



Peacebuilding

United Nations Peacebuilding Fund

TEMPLATE 4.2 – JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT ON THE PEACEBUILDING PRIORITY PLAN

Purpose: Strategic review of the implementation status of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP)

ANNUAL REPORT OF JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE IN LIBERIA

Year of reporting: 2016

Start date of PPP (PBSO approval letter): 3 October 2013 (Please note that this annual report also includes one outcome - #5 - on justice and security that was part of the preceding Liberia Peacebuilding Programme approved in July 2011. Two justice and security projects - both on regional Hubs - were extended until the end of 2016.)

Original end date of PPP: 30 September 2016

Current end date of PPP: 31 December 2016

Date of reporting: 20 December 2016

Approved by JSC Co-Chairs:

Dr. Henrique Flomo Tokpa
Minister of Internal Affairs

Boima S. Kamara
Minister of Finance and
Development Planning

Yacoub El Hillo
DSRSG-PCS, UNMIL

Signature Co-Chairs:

Date:

16 Dec. 16

19-12-16

15/12/2016

PART 1 – FINANCIAL PROGRESS

1.1 Status of budget allocation and expenditure of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan (PPP)

Date of this financial estimate: The end of year expenditure is estimated at the end of November/beginning of December 2016.

PPP Outcomes	PPP approved funds by outcome	PPP allocated funds by outcome (from MPTF to RUNOs)	PPP expended funds by outcome (RUNO financial delivery)¹
Outcome 1...Communities in pilot locations have adequate mechanisms for dealing with the past through the Palava Hut process for truth telling, atonement and reconciliation	US\$ 1,000,000	US\$ 1,000,000	US\$ 830,500
Outcome 2...Women participate in conflict management, peacebuilding and local decision-making in selected communities	US\$ 1,000,000	US\$ 1,000,000	US\$ 1,000,000
Outcome 3...County Peace Committees (CPCs) and Early Warning & Early Response (EWER) mechanisms prevent and resolve local disputes in 15 counties	US\$ 1,500,000	US\$ 1,500,000	US\$ 1,390,000
Outcome 4...Alternative land	US\$ 2,000,000	US\$ 2,000,000	US\$ 1,897,452

¹ Preliminary figures only

SAF

dispute resolution system fully operational and managed by a new national Land Agency			
Outcome 5...Enhancing Access to Security and Justice at the Decentralized Level (Please note that this outcome is imported from the Liberia Peacebuilding Programme 2011-2013)	US\$ 14,755,000	Hub 1: USD 7,766,494 Hub 2 & 3: USD 3,062,405 Total: USD 10,828,899	Hub 1: 3,447,553 (UNDP) Hub 1: 4,080,000 (UNOPS) Hub 2 & 3: 2,862,684 (UNDP) Total: US\$ 10,390,237
Outcome 6...Enhanced social cohesion through the empowerment and enhanced sustainable livelihoods of youth in conflict-prone areas	US\$ 1,500,000	US\$ 1,500,000	US\$ 1,500,000
Outcome 7...Women in conflict-prone areas are empowered through enhanced sustainable livelihoods	US\$ 2,000,000	US\$ 2,000,000	US\$ 2,000,000
Outcome 8... Constitutional and legal reform is finalized through an inclusive, participatory process	US\$ 2,500,000	US\$ 2,500,000	US\$ 1,737,823 + 480,460 = US\$ 2,218,283
Outcome 9...Effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and communication of all PBF-supported projects in Liberia	US\$ 2,500,000	US\$ 1,695,543 + US\$ 399,977 + US\$ 621,670 = US\$ 2,717,190	US\$ 2,035,150

1.2 Comments on the state of financial allocation and expenditure

While the allocation and expenditure (93% delivery rate) is satisfactory regarding several outcomes and projects, this is not always the case. Departing from the original plans, the major setback can be seen in the 2011 allocation of close to USD 15M aimed at establishing the five regional justice and security hubs. At the end of 2016, three Hubs had been established and some USD 10,147,684 spent. (The Gbarnga Hub benefited from large infrastructure investments, while Hubs 2 and 3 focused more on service provision). There are a number of reasons contributing to the deviation from the original plans, including the Ebola crisis, limited capacity of the Government to sustain investments, unforeseen delays in procurement, the need to redesign the project after the establishment of the first hub, and some different opinions on how that best should be done.

Low delivery rates may also be seen in outcomes 8 (88.7%) and 9 (74%). Outcome 8 includes support to the Constitutional review project. The whole constitutional review process was delayed mainly for political reasons. Outcome 9 includes support to the PBO and the PBF Secretariat. To a large extent the low delivery rate may be explained by delayed recruitment of staff to the PBO and the PBF Secretariat in 2016 combined with a decision to temporarily scale down the size of the PBF Secretariat.

PART 2 – RESULTS PROGRESS

2.1 Assessment of progress with regards to the PBF governance and oversight mechanisms in the country (including the Joint Steering Committee and the PBF Secretariat) and the set-up of the PBF support in the country (1000 characters max.)

2016 has been a fairly difficult year when it comes to governance of the PBF. As a result of an evaluation released early 2015 it was decided to transfer the responsibilities of the JSC Secretariat from PBO to a new PBF Secretariat located within the UNMIL premises. The responsibilities were formally transferred on 1 January 2016. However it took until the beginning of June for the Coordinator of the new PBF Secretariat to assume his position. Furthermore, the contracts of the PBO staff members were terminated and all positions were opened up for new recruitment process. After several months with a PBO functioning only on a voluntary basis, the new set of staff members was finally recruited and could start working normally from 1 June. 3 out of 8 newly recruited staff, including the Executive Director, the Programme Manager and the

SATP

Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist were part of the old PBO, which guaranteed some continuity and stability. Due to these and other obstacles, the first JSC meeting of 2016 did not take place until 22 July.

2.2 Assessment of the current implementation status and results of the Peacebuilding Priority Plan

PPP Outcomes	Outcome indicator	Indicator baseline	Progress	Key results	Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures
		(B), target (T), progress (P)	score: 1, 2 or 3 ²		
Peacebuilding situation in the country and PPP Overall Vision				<p><i>What is the overall peacebuilding situation in the country? What are the major developments since the previous year? How well is the PPP positioned to address the current critical conflict factors? What is the overall progress of the PPP? Is the PPP theory of change working and how? If there was no PPP and PBF support, how would the situation be different now? What is the evidence for this assessment? Were there any unintended results (good or bad)?</i></p> <p>Despite very significant</p>	<p><i>If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures?</i></p> <p>Looking at the whole PPP period, Ebola must be mentioned as a great obstacle to effective PPP implementation. Obviously, this was not foreseen. In retrospect it may also be argued that the negative effect of deficient political will and financial commitment was somewhat underestimated. The slow progress regarding</p>

² Provide a score for the overall progress under each Priority Plan outcome area as follows: (1) off-track; (2) on-track, with all outputs progressing as expected; (3) on-track with evidence of significant contribution to peacebuilding

		<p>improvements since the end of the armed conflicts, Liberia remains fragile. There are serious obstacles for reconciling a divided population and also for building credible and efficient institutions, especially in the fields of justice and security. Overcoming the root causes of conflict will take political will, courage and resources. A recent conflict mapping exercise (partly financed by PBF) showed that Liberia is "rife with existing and looming conflicts that have the potential to undermine national peace and stability." The three most critical conflict drivers identified are: 1) land/property disputes, 2) corruption and 3) border/boundary disputes. Critical among major developments during 2016 are: 1) A negative GDP growth in expected in 2016 (-0.5%), partly due to decline in global commodity prices. 2) Handover of security responsibility to the</p>	<p>establishment of the Palava Hut processes and the slow constitutional and legal reform processes, may to some extent be explained by deficient will and commitment by political actors. Furthermore, the weak economic growth and development during the PPP period had worsened prospects for sustainable PBF project results, as the Government's financial resources do not always suffice to absorb and sustain investments. This may be seen in many areas, and it is an important explanation to why regional justice and security hubs were not established in Buchanan and Tubmanburg during the LPP/PPP period. This period has also seen well known bottlenecks in the form of slow procurement processes and some weak institutional arrangements. Important lessons have been learnt and continued PBF investments will have a much stronger focus on sustainability. The final external and</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Gol. on June 30. A positive development, but it will also contribute to an increased fiscal burden on the national budget.</p> <p>3) The forthcoming Presidential and Legislative elections of 2017 and the gradually increasing political tension at the same time as the UNMIL drawdown. The PPP (and the LPP) has focused on relevant areas and has thus been well positioned to address critical problems. Overall progress may however be assessed as only partially satisfactory. Progress has been made, but somewhat more slowly than expected. Furthermore, sustainability of results is doubtful in several cases, as is the catalytic function of many PBF interventions. Nevertheless, the results shown below clearly indicate that PBF interventions have contributed to peacebuilding. Local mechanisms for peace including the alternative dispute resolution (ADR) are</p>	<p>independent evaluation that is planned during the first quarter of 2017 will obviously provide more lessons learnt</p>
--	--	--	---

SATP

		<p>functioning better thanks to PBF. During the reporting period, the Liberia Land Authority Act was voted by the legislature following a long lasting debate with funding contribution of PBF. Women have been empowered and gender equality actors strengthened. Important legal and constitutional processes have been fostered. Furthermore, the investments in justice and security have contributed to making justice and security more accessible in the counties. These are preliminary assessments, and the forthcoming evaluation will measure the results in a more systematic and precise way.</p>	
<p>PPP Outcome 1 Communities in pilot locations have adequate mechanisms for dealing with the</p>	<p>Indicator 1: Proportion of cases taken up by Palava Huts that are resolved (disaggregated by cases</p>	<p>B: (Sep 2013): 0% T: 50% (Sep 2015) P: 0% (not yet started)</p>	<p>1</p> <p><i>Which results have been achieved under this outcome, beyond the individual project outputs? How are they contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers identified under this</i></p> <p><i>If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures?</i></p>

SK19

<p>past through the Palava Hut process for truth telling, atonement and reconciliation</p>	<p>submitted by men/women)</p>	<p>Indicator 2: Proportion of women in the Palava Hut committees</p> <p>Indicator 3: Percentage of citizens in pilot locations who are positive about the national reconciliation process (disaggregated by men/women</p>	<p>B: (Sep 2013): 0% (Palava Huts not yet established) T: (Sep 2015): at least 40% P: 8 district PH committees set up, each consisting of 4 men and 3 women</p> <p>B: (Sep 2013): The holding of a National Reconciliation Barometer Survey will establish a baseline data. T: (Sep 2015): at least 70% P: 0%</p>	<p><i>outcome? What is the evidence for this? Were there any unintended results (good or bad)?</i></p> <p>Context specific methodology and operational guidelines for the Palava Hut mechanism have been formulated and validated by stakeholders. The validated methodology core component of the Ethnographic study report which was validated in December 2015; war-related cases suitable for PH were detailed by stakeholders on April 7-8, 2016, based on the study, and 8 palava hut committees established and trained in Kwa & Mande linguistic regions. Pilot palava hut talks are scheduled for early December 2016 in these socio-linguistic regions. The broad participation of cross sections of citizens in the different forums is a signal of emerging change. The forthcoming pilot process is set to inform national policy on Palava Hut Talks that</p>	<p>The project had required robust engagement with communities across the country. Full implementation was somewhat constrained by rainy season and infrastructure deficits which hampered movement out of Monrovia for a considerable period of time, especially to the target pilot hut regions of Lofa and Grand Gedeh.. The INCHR was therefore constrained to maximise project field activities during the dry season to the extent possible.</p> <p>Delays in procurement due the late, insufficient specifications from INCHR and constrained capacity at UNDP.</p> <p>As the Palava Hut process is also very much of political nature, political considerations may have contributed to slowing down progress.</p>
--	--------------------------------	---	---	---	--

6/29

<p>List of Outcome 1 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page):</p>	<p>PBF/LBRA-11: Support to National Reconciliation (Community-based Truth Telling and Atonement Project) (31 October 2013)</p>		<p>will enable the up scaling of the initiative nationwide based on lesson learnt and strengthen national cohesion.</p>	
<p>PPP Outcome 2 Women participate in conflict management, peacebuilding and local decision-making in selected communities</p>	<p>Indicator 1: Degree of women's participation in conflict management, peacebuilding and local decision making in the selected communities with active women's peace hut mechanisms</p>	<p>B: 16% of women (12% young and 19 of women aged over 24) feel that they participate in the all stages of peacebuilding initiatives T: 30% increase in women's perception of their participation in the 22 communities P: Awaiting final evaluation.</p>	<p>Women are actively participating in conflict management, peacebuilding and local decision-making in the 22 selected communities with active women's peace hut mechanisms. While community testimonies indicate the greater contribution of women in sustaining peace and prevention of domestic violence, the final (outcome) project evaluation is to be conducted by an external evaluation team and the endline project survey to be conducted by UN Women and MGCCSP will measure the extent to which the women's perception</p>	<p>On 22 July 2016, the project was granted a no-cost extension until the end of 2016. The extension was granted to conduct an end-line survey and the final project evaluation for both PBF funded UN Women projects. The process has started and will be finalized with MGCCSP and UN women resources. During the rainy season the road network made the majority of communities unreachable, and it was difficult to deliver both the trainings and supplies for the construction of the peace huts.</p>
	<p>Indicator 2: Number of cases</p>	<p>B: T: 50% increase over</p>		

SNA

<p>that have been taken up by the Peace Huts</p> <p>Indicator 3: Women's perception of their security in the selected communities.</p>	<p>the baseline P. 17 Peace Huts assessed and established by UN Women. Those Peace Huts referred 1,147 cases to local authorities for redress between July 2015-Oct 2016.</p> <p>B: 78% of women feel safe in their communities. (the baseline question should be redesigned to distinguish safety at home and safety in the community T: 100% P: Awaiting final evaluation.</p>	<p>of their security in five targeted communities have changed as they now see themselves as agents of change and peace makers with regards to peacebuilding and conflict mitigation.</p> <p>In addition, the question on the security will be refined to measure the feeling of security in the community and at home.</p>	<p>Ebola (EVD) – which was not foreseen in the risk matrix - made it impossible to conduct project activities as the Government of Liberia introduced a state of emergency across the country prohibiting mobility and public gatherings in order to stop the spread of Ebola.</p> <p>Once the EVD was under control, the market was distorted for two reasons: 1) the prices of goods and services increased and 2) the newly introduced EVD hygiene and prevention measures significantly increased the costs of activities implementation and delayed and prolonged the delivery. Hence the costs of the external company engaged to design and conduct baseline survey were more than twice higher than the ones foreseen in the original budget. In addition, nobody wanted to come to work in Liberia during EVD and the consultancy had to be re-advertised.</p>
---	--	---	---

CAP

					<p>Furthermore, the staff turnover within the PBSO made the communication difficult and UN Women did not obtain any written official guidance on how to proceed with the activities and when at that time.</p>
<p>List of Outcome 2 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page)::</p>	<p>PBF/LBR/A-10: Community Based Conflict Management: Women as Peace Makers and Nation Builders (31 October 2013)</p>				
<p>PPP Outcome 3 County Peace Committees (CPCs) and Early Warning & Early Response (EWER) mechanisms prevent and resolve disputes in 15 counties.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: Number of County Peace Committees (CPCs) preventing and resolving local conflicts (disaggregated by m/f CPC members, and by m/f of the person bringing the dispute)</p>	<p>B: (Sep 2013) 7 CPCs functional T: (Sept 2016) 15 Functional P: CPCs reactivated in 12 counties. Peace Committees are now actively involved with the holding of community dialogues, mediation and other conflict transformation initiatives. (70%am</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Some key project milestones have been achieved. Fourteen county peace structures have been harmonized. The CPCs are now recognized by Superintendents and have received supplies and logistics. A Gender Sensitive training module has been produced and Peacebuilding, Leadership and Gender Sensitive training was conducted for 150 CPC members. As a result, CPCs are more involved in community</p>	<p>The restructuring of the Liberia Peacebuilding Office greatly impacted the implementation of the project. The new PBO structure was only confirmed in May 2016 and hence project activities were significantly slowed down until a full team could be put on board to fully facilitate the project. In spite of this the project has been able to undertake most of its key tasks. The outstanding</p>

6/11

	<p>Indicator 2: Number of counties with a functional Early Warning and Early Response (EWER) Working Group (disaggregated by m/f members)</p>	<p>and 30% f participation).</p> <p>B: 4 Counties (Sept. 2013) T: 13 Counties (Sept. 2016) P: 6 EWER working group currently functional; Early Warning Focal Persons and leadership identified and contributing to data collection in 12 counties; joint activities including coordination to begin shortly (25% of and 75% of active participation).</p>		<p>level conflict resolution including land and other disputes; In Lofa County the active engagement of the Lofa CPC has contributed to the reduction in recurrent cycle of violence between Muslims and Christians in the county and the Since County Peace Committee has contributed in negotiating a resolution in the long running concession dispute between the Butaw Community and the GVL concession company.</p> <p>Early Warning and Early Response Centers have been set up at Gbarnga, Zwedru & Harper Hubs covering 8 counties. Early Warning data communicated via SMS through an internet based platform thereby triggering response actions that help to prevent violence. Examples of community level response actions include violence prevention in Fuamah District, Bong County, involving the workers' union and China</p>	<p>harmonization of the peace mechanism for Montserratado County, given the large Monrovia metropolitan area, the population coupled with the diversity and dynamic of the county, requires additional dialogue and discussion within the framework of on-going discussion on the form and structure of the national peace building structure to support a definitive policy position that will drive the establishment and harmonization of a structure aligned to the needs of Montserratado county.</p>
	<p>Indicator 3: Proportion of Early Warning alerts (by SMS) that result in early responses</p>	<p>B: 26% (Sept. 2012) T: 60% by (Sept. 2016) P: 45% in November 2016.</p>			

679

List of Outcome 3 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page)::	PBF/LBR/D-12: Strengthening Local/Traditional Mechanism for Peace Project (5 November 2013)			<p>Union and dispute resolution between Immigration Officers and citizens of Kpazagzia in Lofa County. Early Warning reporters received 1,449 incident reports during project lifespan which averted at least 30 plus potential incidents of violence.</p> <p>The programme is showing strong evidence of peace building impact, through the active intervention of established peace structures in mitigating and preventing conflict and working with the security actors to avert violence through early warning.</p>	
PPP Outcome 4 Alternative land dispute resolution					

SAR

system fully operational and managed by a new national Land Agency.	PBF/LBR/A-9: Support to the establishment of a land disputes prevention and resolution system in Liberia - Phase 2 (31 October 2013)			
List of Outcome 4 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTP-O Gateway page):	Please note that this PBF project ended in 2015. Hence, it is not reported on in this document. For an assessment of the results, see the JSC Annual Report for 2015.			
PPP Outcome 5 Enhancing Access to Security and Justice at the Decentralized Level (Please note that this outcome is imported from the Liberia Peacebuilding Programme 2011-2013)	Indicator 1: 1.1 - % of justice and security services provided by the Gbarnga, Harper and Zwedru Regional Hubs.	B: (Disaggregated by Hub county) Gbarnga hub 1: Dec 2012: 64% (10 out of 14) Maryland&Zwedru hubs 2&3: Nov:0 T: Hub 1: (Dec 2015)100% Hubs 2&3: (Dec 2015)100% P: Hub 1: (Nov 2016): 100% Hubs 2&3: (Nov 2016): 100% of the services (6 out of 6) rolled out.	2	Hub 1: 2016 saw installation of the long delayed communication network in Hub. The installation of this network has resulted in enhanced communication between LNP HQ and its field offices in ten counties, thereby cutting down on communication costs and time. In Hub 2&3: All six services recommend for Hub 2 & 3 are fully rolled out. SGBV Victim Support Services are now available and over 16 victims have availed themselves to this
				Some reasons for the slow implementation of the justice and security hubs projects are mentioned in section 1.2 above. The Hub concept was a novelty in Liberia in 2011 and despite clear needs and enthusiasm, a number of challenges emerged which slowed implementation. Construction capacity challenges were of primary concern. Operational and coordination challenges relating to co-location of differing security apparatus and joint actions needed to be developed to guide service roll

SAR

	<p>Indicator 2: 1.2 - % of people who feel safe or very safe in their community (disaggregated by county in the Hub region)</p>	<p>B: Hub 1 (June 2012):65%; (June 2014):80% (Nimba 85%, Bong 76%, Lofa 77%) Hubs 2&3:(August 2013): Maryland:82%, Grand Kru:85.2%, River Gee :98% Grand Gedeh:83.8% Sinoe: 86% T: Hub 1 (Dec 2015)? Hubs2&3:(Dec 2015)? P: New survey will be conducted shortly.</p>		<p>service. Complementary to this, the "Development Education Network-Liberia" is carrying out awareness on SGBV issues in the Hub 2 & 3 regions to inform the population of SGBV structures and systems available in the region. The strengthening of the justice and security sectors as the result of PBF's support is contributing to Peacebuilding; particularly in enhancing access to justice services. The Agenda for Transformation mid-term review has highlighted increased public confidence in the sector due to wider access and availability of services. There are more cases being adjudicated by the courts and a number of confidence patrols made by the police as compared to pre-PBF interventions.</p>	<p>out and delivery. Access to the south-east, Hub 2 & 3 regions continued to be a challenge to project implementation. This has affected the roll-out of SGBV awareness and CSO legal awareness projects as the team could not access the southeast to carry out mandatory capacity assessments. Lessons Learnt from Hub 1 greatly influenced the Hub 2 & 3 strategy. However, consensus on the new approach had to be built, and this lengthy process impacted the start and roll out of Hub 2 & 3. The late start had implications for full completion of all activities, especially as relates to legal awareness in Hub 2 & 3. Some of the funds that could not be completely utilised for this activity have (with JSC and PBSO endorsement) been re-allocated to quick impact</p>
	<p>Indicator 3: % of people who trust the court system (disaggregated by county in the Hub region)</p>	<p>B: Hub1: Bong, Lofa and Nimba, June 2012: 37% June 2014: 45% (Bong 57%, Lofa 52, Nimba 32) T: (Dec 2015)</p>			

209

	Increased in the percentage of people accessing the court system. P: New survey will be conducted shortly.		renovation and rehabilitation of core correctional facilities
<p>List of Outcome 5 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page):</p>	<p>PBF/LBR/B-1 (00076699): Enhancing Access to Security and Justice at the Decentralized Level – Gbarnga Justice and Security Regional Hub. (18 November 2010, 6 May 2011, 12 December 2011, 14 March 2012, 16 September 2013)</p> <p>PBF/LBR/B-2 (00088191): Enhancing Access to Security and Justice at the Decentralized Level – Harper and Zwedru Hub. (25 November 2013)</p> <p>Please note that no projects to establish Hubs 4 and 5 were approved by the JSC during the LPP or PPP periods. They were/are planned to be established in Buchanan and Tumbanburg.</p>		
<p>PPP Outcome 6</p> <p>Enhanced social cohesion through the empowerment and enhanced sustainable livelihoods of youth in conflict-prone areas</p>		2	
<p>List of Outcome 6 projects (and in</p>	<p>PBF/LBR/D-13: National Youth Service Programme for Peace and Development (15 November 2013)</p>		

SMR

<p>brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page)::</p>	<p>Please note that this PBF project ended in 2015. Hence, it is not reported on in this document. For an assessment of the results, see the JSC Annual Report for 2015.</p>				
<p>PPP Outcome 7 Women in conflict-prone areas are empowered through enhanced sustainable livelihoods</p>	<p>Indicator 1: Average level of annual business revenue and savings of women-owned businesses in targeted communities.</p>	<p>B: (Feb 2015) Average level of annual business revenue is 57% T: 100% P: Awaiting final evaluation.</p>		<p>Women beneficiaries are able to read and write and also assist their children to do their homework as a result of the adult literacy classes that were offered to women last year. They have increased self-confidence. Women involved in businesses are also better managing and organizing their respective investments from improved business practice and increased income as a result of the business development skills (BDS) trainings. Male involvement is an integral part of a long-term strategy to ensure that women are supported and their rights protected and promoted from the start of project, during, and at the end of project implementation. This was the case with this project. UN</p>	<p>EVD prevention and hygiene measures increased the costs of project activities and have slowed down the work with communities. UN Women used other funds (Germany and Japan) to cover additional costs related to EVD prevention.</p>

SME

<p>List of Outcome 7 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page):</p>				<p>Women worked with its partners to ensure men were involved in all processes to ensure that women did not experience backlashes from men when they were attending and participating in trainings. To ensure increased ownership of the project, men were introduced to a series of engagements that ranged from UN Women's awareness raising on the HeForShe Campaign. Men as male advocates in ending violence against women and in some cases men being given the opportunity to participate in other UN Women funded projects (i.e. JP on RWEE, JP on HS, etc.)</p>	
<p>PPP Outcome 8</p>	<p>Indicator 1:</p>	<p>B: Sep 2013): 3</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The proposals emanating from</p>	<p>A number of proposals, populist</p>

6/19

<p>Constitutional and legal reform is finalized through an inclusive, participatory process.</p>	<p>Number of public consultations on constitutional review conducted with key stakeholders (i.e. CSOs, traditional leaders, women, youth, disabled, political parties, legislators)</p>	<p>T: (Dec 2015): 10 P: 73 nationwide public consultations done, 4 Diaspora consultation and 10 thematic/sectoral consultations</p>	<p>B: (Sep 2013): Disjointed and uncoordinated law making process, dual legal system and lack of overall policy framework T: (Sep 2015): National Law Reform Policy validated and approved following participatory stakeholder consultations and due process P: Policy formulated, validated and</p>	<p>the National Consultative Constitutional Conference have been duly submitted to the Legislature for consideration. The National legislature is now tasked with the sovereign responsibility of reviewing the proposals and reaching an agreement by both Houses on issues to be forwarded for possible referendum. As a means of ensuring continued civic engagement and advocacy for expedited legislative action on the proposals, the project is supporting (7) civil society / media organizations to engage political parties and the legislature. Planned interactive engagements and discussion are on-going amongst legislators, media and stakeholders at country level on constitutional review issues in all 15 counties.</p>	<p>in nature, contravene basic rights of some groups. Additionally one proposal on reduction of tenure for elected officers was met with lukewarm reception by the legislators who are to be directly affected. The review process at the legislature has been elongated due to dialogue and advocacy on these and other issues. As such the timeline for possible referendum has been shifted forward. The project however has achieved its key milestone deliverable of facilitating a participatory and inclusive review process.</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--

SAP

	submitted to government (Executive Legislature) for endorsement.	consultative conference were controversial and some actors saw them as infringing on the rights of minority groups. Through the civic engagements grant, legislators and their constituents have the opportunity to further consult on the prioritization of proposals and their impact on human rights of citizens. This provides citizens a better understanding of Liberia's international obligations within the global human rights framework and enables a robust discussion on the best possible framing of agreed proposals to ensure that the best interest of all is represented.	
List of Outcome 8 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page)::	PBF/LBR/A-12: Support to Constitution Review Process in Liberia (CRC) (1 November 2013)	PBF/LBR/A-14: Enhancing access to justice and supporting national capacities for structured legal drafting (LRC) (17 January 2014)	
PPP Outcome 9	Indicator 1: JSC Annual	B: T: All submitted on	1 Monitoring of and reporting on the PBF projects has functioned
			The main reason why outcome progress is assessed as 1 (off-

SAG

<p>Effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, and evaluation and communication of all PBF-supported projects in Liberia</p>	<p>Reports submitted within 7 days of the deadline</p> <p>Indicator 2: Quality of JSC Annual Reports rated "acceptable" by PBBSO review team</p>	<p>time P: Annual reports for 2015 and 2016 submitted late</p> <p>B: T: Quality of all JSC Annual reports rated "acceptable" P: Draft Annual Report for 2015 was not approved by JSC in meeting on 10 December 2015. Revised version was submitted in January 2016. Quality rating of PBBSO unknown.</p>		<p>relatively well. The long absence of a JSC/PBF Secretariat affected coordination on the JSC level. Communication on PBF issues to the JSC and other stakeholders has been somewhat limited and the PBF evaluations to be carried out in 2016 are not yet finalized.</p> <p>PBO has contributed substantially to the SMC process, by facilitating development of rolling targets, the implementation, the follow-up as well as awareness of the SMC.</p> <p>PBO has furthermore contributed to peacebuilding by actively supporting the activities of the PBC in Liberia, especially during visits.</p> <p>The PBO has organized a number of coordination meetings involving civil society organizations, and government representatives amongst others.</p>	<p>track) for 2016 is the fact that PBO was not fully re-established until June 2016. Furthermore, the PBF Secretariat, foreseen to assume the functions of the JSC Secretariat from 1 January, was not established until June, with the recruitment of the Coordinator. The uncertainty and vacuum for several months naturally affected coordination, monitoring and reporting.</p> <p>From June and onwards functionality has improved considerably. However, the JSC is still not fully functioning as intended. The first meeting in 2016 was not held until 22 July and there is certain lack of clarity regarding membership and ToR. However, these issues are expected to be resolved shortly.</p> <p>PBO has continued to face problems regarding lengthy and cumbersome procurement processes. This has affected efficiency. Uncertainty regarding the sustainability of</p>
	<p>Indicator 3: Mid-year and annual reviews, as well as evaluations, conducted on time</p>	<p>B: T: All reviews and evaluations conducted on time P: One review of PBF projects was undertaken in 2016 (September). No evaluation yet carried out. One planned for</p>			

CAF

	<p>Indicator 4: Key partners with satisfied level and timeliness of PBO communication and coordination</p>	<p>late 2016 (UN Women)</p> <p>B: T: All satisfied or very satisfied P: A quick survey among eight selected partners show the following result: Very satisfied: 12% Satisfied: 38% To some extent satisfied: 25% Not satisfied: 0% No answer: 25%</p>	<p>As a result, coordination and coherence in peacebuilding and reconciliation is taking root within the sector. In addition, the PBO has built capacity of 900 members of community peace committees and 90 junior national volunteers in six counties that have helped to mitigate or mediate 93 conflicts. For example, the Town Chief in Dorjee community in Grand Gedeh County expressed that the volume of conflicts that came to him on a monthly basis has reduced due to the intervention of the community peace structures.</p> <p>A main accomplishment during 2016 has been the Conflict Mapping Exercise, carried out by PBO in cooperation with ACCORD. Furthermore, a highly interesting perception survey is presently being carried out. These examples show the advantages of PBO and its contribution to</p>	<p>the PBO is still an issue, but efforts are made to increase prospects for sustainability.</p>
--	---	---	---	--

NR

<p>List of Outcome 9 projects (and in brackets the date of funding transfer to the project as per the MPTF-O Gateway page)::</p>				<p>peacebuilding.</p>	
<p>PBF/LBR/H-1: Support to the Liberia Peacebuilding Office for coordination, monitoring & evaluation, communication and capacity building in conflict management (17 December 2013 and 13 February 2015) PBF/LBR/A-15: Support to Peacebuilding Office (PBO) at the MoIA. (11 March 2016) PBF/LBR/H-2: PBF Secretariat. Provides coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and communication on the achievement of the Priority Plan outcomes and the projects that support it. (15 December 2015)</p>					

5249

2.3 Assessment of Priority Plan coherence, risk, catalytic effects, value for money and other cross-cutting questions

<p>Coherence/ coordination: Did the PPP contribute to better coherence and coordination of UN and/or Development Partner support in peacebuilding in the country? How?</p>	<p>We want to believe – and do see some indications – that coherence and coordination among key actors has been fostered by the PPP. However, we leave it to the independent evaluation commissioned by the PBSO to provide more substantial evidence for progress in this area. One important case that must be mentioned is the recently approved cross-border project between Liberia and the Ivory Coast which is expected to further promote coherence and coordination. The cross-border project is a USD 3M IRF project between several UN agencies in Liberia and the Ivory Coast, in cooperation with the two governments and CSOs. This project will be complemented by assessed funding projects on both sides of the border. Hence, quite a unique exercise that hopefully will set an example for future cross-border cooperation.</p>
<p>Value for money: Did the PPP provide value for money, that is, is the level of outcomes proportionate to the level of investment? What is the evidence?</p>	<p>A definitive answer cannot be given as no evaluation of the efficiency has been made. As clearly shown in the pages above, the results are mixed. Important progress has absolutely been made in several areas, and it is assessed that many investments have given value for money. However, sustainability remains a concern and it is still to be seen to which extent the results prove to be sustainable. Not until then can we know for sure if value for money was achieved considering the PPP as a whole.</p>
<p>Catalytic effects: Did the PPP achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/ accelerate peace relevant processes? How?</p>	<p>Some catalytic effects of the PPP can be seen, even if it must be said that there are also failures in this respect. The justice and security hubs in Gbarnga, Zwedru and Harper have been supported by the Government and also by other actors/donors. Outcome area 8 (Constitutional & legal reform) has attracted financial support from the US Government. There are also clear indications that outcome area 3 (CPCs and EWER) is receiving increasing support from Liberian local and national bodies. In this context it may also be mentioned that the CPCs are taking on dispute resolutions roles during the election campaign, which may be seen as a catalytic effect. Regarding support to the PBO it was foreseen that the Government of Liberia would commit resources in its budget for 2016/2017. Unfortunately this did not happen and the PBF is forced to consider a possible extension of international support.</p>

549

<p>Risk taking/ innovation: Did the PPP support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result?</p>	<p>Support to the Palava Hut process (Community based truth telling and atonement project) must be said to be risky for several reasons: 1) It's an innovative and yet untested way of coming to terms with some of the acts committed during the civil wars; 2) It is politically sensitive as it aims at dealing with unlawful acts committed also by people with important political influence; 3) Due to the sensitivity of the issues to be dealt with, the process risks stirring up feelings that may potentially result in acts of violence; 4) As the process is not financially supported by the Government, it is risky in terms of sustainability. Nevertheless, these risks were considered worth taking due to the potential results in terms of reconciliation. As described above, the project has developed slowly and few results may yet be shown. Sustainability is a problem.</p>
<p>Gender sensitivity and responsiveness: How is the Priority Plan taking into account gender considerations and promoting gender equity/women's empowerment? What is the estimate of the proportion of funds being spent directly on gender equity and women's empowerment? Are any measures being taken to strengthen the gender focus of the Priority Plan?</p>	<p>All RUNO's and implementing partners have taken gender issues into consideration when designing and implementing the projects. The two PBF projects directly and explicitly aimed at promoting gender equality and women empowerment are managed by UN Women (both having the highest gender marker score - three on the scale from 0-3). (PBF/LBR/A-10: Community Based Conflict Management: Women as Peace Makers and Nation Builders and PBF/LBR/A-13: Women's Economic Empowerment: Building Peace, Promoting Prosperity.) Together they amount to USD 3M which is 20% of the allocation for the PPP.</p> <p>The Palava Hut committees are traditionally very male dominated, in terms of composition as well in in terms of their actions. The PBF project has succeeded in promoting a better gender balance. The eight district Palava Hut committees restructured and trained in the Kwa and Mande linguistic regions, are composed of four men and three women.</p> <p>The Liberian NGO EDUCARE, a long term UN Women partner, had a project approved by this year's Gender Promotion Initiative of the PBF. This will further improve the gender profile of the Liberia portfolio. The JSC is firmly convinced that gender perspectives can be even better integrated into future PBF projects, and will strive to see this happen.</p>
<p>PBF/PBC synergy: For countries on the PBC agenda, how did the PPP promote the</p>	<p>The PPP has no doubt been an important instrument for promoting PBF/PBC synergy. All PBF projects are in line with the recently revised SMC. In fact they all specifically focus on issues highlighted in the SMC, and many of the projects are assessed to have directly contributed to the implementation of commitments. As the</p>

STG

<p>synergy between PBF support and PBC engagement? Did the PPP support the PBC to achieve its commitments in the country?</p>	<p>Peacebuilding Office of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is has been a direct beneficiary of the PBF, it merits special mention in this section. The PBO has substantially contributed to promoting the work of PBC and the implementation of the PBCs commitments. It has done so through its advisory, training and coordination services as well as very practically in connection with visits by the PBC.</p>
<p><u>Any additional comments:</u></p>	<p>In a letter dated 2 December 2016, the Auditor General of Liberia informs the SRSG about four new audit reports, two of which are relevant for the PBF. The report "Temple of Justice Peacebuilding Fund Project" covers the period 1 July 2012-30 September 2015. The report "Ministry of Justice-Justice and Security Joint Program Peacebuilding Fund Project" covers the period 1 July 2012-30 June 2015. In both cases the Auditor General expresses Adverse Conclusions. The reports are presently analysed by the UN in order to decide on appropriate action. A public hearing on the reports in the Legislature is foreseen for 2017.</p>

PART 3: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY

3.1 Lessons learned

Provide at least three key lessons learned from the implementation of the PPP. These can include lessons on the themes supported by the PPP or the PPP processes and management.

Lesson 1	<p>Ownership and firm commitment shown by the Government of Liberia is crucial for assuring sustainability. Projects and processes financed by PBF only (or international donors only) have shown weak prospects for being sustainable. Support to the National Youth Service Programme and the Land Coordination Centers ended after the PBF interventions. As present PBF funding for the Palava Huts process ends in 2016, the future of the process is uncertain. The same may also be said about the PBO and many of the County Peace Committees. This lesson is obviously not new in any way, but basically as old as development cooperation. However, it needs to be repeated and taken seriously into consideration when the future PBF interventions are planned, designed and implemented.</p>
Lesson 2	<p>There is a lack of independent evaluations of PBF projects and programmes. There was a fairly recent independent evaluation of the PBO, but as far as we are aware that was the only evaluation during the whole PPP period. The previous independent evaluation/review was the mid-term review of the Liberia Peacebuilding Programme, published in March 2010. It is commendable that UN Women is presently commissioning an independent, gender sensitive, evaluation of its PBF-</p>

CSA

	funded activities but unfortunately those results are not available in time for this annual report. It is very much appreciated that the PBSO is commissioning an independent evaluation of the PBF interventions during 2011-2016, but very unfortunate that the results will not be available for this report and, more seriously, for the planning of the coming "transition package" of IRF interventions.
Lesson 3	Important organisational changes should be planned carefully in order to avoid serious effects on efficiency. The restructuring of the PBO at the same time as the transfer of the JSC secretariat functions to a not-yet-recruited PBF secretariat, negatively affected PBF projects in general and specifically the efficiency of the JSC. Only one JSC meeting was held in 2016. Furthermore, there are still uncertainties regarding its ToR and its membership. The establishment of the revised AFT Pillar 1 structure and the Peacebuilding and Reconciliation Technical Working Group provides a fresh opportunity create a more efficient structure for handling JSC responsibilities.

3.2 Success story

Provide one success story from the PPP implementation which can be shared on the PBSO website and Newsletter. Please include key facts and figures and any citations.

Beneficiaries of the UN Women PBF funded projects: PBF/LBR/A-10: Community Based Conflict Management: Women as Peace Makers and Nation Builders and PBF/LBR/A-13: Women's Economic Empowerment: Building Peace, Promoting Prosperity

Prince Tangay (33, Grand Gedeh, Tiama Town): "This training made me guilty of beating on my girlfriend almost every day and forcing her to have sexual intercourse even if she complained on being tired. I am not only ready to change my bad behaviour that continues to violate the rights of women and girls, but to also change my friends' ugly behaviours against women and girls in my community."

Mariamama Kpah, 33 years, Grand Gedeh County: "Before my participation in the project, I used to sell in the local market in Tiama Town. I wanted to be a cross border trader but didn't understand the security issues at the border. I had low self-esteem because I had no idea or knowledge about my rights as a cross border trader nor the security issues that many women in cross border trade face at the borders. When I participated in the Peace Hut training with women peace builders including attending regular peace hut meetings, I was able to understand my rights as a woman and what to do when my rights were abused. I began to understand my rights and how to get justice. The peace hut in my village opened my eyes, and today, I am now crossing the borders to trade goods and to buy goods because I now have confidence as a trader

STK

and as a woman. I now have a space in my village to discuss issues affecting women in the community. Also, my business as a cross border trader has grown, and I continue to get mentoring and coaching services from the project. Many women and girls in my village are now reporting incidences of Sexual and Gender based Violence (SGBV), Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), Extortion and other serious issues that affect women.

Victoria Wollie, National Coordinator for the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding—Women in Peacebuilding Network in Liberia, notes that in the last few years, the Peacebuilding Fund has invested in the work of women's organizations in Liberia. With this support, women-led peace huts have served as a safe space for women and contributed to resolving local conflicts for years. "We hope that this type of support will be scaled up so that women can participate in peaceful elections and help strengthen national reconciliation, the rule of law, the security sector, and an equitable management of natural resources," she says. "These are the kinds of investments that will secure Liberia's path to peace consolidation."

CNF