PBF rules & regulations.

Accountability, transparency and reporting of the Recipient United Nations Organizations

Recipient United Nations Organizations will assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to them by the Administrative Agent. Such funds will be administered by each RUNO in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures.

Each RUNO shall establish a separate ledger account for the receipt and administration of the funds disbursed to it by the Administrative Agent from the PBF account. This separate ledger account shall be administered by each RUNO in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures, including those relating to interest. The separate ledger account shall be subject exclusively to the internal and external auditing procedures laid down in the financial regulations, rules, directives and procedures applicable to the RUNO.

Each RUNO will provide the Administrative Agent and the PBPSO (for narrative reports only) with:

Type of report	Due when	Submitted by
Semi-annual project progress report	15 June	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
Annual project progress report	15 November	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
End of project report covering entire project duration	Within three months from the operational project closure (it can be submitted instead of an annual report if timing coincides)	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
Annual strategic peacebuilding and PBF progress report (for PRF allocations only), which may contain a request for additional PBF allocation if the context requires it	1 December	PBF Secretariat on behalf of the PBF Steering Committee, where it exists or Head of UN Country Team where it does not.

Financial reporting and timeline

Timeline	**Event**
30 April	Annual reporting – Report **Q4 expenses** (Jan. to Dec. of previous year)
Certified final financial report to be provided by 30 June of the calendar year after project closure	

UNEX also opens for voluntary financial reporting for UN recipient organizations the following dates

31 July	Voluntary Q2 expenses (January to June)
31 October	Voluntary Q3 expenses (January to September)

Unspent Balance exceeding USD 250, at the closure of the project would have to been refunded and a notification sent to the MPTF Office, no later than six months (30 June) of the year following the completion of the activities.

Ownership of Equipment, Supplies and Other Property

Ownership of equipment, supplies and other property financed from the PBF shall vest in the RUNO undertaking the activities. Matters relating to the transfer of ownership by the RUNO shall be determined in accordance with its own applicable policies and procedures.

Public Disclosure

The PBPSO and Administrative Agent will ensure that operations of the PBF are publicly disclosed on the PBF website (www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund) and the Administrative Agent's website (www.mptf.undp.org).

Annex B.2: Project Administrative arrangements for Non-UN Recipient Organizations

(This section uses standard wording – please do not remove)

Accountability, transparency and reporting of the Recipient Non-United Nations Organization:

The Recipient Non-United Nations Organization will assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to them by the Administrative Agent. Such funds will be administered by each recipient in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives, and procedures.

The Recipient Non-United Nations Organization will have full responsibility for ensuring that the Activity is implemented in accordance with the signed Project Document;

In the event of a financial review, audit or evaluation recommended by PBPSO, the cost of such activity should be included in the project budget;

Ensure professional management of the Activity, including performance monitoring and reporting activities in accordance with PBPSO guidelines.

Ensure compliance with the Financing Agreement and relevant applicable clauses in the Fund MOU.

Reporting:

Each Receipt will provide the Administrative Agent and the PBPSO (for narrative reports only) with:

Type of report	Due when	Submitted by
Bi-annual project progress report	15 June	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
Annual project progress report	15 November	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
End of project report covering entire project duration	Within three months from the operational project closure (it can be submitted instead of an annual report if timing coincides)	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by PBF Secretariats, where they exist
Annual strategic peacebuilding and PBF progress report (for PRF allocations only), which may contain a request for additional PBF allocation if the context requires it	1 December	PBF Secretariat on behalf of the PBF Steering Committee, where it exists or Head of UN Country Team where it does not.

Financial reports and timeline

Timeline	**Event**
28 February	Annual reporting – Report **Q4 expenses** (Jan. to Dec. of previous year)
30 April	Report **Q1 expenses** (January to March)
31 July	Report **Q2 expenses** (January to June)
31 October	Report **Q3 expenses** (January to September)
Certified final financial report to be provided at the quarter following the project financial closure	

Unspent Balance exceeding USD 250 at the closure of the project would have to been refunded and a notification sent to the Administrative Agent, no later than three months (31 March) of the year following the completion of the activities.

Ownership of Equipment, Supplies and Other Property

Matters relating to the transfer of ownership by the Recipient Non-UN Recipient Organization will be determined in accordance with applicable policies and procedures defined by the PBPSO.

Public Disclosure

The PBPSO and Administrative Agent will ensure that operations of the PBF are publicly disclosed on the PBF website (www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund) and the Administrative Agent website (www.mptf.undp.org).

Final Project Audit for non-UN recipient organization projects

An independent project audit will be requested by the end of the project. The audit report needs to be attached to the final narrative project report. The cost of such activity must be included in the project budget.

Special Provisions regarding Financing of Terrorism

Consistent with UN Security Council Resolutions relating to terrorism, including UN Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001) and 1267 (1999) and related resolutions, the Participants are firmly committed to the international fight against terrorism, and in particular, against the financing of terrorism. Similarly, all Recipient Organizations recognize their obligation to comply with any applicable sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council. Each of the Recipient Organizations will use all reasonable efforts to ensure that the funds transferred to it in accordance with this agreement are not used to provide support or assistance to individuals or entities associated with terrorism as designated by any UN Security Council sanctions regime. If, during the term of this agreement, a Recipient Organization determines that there are credible allegations that funds transferred to it in accordance with this agreement have been used to provide support or assistance to individuals or entities associated with terrorism as designated by any UN Security Council sanctions regime it will as soon as it becomes aware of it inform the head of PBPSO, the Administrative Agent and the donor(s) and, in consultation with the donors as appropriate, determine an appropriate response.

Non-UN recipient organization (NUNO) eligibility:

In order to be declared eligible to receive PBF funds directly, NUNOs must be assessed as technically, financially and legally sound by the PBF and its agent, the Multi Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO). Prior to submitting a finalized project document, it is the responsibility of each NUNO to liaise with PBPSO and MPTFO and provide all the necessary documents (see below) to demonstrate that all the criteria have been fulfilled and to be declared as eligible for direct PBF funds.

The NUNO must provide (in a timely fashion, ensuring PBPSO and MPTFO have sufficient time to review the package) the documentation demonstrating that the NUNO:

- Has previously received funding from the UN, the PBF, or any of the contributors to the PBF, in the country of project implementation.
- Has a current valid registration as a non-profit, tax-exempt organization with a social based mission in both the country where headquarter is located and in country of

project implementation for the duration of the proposed grant. (**NOTE**: If registration is done on an annual basis in the country, the organization must have the current registration and obtain renewals for the duration of the project, in order to receive subsequent funding tranches).

Produces an annual report that includes the proposed country for the grant.

Commissions audited financial statements, available for the last two years, including the auditor opinion letter. The financial statements should include the legal organization that will sign the agreement (and oversee the country of implementation, if applicable) as well as the activities of the country of implementation. (**NOTE**: If these are not available for the country of proposed project implementation, the CSO will also need to provide the latest two audit reports for a program or project-based audit in country.) The letter from the auditor should also state whether the auditor firm is part of the nationally qualified audit firms.

Demonstrates an annual budget in the country of proposed project implementation for the previous two calendar years, which is at least twice the annualized budget sought from PBF for the project.[25]

Demonstrates at least 3 years of experience in the country where grant is sought.

Provides a clear explanation of the CSO's legal structure, including the specific entity which will enter into the legal agreement with the MPTFO for the PBF grant.

[25] Annualized PBF project budget is obtained by dividing the PBF project budget by the number of project duration months and multiplying by 12.

Annex C: Project Results Framework (MUST include sex- and age disaggregated targets)

<u>Outcome:</u>* UN Resident Coordinators and field presences in complex settings (including peace operations, special political missions and Country Teams with a Peace and Development Advisor) are effectively equipped to engage with International Financial Institutions, including regional MDBs, as well as with other peace finance ecosystem partners on strategies to tackle the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict and enable the acceleration of the SDGs** ***Outcome indicator *~~Frequency and~~ Quality of strategic interactions on prevention and peacebuilding between UN and IFI field leadership **in priority settings (tier 1 and tier 2)*** ***Outcome target*** *(At the end of 15 months) UN field leadership reports strategic alignment and policy convergence with IFIs in support of tackling the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict and enabling the acceleration of the SDGs in at least 10 settings (tier 1 + tier 2)* *~~(Year 2) UN leadership reports strategic alignment and policy convergence with IFIs in support of tackling the root causes and drivers of violence and conflict and enabling the acceleration of the SDGs in at least 15 settings~~*		
<u>Output 1 (tier 1):</u> UN Resident Coordinators and UN field presences in **high-priority contexts**	Indicators ~~1 regular UN-IFI dialogue on shared peacebuilding priorities in these contexts, including the promotion of gender equality and women's~~	Targets ~~1.Quarterly briefings to UN and~~

UNCLASSIFIE

benefit from embedded UN-IFI partnership and peace finance capacities in-country	~~empowerment and youth inclusion~~ ~~2 # of joint initiatives furthering analytical/operational convergence, including the promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment and youth inclusion~~ ~~3 UN stakeholders reporting that standing capacities adequately supported strategic, analytical, and operational collaboration with IFIs~~ 1.1 # of embedded UN-IFI partnerships and peace finance capacities in RCOs 1.2 UN field leadership reporting that embedded UN-IFI partnerships and peace finance capacities were relevant, timely, useful, and sustainable	~~IFI field-based leadership~~ ~~2. Yearly partnership dialogue~~ ~~Year 1:~~ 5 embedded personnel ~~Year 2: 10~~ ~~Year 1 and Year 2:~~ At least 70% of UN field leadership report being "satisfied" or "highly satisfied" with embedded capacities [Source: Facility survey of tier 1 RC satisfaction]
<u>Output 2 (tier 2):</u> UN Resident Coordinators	• ~~Retainer modality established giving RCs access to a pool of experts that is gender balanced, geographically diverse, and offers a range~~	

UNCLASSIFIE

in **medium-priority** prevention and peacebuilding settings benefit from advisory support and surge deployments to advance the collaboration with IFIs and peace finance ecosystem partners	~~of expertise on UN-IFI partnership issues relevant to prevention and peacebuilding settings~~ 2.1 # of ~~advisory support products delivered and timely~~ Surge Advisory Team (SAT) country engagements ~~deployments~~ supported at RCs' requests 2.2 UN field leadership ~~Stakeholder~~ reporting that SAT engagements ~~mission deployments~~ were relevant, timely, useful, and sustainable	~~Year 1: 5 deployments~~ 10 SAT engagements ~~Year 2: 10 deployments~~ ~~Year 1 and Year 2:~~ At least 70% of UN field leadership report being "satisfied" or "highly satisfied" with ~~mission~~ 10 deployments [Source: Facility survey of tier 2/SAT RC satisfaction]
Output 3 (tier 3): Knowledge management products and mechanisms on UN-IFI partnership and peace finance, including good practices on "frontier issues", inform future policy and are effectively used by practitioners	3.1 # of analytical and knowledge products i) documenting good practices and lessons learned; 2) exploring "frontier issues", eg partnership with MDBs, peacebuilding impact, and other topics; 3.2 # of events (1) promoting dialogue/collaboration on innovative peace finance approaches and (2) capturing good practices/building capacity 3.3 UN client ~~Stakeholder~~ feedback on knowledge management offer including targeted learning and guidance materials~~, including a~~	~~Year 1:~~ 5 products in total ~~Year 2: 10 (cumulative)~~ ~~Year 1: 4~~ (1) 4 events ~~Year 2: 6~~ (2) 10 event

UNCLASSIFIE

	~~Community of Practice on UN-IFI partnership in crisis-affected settings~~	~~Year 1 and Year 2:~~ At least 70% of UN ~~stakeholders~~ RCs/RCOs report being “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with knowledge management offer [Source: Facility internal perception/KM survey]

Annex D: Detailed and UNDG budgets

CATEGORIES	Item	UNOPS (through 30 September 2026)		Total
		Workplan	Grants	
1. Staff and other personnel	IICA-2			1,394,890
	P-4	455,573		
	IICA-3	195,484		
	Retainer - PPBA Burkina Faso			
	IICA-1			
	IICA-1			
	P-2			
	P-3	335,500		
	LICA-6			
	G-6	203,333		
	Retainers	205,000		
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	Supplies, Commodities, Materials			
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture (in	Two Laptops	-		
4. Contractual services	2 x lessons learned and guidance x 33,750	-		65,000
	1 x annual report	-		
	1 x Final Evaluation			
	2x Project / Institutional contracting (KM&Policy)	65,000		
	4x Contractual Services COVID-19 response (Pre-selection procurement of consultancy organizations for risk resilience studies)		-	
5.Travel	Technical support missions	100,000		100,000
	2 x Global or Regional community of practice meeting			
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	UN2UN Agreements		1,473,716	1,473,716
7. General Operating and other Direct Co	CMDC		24,000	202,190
	Operational Costs - LMDC	-	100,105	
	Operational Costs - Project Management			
	Rent USD 17,000 per person	73,750	-	
	Telephone Expenses (one time set up plus monthly)			
	Network connection	4,335		
Sub-Total Project Costs		1,637,975	1,597,821	3,235,796
8. Indirect Support Costs	3% for passthrough grants		47,935	162,593
	7% for secretariat costs	114,658		
TOTAL		1,752,633	1,645,756	3,398,389