

**SECRETARY-GENERAL'S PEACEBUILDING FUND
PROJECT DOCUMENT TEMPLATE**



United Nations
Peacebuilding

PBF PROJECT DOCUMENT

(Length : Max. 12 pages plus cover page and annexes)

Country (ies): The Gambia	
Project Title: Addressing Conflict over Land and Natural Resources (LNR) in The Gambia Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway (if existing project):	
PBF project modality: <input type="checkbox"/> IRF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRF	If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund: <input type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund Name of Recipient Fund:
List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc): FAO and UNDP List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental: Ministries of Lands and Regional Government, Agriculture, Environment, Climate Change & Natural Resources, and Justice; the National Environment Agency, National Assembly; and the NGOs ActionAid, WANEP, CRS, UP and ADRC.	
Expected project commencement date¹: December 1 st , 2018 Project duration in months:² 18 months	
Geographic zones for project implementation: Nationwide for legal reforms; and Western Region and Central River Region for dialogue and conflict resolution interventions	
Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below: <input type="checkbox"/> Gender promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Youth promotion initiative <input type="checkbox"/> Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions <input type="checkbox"/> Cross-border or regional project	
Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization): FAO: \$ 1,100,000 UNDP: \$ 300,000 Total PBF budget: \$1,400,000 <i>*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO'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.</i>	
Any other existing funding for the project (amount and source): 0 Project total budget: US\$1, 400,000	

¹ Note: actual commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer.

² Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

Wk

PBF 1st tranche: FAO: \$770,000 UNDP: \$200,000 Total: \$970,000	PBF 2nd tranche*: FAO: \$330,000 UNDP: \$100,000 Total: \$430,000	PBF 3rd tranche*: Total:	— tranche Total:
<p>Two-three sentences with a brief project description and succinct explanation of how the project is time sensitive, catalytic and risk-tolerant/ innovative:</p> <p>The project will strengthen legal frameworks for land and natural resources (LNR) - related conflict resolution and governance, enhance mechanisms for conflict prevention, and in communities where LNR conflict-related violence has already occurred, support actions for peace building. There is an immediate need to arrest the escalation in LNR-related tensions, many of which have festered over many years and in the 'New Gambia' that is associated with greater freedom of expression, some have escalated into conflicts, some disputes in 2018 resulting in violence and death in several communities in target areas. The intervention is also timely as it will occur at the same time as the recently initiated national constitutional and legislative review processes. The intervention will demonstrate concrete mechanisms for conflict prevention (e.g., livestock tracks and identification) that subsequent support can build upon to expand similar interventions throughout the country. Likewise, LNR conflict and resolution database will provide a strong platform for subsequent monitoring to support policies and programming. Finally, the participatory and inclusive approaches to be utilized will ensure stakeholder engagement, especially of the highly sensitive youth population as well as women in all aspects of project implementation.</p>			
<p>Summarize the in-country project consultation and endorsement process prior to submission to PBSO, including through any PBF Steering Committee where it exists:</p> <p>The conflict and development analysis study (June, 2018) served as a basis for identification of conflict drivers within land and natural resource management sector. Consultations with all stakeholders at local and national levels allowed stakeholders to analyse conflicts relating to land and NR and facilitated engagement of community members and government authorities through the formulation process. Endorsement and submitted of the eligibility request by the President of the country demonstrate political commitment and buy-in at the highest level of authority. The proposal was also developed in close consultation with government partners.</p>			
<p>Project Gender Marker score: 2³ (40%) approximately USD 560,000</p>			
<p>Project Risk Marker score: 0⁴</p>			
<p>Select PBF Focus Areas which best summarizes the focus of the project (select ONLY one): 2.3⁵ If applicable, UNDAF outcome(s) to which the project contributes: Outcome 3.2, If applicable, Sustainable Development Goal to which the project contributes: (Goals: 1, 2, 5 and 15)</p>			

³ Score 3 for projects that have gender equality as a principal objective

Score 2 for projects that have gender equality as a significant objective

Score 1 for projects that contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly (less than 15% of budget)

⁴ Risk marker 0 = low risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

⁵ 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)

PKK

<p>Type of submission:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New project <input type="checkbox"/> Project amendment</p>	<p>If it is a project amendment, select all changes that apply and provide a brief justification:</p> <p>Extension of duration: <input type="checkbox"/> Additional duration in months: Change of project outcome/ scope: <input type="checkbox"/> Change of budget allocation between outcomes or budget categories of more than 15%: <input type="checkbox"/> Additional PBF budget: <input type="checkbox"/> Additional amount by recipient organization: USD XXXXX</p> <p>Brief justification for amendment: <i>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.</i></p>
---	--

7/11

PROJECT SIGNATURES:

<p>Recipient Organization(s)⁶ Name of Representative: Perpetua Katepa Kalala Signature: [Redacted] Name of Agency: UNDP Date & Seal: 27/11/18</p>	<p>Representative of National Authorities Ministry for Regional Administrations Lands and Traditional Rulers Name of Government Counterpart: Saikou Sanyang Signature: [Redacted] Title: Permanent Secretary, MRA Date & Seal: [Redacted]</p>
<p>Name of Representative: [Redacted] Signature: [Redacted] Name of Agency: UNDP Date & Seal: [Redacted]</p>	<p>Name of Government Counterpart: [Redacted] Signature: [Redacted] Title: Secretary General, Office of the President Date & Seal: 27/11/18</p>
<p>Head of UN Country Team Name of Representative: [Redacted] Signature: [Redacted] Title: [Redacted] Date & Seal: [Redacted]</p>	<p>Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) Oscar Fernandez-Taranco [Redacted] Assistant Secretary-General, Peacebuilding Support Office Signature: [Redacted] Date: [Redacted]</p>

⁶ Please include a separate signature block for each direct recipient organization under this project.

72.06

I. Peacebuilding Context and Rationale for PBF support (4 pages max)

- a) A brief summary of conflict analysis findings as they relate to this project, focusing on the driving factors of tensions/conflict that the project aims to address and an analysis of the main actors/ stakeholders that have an impact on or are impacted by the driving factors, which the project will aim to engage. This analysis must be gender- and age-sensitive.

Access to land is inextricably linked to food production as well as the exploitation of natural resources both of which are mainstays of the Gambian economy and the bases of livelihood for people. Thus, there are competing interest with regards to access to and control over land, its allocation and the purposes for which it is committed. Public perceptions and legal provisions related to existing practices of control and enforcement of land tenure systems in the country are diverged and strongly associated with significant destabilizing tensions. These tensions affect everyday relations amongst citizens, and between resource-linked communities.

The situation was exacerbated by eminent involvement of the former regime in land grabbing and natural resource exploitations. Consequently, and sequel to change of government in the Gambia, and citizens' misinterpretation of democratic rights there has been an increased manifestation of tensions and instability related to lingering and/or unresolved disputes over land, ownership and access to natural resources (forests, water and fisheries) in both rural and peri-urban areas (West Coast Region) – CDA 2018. Disputes have erupted over farmlands, cattle tracks and access to water and pasture, cattle destruction of crops, land ownership claims and related transactions and practices, as well as protests related to perceived destruction of the environment by new private sector ventures. Some of these tensions degenerated into violent conflicts in places like Faraba-Bantang, Taneneh, Gunjur, Kartong Jambanjelly, Kerewan Njakoi, and CRR, to mention but a few. Based on consultations with officials of Ministry of Local Government and Lands identified 50 hotspots of land conflicts and an FAO implemented project has identified the need for one – three cattle tracks in each of the active 40 districts but able to re-demarcate only ten.

The factors driving land conflict in the Gambia are⁷:

1) Inadequate legal frameworks and poor enforcement of existing laws and regulations pertaining to tenure of land, forests and other natural resources. The Gambia has not been consistent in addressing significant land governance challenges posed by different frameworks; Common Law, Islamic and customary law. These different legal frameworks have led to significant destabilizing tensions affecting everyday relations amongst citizens, and between resource-linked communities.

These multiple systems co-exist as mechanisms for land transfer and dispute resolution and moreover, they lack effective channels of sustained communication or cooperation among them. To address this inadequacy significant land administration reforms were attempted in 1991 to unitize land by the wholesale conversion of customary land to leasehold. These included the introduction for the first time of a coherent framework for land use planning for urban areas and a system for the municipal rates assessment and collection. The momentum of these reforms was however not continued, and since 1991 there has not been any consistent effort to address land governance challenges. The basic legal framework continues to be defined by the tripartite system created by the mixed legacy of the English Common Law and Sharia superimposed on traditional structures.

⁷ Conflict and Development Analysis of the Gambia June 2018

DM

Therefore, there are no consistent and coherent land conflict management systems and mechanisms, increasing the social and financial cost for community members leading to further tension and undermining social cohesion.

2) Eroded citizens' (especially youth) confidence in traditional (Chieftaincy/Alkaloshi) dispute resolution mechanism compounded by increasing opportunities for the transfer of land from communal to private leaseholds with often non-transparent payments to traditional leaders and others. Chieftaincy/Alkaloshi roles and practices remain central to catalyzing these tensions. Whereas Gambians rely upon local Alkalo leadership for resolving local disputes (specifically for land), confidence in these authorities has been eroded on multiple levels. There is a general feeling that these stewards have become biased and politicized over time, or expressed doubts about the training and skill-sets they possess to appropriately conduct such management duties effectively. As a result, community members, especially the youths take the law into their own hands. For instance, three persons were killed in Faraba in June 2018 following a clash between the police and residents protesting sand mining by a private company reflects the heightening tensions over land and natural resources in many communities. Similar tensions degenerated into violence in Taneneh, Gunjur, Kartong, Jambanjelly, Kerewan Njakoi, and CRR, to mention but a few. Such occurrences of violence, albeit sporadic, have the potential to spread quickly and widely given the current societal dynamics underlying the transitional context in The Gambia.

Due to ascribed differences in the property and other rights of men, women and youth in traditional dispute settlement systems, youth and women are sometimes discouraged from going to traditional systems to reconcile land disputes, attributable to unfavorable decision for women and high cost. Consequently, youth involved in land disputes tend to use civil, which over the years has been working well for youth and women who can afford legal fees and/or persevere lengthy proceedings, rather than customary mechanisms (courts or call upon the police in some cases) or take the law into their own hands/opt to leave home. However, any obvious discrepancy between civil and customary (traditional) courts, though civil court judgements are most respected, can be sources of conflicts.

3) Rapid urbanization and growing investments have accelerated the demand for resources such as sand and timber for construction and export, taking up land formerly used for crops, livestock and forest reserves, resulting in conflicts over affected land such as the conflict in Faraba and Jambanjelly. Likewise, the increasing demand for forage and water resources for livestock, due to an increase in livestock population (tripled over a period of 4 decades) and the absence of adequate cattle tracks has increased tensions between crop and livestock farmers. Some of these conflicts have led to violence in few communities, the most recent in early July 2018 in Central River Region (CRR). There are 59,000 heads⁸ of cattle in the region and most tracks demarcated in early 1970s, have been encroached upon. While the requirement is one stock track for every 1000 heads of cattle, in CRR there is currently only three for the 59,000 cattle. There is a need to ensure that persistent wide-spread tensions between crop and livestock farmers do not escalate since more than two thirds of Gambia's districts are considered agricultural and have both crop and livestock herders.

The project will target national institutions; judiciary, legislative, traditional and regional authorities for equitable land dispute resolution. It also target community members,

⁸ Livestock census 2017

R.M.

especially youth and women, to understand and utilize appropriate land resolution mechanism.

b) A brief description of how the project aligns with/ supports existing Governmental and UN strategic frameworks, how it ensures national ownership and how the project complements/ builds on any other relevant interventions in this sector/area, including any lessons from previous PBF support.

The intervention is specifically in line with outcomes of National Development Plan of the Gambia Government which states sustainable management and utilization of natural resources as a key strategic objective and priority for promoting environmental sustainability, climate resilient communities, and appropriate land use. The proposed project will contribute to increase production and productivity and address hunger and food security needs through using sustainable land and water management practices. It will consolidate ANR sector policy with appropriate sub-sector policies to create an enabling environment for modern, market-led agriculture.

The proposed intervention in The Gambia will draw on important lessons learned from work to strengthen land management and reduce conflict in other countries, including in West African countries such as Sierra Leone where it was found that key aspects of responsible land tenure systems included the recognition and protection of legitimate tenure rights against threats and infringement, strengthening the right to participate and be consulted, including providing the opportunity for tenure right holders to participate in decision-making processes that affect their tenure rights; strengthening gender equality and women's rights; strengthened frameworks for responsible investments in land that have the potential to contribute to food security, nutrition, poverty eradication and environmental resilience while at the same time safeguarding against dispossession of legitimate tenure right holders; strengthening the land registration system and establishing post transactional monitoring to determine the effects of land agreements on the tenure of right holders. This work drew heavily from FAO's flagship Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Land Tenure. The project will also draw lessons from PBF supported projects on land conflict by liaising with countries such as Liberia where the PBSO has supported related projects in recent years.

The project will also draw lessons from earlier experiences of livestock track demarcation in the 1970s as well as ongoing demarcation work under two GEF-funded projects whose work the PBF funded project will complement. In addition, FAO found in Southern and Eastern Africa that livestock identification was extremely important in reducing theft and facilitating the resolution of conflicts related to livestock. While recognizing that situations in countries differ, FAO will facilitate learning from experiences with this type of work in other countries during the implementation of this project.

The proposed intervention is aligned to FAO's global strategic objectives that address the strengthening of an enabling environment for the eradication of hunger and strengthening capacities for enhanced increased agricultural production that at the same time strengthens the sustainable management of natural resources, including land, forests and fisheries. The project will build capacities of governments and stakeholders to improve, develop and implement legal and accountability frameworks to improve governance of land and natural resources, and reduce land and natural resources conflicts, that threaten social cohesion as well as undermine food production and productivity and erode incentives to sustainably manage land and natural resources. The project will also review land and natural resources governance frameworks, including legislation, policies, and regulations as well as strategies

PW

and investment programmes formulated, to support sustainable agriculture, forestry and fishery, and address climate change and environmental degradation.

Though simmering for many years, conflicts related to land and natural resources emerged as priority intervention areas in The Gambia after the 2017 change in government, but especially in 2018 after the deaths of protesters in Faraba, and incidents of conflict between crop and livestock farmers in CRR. Findings of the Gambia Conflict and Development Analysis, a participatory process supported by the UN system in The Gambia, identified land and natural-resources conflict among the priority areas to be addressed immediately. Government and development partners, including the UN system, recognize the critical importance of curbing land and natural-resources conflict early as they have the potential to severely undermine social cohesion, and all aspects of rural development. Indeed, the successful implementation of the CPF, UNDAF and indeed the National Development Plan is predicated on the assumption of social cohesion and peace. Conflicts between crop farmers and livestock herders and lack of security for livestock have the potential to disrupt peace, as was seen in northern Nigeria earlier in 2018 where conflict between herders and crop farmers resulted in the deaths of dozens of people. It can severely hinder the livestock and rural sector's development. The proposed work is thus fundamental to, and supports the core tenets of the NDP, UNDP and FAO CPF.

It is aligned to United Nations' Development Assistance Framework result three; Sustainable Agriculture, Natural Resources, Environmental and Climate Change, Management, Outcome 3.2. The intervention also supports political engagement strategy of the UN in the country; i.e. through policy reforms and institutions of justice to increasing peacebuilding. It is equally in line with SDGs of UN; (Goals: 1, 2, 5 and 15) (Targets: 1.4, 2.3, 5a, 15.2 and 15.3).

The Government of the Gambia has recently constituted Land Commission to look into the challenges of land administration in order to address conflicts emanating from land matters in the country. The land commission could serve to arbitrate or clarify final ownership rights and physical planning directives for clear mapping out of property ownership countrywide; including farmland management, claims over rice fields, wetlands, joint and community owned land, community woodlots, and government reserve areas.

UNDP is currently supporting Ministry of Local Governments and Land with two UN volunteers on GIS (including survey) and land valuation. Furthermore, the project will build upon two other projects being implemented by FAO-Gambia; Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change, which has a key component on re-demarcation of cattle tracks; and Sustainable Dryland Community Forest, which will demarcate forest park and encourage community ownership of forest resources.

The former FAO supported project will promote sustainable and diversified livelihood strategies for reducing the impacts of climate variability and change in agriculture and livestock sector. Thus to improve management of rangelands and increase access to livelihood assets to sustain sources of income by livestock dependent communities, the project will demarcate 10 cattle tracks (North of the country only) of 39 districts, and establish local conventions/regulations with regard to grazing. Whilst the latter Dryland will support institutions at national and regional level to have the capacity to integrate forestry and stock tracks management into policies, sectoral planning, and practices.

RW

The proposed project will enhanced capacity of Land Commission Members, collaborate with the Commission to sensitize community members on land dispute management systems.

Bill

II. Project content, strategic justification and implementation strategy (4 pages max Plus Results Framework Annex)

- a) A brief description of the project content – in a nutshell, what results is the project trying to achieve, and how does it aim to address the conflict analysis factors outlined in Section I (must be gender- and age- sensitive).

The project will strengthen legal frameworks for land governance and conflict resolution through review of legislative frameworks, support for advocacy and enactment of disputes resolution mechanisms. The legislative frameworks (policies and laws) dealing with land and natural resources in the Gambia are old and archaic. The current system of land governance and administration is based on the land Act of 1945, with minor revisions in 1991. There is need for review of the legal framework in line with the changing trends in society and international treaties and conventions such as the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). The formal law is completely silent on women land rights. The constitution recognizes customary practices as an exception to the definition of discrimination, posing an obstacle to the legal equality of women and reinforcing customary practices that deny women ownership and control over land. Both English and customary/traditional (Sharia superimposed) laws will be reviewed to reduce conflict over land and increase social cohesion.

The review will use the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) of FAO and Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) to address disputes over land ownership claims and equitable access to land. GRMs are formal or informal, legal or non-legal, judicial or non-judicial processes in which disputes that arise between two or more parties engaged in legal, administrative, economic or social relationships are received, considered and decided or resolved. Reviewed legislative frameworks will have to be enacted into law to replace old ones.

The review will enhance inclusive mechanisms for equitable access to and ownership of land and introduce tools that encourage peace in conflict hot spots⁹ and conflict prevention in intervention areas. This would include the rights of women to access land, the rights of “strangers” as tenants and clearer identification and distinction between the different types of land (community, family, individual land).

The critical gaps in land governance will also be addressed through development of a unified national land policy that gives more prominence to the recognition and protection of all legitimate tenure rights, provide an opportunity for tenure right holders to participate in the decision making processes that will affect their rights, and encourage responsible investments that have the potential to contribute to food security, nutrition, poverty eradication and environmental resilience. The Land Policy will also acknowledge gender differences and include specific measure aimed at accelerating de facto equality when necessary.

The introduction of land information system and collection of live data on conflicts relating to land and natural resources will support informed decision making. Tools to be used will encourage dialogue, negotiation and identification of clear channels to resolve land and natural resource conflicts. It further initiates consultative processes of building consensus over deeply rooted social disruptions and demanded by the government and accepted by communities engaged during the preparatory stage.

⁹ 14 of the conflict hot spots are in CRR and WCR

RM

- b) Project result framework, outlining all project results, outputs, activities with indicators of progress, baselines and targets (must be gender- and age- sensitive). Use Annex B; no need to provide additional narrative here. See Results Framework
- c) Provide a project-level 'theory of change' – i.e. how do you expect these interventions to lead to results and why have these interventions been selected. Specify if any of these interventions are particularly risky.

Under the assumption that government of the Gambia is receptive and committed to strengthening its role as duty bearers in the delivery of appropriate policies, improving the design of legislative and customary frameworks by bringing together decision makers with those affected by policy decision are more likely to reflect the realities on the ground and therefore more receptive to affected communities. An inclusive approach to reform the frameworks and engagement of actors to influence actions of authorities will lead to lasting peace.

Government commitment to increase democratic space for civil society to engage in processes of accountability and democratization, or gradual increase of the existing democratic space equipping communities with enhanced systems and increasing their knowledge and skills will assist communities to better understand their environment and respond to appropriately negative changes that affect their lives. The consultative nature of the project and community buy-in will lead to inclusive decision processes and is first of its kind in the country.

Awareness and knowledge on source of disputes relating to land and understanding of proper use of land and natural resources and enhanced clarity in agreed crop-livestock land uses (re-demarcation of livestock tracks) and establishment of local conventions/regulations with regard to grazing route will enhance community management of disputes (competing interests and priorities among different groups). It will improve community engagement and collaboration at all levels and bring about stronger systems of land governance and peace between crop and livestock farmers. It will enable decision makers also to become more responsive to the needs and priorities of their communities.

The interventions selected will address root causes of conflicts related to land and natural resources, it will create an enabling environment for various actors/stakeholders to co-exist and increase social cohesion within and between communities. For instance, once there are consistent and coherent land dispute resolution frameworks, community members are aware and able to utilize these frameworks effectively through dialogue, it will reduce tension and prevent lingering of land related conflicts. Currently there are limited interventions on land and natural resources related conflicts. Most development interventions are related to production and productivity.

(Note: Change may happen through various and diverse approaches, i.e. social cohesion may be fostered through dialogue or employment opportunities or joint management of infrastructure. The selection of which approach should depend on context-specific factors. What basic assumptions about how change will occur have driven your choice of programming approach?)

- d) Project implementation strategy – explain how the project will undertake the activities to ensure most effective and efficient achievement of results, including justification for geographic zones, criteria for beneficiary selection, timing among various activities, coherence between results and any other information on implementation approach (must be gender- and age-sensitive). No need to repeat all outputs and activities from the Result Framework.

The project will focus on strengthening governance and LNR-related conflict resolution frameworks and capacities to enforce and adhere to them; increase the availability of conflict prevention mechanisms and re-build and strengthen peace in communities where conflict has already erupted.

To attain the outcomes, technical expertise will consult all relevant stakeholders (including women and youth) and will assist authorities to review and assess the adequacy and coherence of statutory, customary and religious frameworks that guide land and natural resources management for all functions, including investment, land allocation, transfer and dispute resolutions. Build capacities of institutions to apply or enforce the reviewed legislative frameworks and strengthen inclusive approaches. Sequel to review, the project will raise awareness of stakeholders to get community buy-in and validate proposed amendments. This will be followed by advocacy for adoption by Executive arm of government, and enactment by National Assembly. FAO Voluntary Guidelines for the Tenure of Land, Forests and Fisheries and other FAO tools (Consensual Negotiation Process, Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Development and Land Tenure Alternative Conflict Management) for land related conflict resolution will be strategic tools for the review and where necessary gaps will be identified to prompt the revision of relevant frameworks.

Building on experiences of on-going projects; the GEF-funded projects 'Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change' and 'Sustainable Drylands and Community Forest Management', community member's awareness will be raised on land and natural resource management, improved skills on how to identify clear channels of resolving land and natural resource management disputes through the establishment of information systems to provide live data on conflicts and conflict resolution for decision making at both local and national levels, and the participatory decisions on livestock track demarcation and livestock identification to enhance conflict prevention. Furthermore, community inclusive consultations, negotiations on land use, will enhance peace resolution.

These interventions will target relevant national and community authorities and members, paying special attention to addressing the needs and interest of the youth (18 – 35) and women; leveraging on existing Women's Act and the National Youth Policy. These will include gender-sensitive conflict management capacity building on traditional and civil land dispute resolution mechanisms, gender and generation-specific cultural issues to increase trust of dispute forums like ADRS. Conversely, the intervention will undertake sensitization and media campaigns, to locally disseminate information and enable citizen-proactivity to competently utilize existing mechanisms in appropriate sequence, according to the nature of the dispute or level of complexity. The geographic coverage of the sensitization will be nationwide.

Community-level support for peace building will focus on the West Coast Region and CRR in the communities where tensions are already high, some having already spilt over into conflict. The project will support 200 communities for cattle track and livestock identification, while the advocacy campaign for equitable access to and ownership of land for both women and men will be conducted nationwide.

There is no noticeable evidence on impact of returning migrants relating to land and natural resource conflicts in the country. However, the project will complement re-integration of returning migrants who are interested in crop/livestock production and host community members by enhancing youth access to and ownership of productive land as foundation for peace, economic and social interdependencies between returnees and the communities.

Activities will be implemented in the span of 18 months, beginning with community sensitization, trainings, review of legal framework and enactment. The intervention will be implemented in close associate with the PBF project on Women and Youth participation to ensure that social-cohesion activities are synchronized in common geographic areas.

DAK

Dialogue spaces established and conflict prevention capacities enhanced through the Women and Youth project will be leveraged and utilized for community consultations and dialogues to avoid duplication and doing harm.

III. Project management and coordination (4 pages max)

- a) **Recipient organizations and implementing partners** – list direct recipient organizations and their implementing partners (international and local), specifying the Convening Organization, which will coordinate the project, and providing a brief justification for the choices, based on mandate, experience, local know-how and existing capacity.

FAO has comparative advantage in land tenure management, using well developed tools such as Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), Participatory and Negotiated Territorial Development (DTPN) and the Land Tenure Alternative Conflict Management (ACM) to address disputes over land ownership claims and equitable access to land. FAO assists member countries with technical support on land tenure and land and natural resources governance, in the review and revision of land legislation as requested, including in situations where conflict over land and natural resources is prevalent, in land use planning for agriculture, forests and fisheries. Recently, FAO Gambia has facilitated review of Forest Policy and the Forest Act early 2019, which has presented a unique window for participatory dialogue in natural resource management.

Furthermore, lessons learnt from similar works in other West African countries and beyond by FAO and partners, on land policy and legislation reviews, eminent expertise in dealing with crop and livestock farmers, especially, cattle track demarcations, livestock identification processes to avoid conflict will all be useful resources that will be harnessed to implement project to address a key conflict driving factor in the country. FAO Gambia will work closely with government counterparts in the implementation of the project. It has officers that are already working with government partners on livestock track demarcation; forestry and natural resources officers and a livestock officer will work closely with counterparts, drawing on additional technical officers from the FAO Regional Office for additional support on legal, land and livestock, and from FAO headquarters on legal technical support as needed. A technical multi-disciplinary FAO team will accompany the project and help to ensure the incorporation of best practice through the provision of advice, often virtually and if needed through physical backstopping.

FAO will work closely with Ministries of Lands and Regional Government, Agriculture, Environment, Climate Change & Natural Resources, and Justice; the National Environment Agency, National Assembly; and the NGOs ActionAid, WANEP, CRS, UP and ADRC.

UNDP will provide support for peace building, with support from the UN Peace and Development Advisor at the RCO. This will include advisory support and facilitating regional/community specific consultations and assessments on identifying land/natural resource-related conflicts and grievances, as well as existing local capacities and resolution mechanisms. It will work with local NGOs such as TANGO, Action Aid and WANEP in undertaking community level peace building initiatives that are participatory and inclusive; and aim at strengthening local capacities for preventing and addressing disputes and grievances.

- b) **Project management and coordination** – present the project implementation team, including positions and roles and explanation of which positions are to be funded by the project (to which percentage). Explain project coordination and oversight arrangements. Fill out project implementation readiness checklist in Annex C.

The implementation team will include one fully funded National Project Manager; responsible for coordination of project activities. Suitable qualifications include any of the following: MSc in International Law, Policy Analysis, Conflict Management, Rural Development or equivalent. Desired experience; minimum of 5 years of experience in project management relating to land and natural resource, land tenure administration in developing countries, experience in Gambia or West African

countries will be an added advantage. Fluent in English language and limited knowledge of French will be required.

Under the overall coordination of the FAO Representative in the Gambia and direct supervision of the Assistant FAOR Programme and the Lead Technical Officer (FAO Regional Office) and in collaboration with the National Project team (including M&E), will be responsible for implementation of the entire project while UNDP Head of Programmes will be responsible for implementation of UNDP project component. UN Habitat regional expertise will be sought through formal agreement contract (Letter of Agreement) to support with the establishment of land information system on active land and natural resources related disputes.

The responsibility for coordinating and managing this project will lie jointly with the Government of The Gambia represented by line Ministries, FAO and UNDP. The overall focal point for liaising with the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and PBF and for ensuring overall project coherence, coordination and quality implementation and reporting will be the FAO Representative through the RC. An overarching Joint Steering Committee (JSC) of all the PBF Projects, will be established and chaired jointly by Secretary General of Gambia Government and the UN RC. A project specific Steering Committee will be established and co-chaired by the Permanent Secretary of line Ministries and the FAO Representative, with UNDP has a standing member. Other representatives on this Steering Committee (SC) may be drawn from various relevant ministries and institutions at the discretion of the Co-Chairs. Beneath this will be a Technical Committee (TC), largely related to technical level representatives of implementing partners. The TC will ensure technical integrity of the project and make recommendations for steering committee consideration. In addition to UN-Agency level focal persons, quality assurance support will be provided through PBF-Funded mini-secretariat located at the RCO. The secretariat support will include development of collaborative partnerships with other PBF projects to establish and demonstrate linkages of on-going efforts.

- c) **Risk management** – assess the level of risk for project success (low, medium and high) and provide a list of major project specific risks and how they will be managed, including the approach to updating risks and making project adjustments. Include any Do No Harm issues and project mitigation.

Risk level of this project is low. Project specific risk include; a) public cynicism; b) community disputes, c) political civil unrest, d) unavailable national capacity on land policy reforms,

Risk	Likelihood (high, medium low)	Severity of impact on project (high, medium, low)	Mitigating Strategy
Public cynicism of community interest in the reconciliation process	Low	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate commitment by political, religious, and traditional leaders by taking the first steps in the process Link dialogues and other soft activities with tangible land reforms processes Engage in intensive public education and awareness raising campaign, highlighting the value added of the strategy as well as the inclusive and national nature of the process
Community disputes,	Medium	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake serious research of the core issues and sensitivity in each community as prelude to the dialogue process Invest in intensive training and preparation of all community mediation structures
Political and civil unrest	Low	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage an inter-party forum as stakeholder in the process Regularly inform the populace and ensure there is public support and ownership
Limited capacity on land policy reforms	Low	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outsource for capacity outside the country to build capacity within the country.

- d) **Monitoring and evaluation** – What will be the M&E approach for the project, including M&E expertise in the project team and main means and timing of collecting data? Include a break-down of M&E budget that the project is putting aside, including for collection of baseline and end line data for indicators and independent evaluation, and an approximate M&E timeline. Ensure at least 5-7% of the project budget is set aside for M&E activities.

P. U. K.

Four – tiers monitoring and evaluation approach; **input** (activities and resources), **output**, **outcome** (result, purpose) and **impact** (goal), will be used to assess the performance and impact attribute of the project. M&E activities baseline, ongoing data collection for systematic assessment of project performance, and end-line evaluation to determine attributable changes. FAO, has two project management systems; FPMIS and PIRES. These systems are aligned to Result-based Monitoring and Evaluation system, thus the M&E system will be Results-based.

This current proposal is the first phase of a 5-year programme on peace building; an emerging issue in the country (conflict over ownership and tenure rights). The capture of information and lessons to inform future implementation will thus be an important aspect of the project. Annual reports, comparative analyses of lessons drawn from the initially targeted 50 communities about the identification of LNR conflict drivers, and their experiences with conflict resolution frameworks before and after the intervention will form an important part of the documentation that will be carried forward.

Ongoing monitoring and evaluation reports will also be shared with all stakeholders who will also be provided an opportunity to participate in sessions to review lessons learnt that will inform future initiatives on land disputes management. To minimize costs, the project management unit will share information regularly with stakeholders, including resource partners, electronically, as well as through already scheduled consultations with communities and utilizing already established communication mechanisms such as Farmer Field Schools now established throughout the country and already sharing a wide range of information through such mechanisms as WhatsApp.

Baseline survey: \$25,000, Ongoing data collection and analysis \$18,000 and end-line evaluation \$27,000

- e) **Project exit strategy/ sustainability** – Briefly explain the project's exit strategy to ensure that the project can be wrapped up at the end of the project duration, either through sustainability measures; agreements with other donors for follow-up funding or end of activities which do not need further support. If support from other donors is expected, explain what the project will do to try to ensure this support from the start.

The project will be working with local counterparts, specifically national and local authorities, thus continuous implementation of issues relating to land and natural resources management will be assumed by these authorities from the onset. There are activities that focused more on strengthening the capacity of partners, communities and local stakeholders, this is to ensure responsible exit and greater attention to advocacy in the project is part of the shift towards sustainability. Therefore, the project will build broader coalitions for change with wider stakeholders at community, district regional and national levels to ensure sustainability. Government counterpart funding will be in kind, people and institutions to be involved in implementation of the project

However, to address land and natural resource disputes nationwide will require a comprehensive intervention, which will include linking with current FAO projects (AACC, Sustainable Drylands, etc.) and further resource mobilization during and after implementation of the current proposed project, from different donors, including Peace Building Fund of the United Nations, European Union, AfDB and World Bank. The project technical committee will thus include/keep informed key potential donors about the scope, progress in project implementation as well as inform them about additional requirements to ensure the required scaling up.

IV. Project budget

Please provide a brief justification for the proposed budget, 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 funds for independent evaluation. Proposed budget for projects involving non-UN direct recipients must include funds for independent audit.

RLK

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

Annex A.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 PBSO 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 PBSO. The AA will normally make each disbursement within three (3) to five (5) business days after having received instructions from the PBSO 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 PBSO;
- 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 costs extension that the PBSO 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 PBSO (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

RUC

		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)
<i>Certified final financial report to be provided by 30 June of the calendar year after project closure</i>	

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 be 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 PBSO and Administrative Agent will ensure that operations of the PBF are publicly disclosed on the PBF website (<http://unpbf.org>) and the Administrative Agent's website (<http://mptf.undp.org>).

RW

Annex A.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 PBSO, 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 PBSO 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 PBSO (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)
<i>Certified final financial report to be provided at the quarter following the project financial closure</i>	

Unspent Balance exceeding USD 250 at the closure of the project would have to be 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 PBSO.

Public Disclosure

The PBSO and Administrative Agent will ensure that operations of the PBF are publicly disclosed on the PBF website (<http://unpbf.org>) and the Administrative Agent website (<http://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 PBSO, the Administrative Agent and the donor(s) and, in consultation with the donors as appropriate, determine an appropriate response.

RWK

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 PBSO 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 PBSO 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 project¹⁰
- 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 MPTF-O for the PBF grant.

¹⁰ Annualized PBF project budget is obtained by dividing the PBF project budget by the number of project duration months and multiplying by 12.

21

Annex E: Project Results Framework (MUST include sex- and age disaggregated data)

Outcomes	Outputs	Indicators	Means of Verification/ frequency of collection	Indicator milestones
Outcome 1: Local and national authorities adopt strengthened, inclusive legislative and policy frameworks for land and natural resources dispute resolution		Outcome Indicator 1a: Number of district tribunals that adopt reviewed frameworks for land dispute resolutions; Baseline: zero in October 2018 Target: 20 by April 2020	Monitoring reports, local government and justice ministry records. Monthly and yearly.	
		Outcome Indicator 1b: Percent of women and youth that are satisfied with the resolution of land and NR related disputes; Baseline: TBD Target: 30% increase over baseline by October 2020.		
	Output 1.1: Strengthened frameworks for LNR governance and conflict resolution. List of activities under this Output:	Output Indicator 1.1: Number of legislative and other LNR governance frameworks strengthened; Baseline: 0 Target: 60 % of identified legislations, regulations and policies revised by April 2020	Ministry of Justice and local government reports; MTIE Information to be collected annually	Stakeholder consultations and reviews completed by June 2019
	1.1.1 Review documentation and conduct inclusive consultation with stakeholders to identify key causes of LNR-conflict	Output Indicator 1.1.1 Percent of stakeholders consulted who are satisfied with resolution mechanisms Baseline: 0 October 2018 Target: April 2020: 75%	M&E reports, national news and authorities records. Monthly	Reduce frequency of conflict in WCR and URR
	1.1.2 Conduct empirical assessment of judicial, and non-judicial grievances mechanisms relating to land disputes;	Output Indicator 1.1.2 Number of grievance mechanisms reviewed, and informants interviewed Baseline: 0 October 2018 - TBD Target: April 2020 - 50	Assessment Report	Initial consultations in all 50 communities completed June 2019
	1.1.3 Propose revision of legislative frameworks and related policies	Output Indicator 1.1.3 Number of legislative and policy reform proposals made Baseline: 0 October 2018-TBD Target: April 2020 5	Project Baseline and M&E report	
	Output 1.2 Capacity of National and local institutions strengthened to enforce inclusive LNR governance and conflict resolution mechanisms List of activities under this Output:	Output indicator 1.2.1, Number of officials (national and local) with increased knowledge and skills in LNR conflict dispute resolution mechanisms. Baseline: October 2018: - 0 Target: April 2020: 80%	Survey	40% at end of 1 st training session
	1.2.1 Train national and local authorities in the application of inclusive LNR frameworks; 1.2.2 Increase capacity of LNR	Output Indicator 1.2.2: Proportion of national and local authorities who are aware of the gender and age-related aspects of LNR dispute resolution mechanisms Baseline: October 2018: TBD by Baseline;	Baseline and end of project survey	Percentage utilization of the new LNR framework

<p>institutions to facilitate LNR-conflict resolution</p> <p>1.2.3 Gender and youth desk established at Ministry of Justice and regional levels</p>	<p>Target: April 2020: 50% over baseline</p> <p>Output 1.2.3 Number of youth and women who resort to alternative LNR conflict resolution mechanisms, Output Indicator 1.2.3 Number of gender and youth desk</p> <p>Baseline: October 2018: 0 Target: April 2020: 7</p>	<p>Reports of Ministry of Lands and Regional governors</p>	<p>June 2019 All key national officials and governors have participated in consultations to build understanding and capacity in the importance of mainstreaming gender and age in LNR-conflict resolution frameworks</p> <p>Number land use plans developed and accepted by communities</p>
<p>Output 1.3 Increased awareness of authorities and communities on revised legal frameworks/policies</p> <p>List of activities under this Output:</p> <p>1.3.1 Advocate at national and local level for adoption and application of revised LNR frameworks</p> <p>1.3.2 Conduct sensitization of community members on legal and statutory frameworks through media channels</p>	<p>Output Indicator 1.3.1 Number of people working with national and local authorities who have increased knowledge of LNR legal frameworks.</p> <p>Baseline: 0 October 2018</p> <p>Target: 40%</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.3.2 Number of people in communities who know the different LNR legal frameworks and which one to use.</p> <p>Baseline: 0 TBD by baseline survey.</p> <p>Target: 60%</p>	<p>M&E reports, and record of local authorities</p> <p>Monthly/yearly</p>	<p>Number land use plans developed and accepted by communities</p>
<p>Outcome 2: National authorities and communities use dispute resolution mechanisms to address LNR disputes in conflict hot spots.</p>	<p>Outcome Indicator 2a: Proportion of targeted communities that utilize reviewed dispute resolution mechanisms to resolve land conflicts:</p> <p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: 40 communities by end of project</p>	<p>M&E reports, and records of authorities</p> <p>Monthly/yearly</p>	<p>Training of trainers completed by April 2019</p> <p>At least 30 communities will have received training in conflict resolution by December 2019</p> <p>At least 4 regions will have completed populating LNR database by December 2019</p>
<p>Output 2.1: Information system to track land disputes and to inform policy and investments established</p>	<p>Outcome Indicator 2 b. Number of disputes resolved using improved e information system, disaggregated by gender and age where appropriate</p> <p>Baseline: October 2018: None.</p> <p>Target: 15 decisions by April 2020</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 2c: Percentage reduction in violent LNR disputes by end of the project</p> <p>Baseline: TBD.</p> <p>Target: TBD</p>	<p>M&E reports and authorities records.</p> <p>Monthly/yearly</p>	<p>Land dispute information system framework completed by June 2019</p>

	List of activities under this Output: 2.1.1 Introduce and agree on scope and format of information system for the tracking of land disputes 2.1.2 Provide needed equipment and train concerned national and regional actors to populate and maintain information system;	Target: 7 Regional information system		Land dispute information system framework populated by June December 2019
		Output Indicator 2.1.2: Number of national and regional authorities have the knowledge and skills in the use of the land dispute tracking information system Baseline: October 2018: 0 Target: 20 national and local authorities by April 2020:	Availability of training report	One training manual on local LNR dispute resolution developed by April 2019
	Output 2.2 Strengthened capacity of rural communities to prevent conflict LNR disputes	Output Indicator 2.2.1: Number of rural communities with clearly demarcated livestock tracks Baseline: 0: October 2018; TBD by baseline survey, Target: April 2020: 10	M&E reports, DLS reports Monthly, yearly	Livestock tracks established in 10 rural communities by June 2019
	List of activities under this Output: 2.2.1 Build consensus on re-demarcation of cattle tracks with established watering point in conflict regions (WCR & CRR); <i>At least 40% of those consulted should be women and 40% youth.</i>	Output Indicator 2.2.2: Number of communities with Forest parks identified and re-demarcated. Baseline: 5 Target: April 2020: 10	M&E reports, MECCNAR reports Monthly, yearly	At least 5 forest parks (re)demarcated by June 2019
	2.2.2 Re-demarcate forest parks and enhance community in conflict regions (WCR & CRR); <i>Consultations to include at least 40% women and 40% youth</i>	Output Indicator 2.2.3: Number of communities in targeted regions where rangeland and watering points have been developed; Baseline: Exact number TBD by Baseline survey Target: 10	Project M&E report	tracks in target communities identified are equipped with watering points and grass species by September 2019
	2.2.3 Establish livestock identification system, conduct sensitization campaign and conduct tagging 1 st wave of and tagging exercise; <i>Sensitization campaign to engage include at least 40% women and 40% youth.</i>	Output Indicator 2.2.4: Proportion of livestock with identification tag Baseline: 0 Target: April 2020: 50%		Format for livestock identification system adopted by June 2019
	Output 2.3 Enhanced capacity of Land Commission Members, Regional MDFT ¹¹ Alkalos and local chiefs to facilitate community dialogue and	Output Indicator 2.3.1 Percent of local Alkalos and Chiefs with skills to resolve dispute through dialogue Baseline: TBD through baseline survey	Project M&E reports (quarterly and annually)	Number of village and district authorities with knowledge on new land reforms and dispute

¹¹ Multi-Disciplinary Facilitation Team of the regions support

	<p>resolve land disputes</p> <p>List of activities under this Output:</p> <p>2.3.1 Consultations with local chiefs on state of land conflicts</p> <p>2.3.2 Capacity needs assessment of local communities on land dispute resolution</p> <p>2.3.3 Sensitization and Training of Chiefs, Alkaios, Land Commission members and VDCs in capacity gaps</p> <p>2.3.4 Development on guidelines for local land dispute resolution in local languages</p>	<p>Target: TBD based on baseline survey findings</p> <p>Output Indicator: 2.3.2 Number of disputes resolved through traditional system</p> <p>Baseline: TBD through baseline survey</p> <p>Target: TBD based on baseline survey findings</p> <p>Output indicator: 2.3.3 Number of female and male familiar with different conflict systems in the communities</p> <p>Baseline: TBD by baseline survey</p> <p>Target: TBD based on baseline survey findings</p>	<p>Project M&E reports quarterly and annually</p>	<p>resolution</p> <p>Available and use of guidelines on land conflict resolution in local languages</p>
--	--	--	---	---

ml

Annex C: Checklist of project implementation readiness

Question	Yes	No	Comment
1. Have all implementing partners been identified?	x		
2. Have TORs for key project staff been finalized and ready to advertise?		x	
3. Have project sites been identified?	x		
4. Have local communities and government offices been consulted/ sensitized on the existence the project?	x		
5. Has any preliminary analysis/ identification of lessons learned/ existing activities been done?	x		
6. Have beneficiary criteria been identified?	x		
7. Have any agreements been made with the relevant Government counterparts relating to project implementation sites, approaches, Government contribution?		x	
8. Have clear arrangements been made on project implementing approach between project recipient organizations?	x		
9. What other preparatory activities need to be undertaken before actual project implementation can begin and how long will this take?		N/A	

ML

Annex D: Detailed and UNDG budgets (attached Excel sheet)

PK

Annex D - PBF project budget

Note: If this is a budget revision, insert extra columns to show budget changes.

Table 1 - PBF project budget by Outcome, output and activity

Outcome/ Output number	Outcome/ output/ activity formulation:	Budget by recipient organization in USD - FAO	Budget by recipient organization in USD - UNDP	Percent of budget for each output reserved for direct action on gender equality (if any):
OUTCOME 1: Local and national authorities adopt strengthened, inclusive legislative and policy frameworks for land and natural resources dispute resolution transfer and				
Output 1.1:	Strengthened frameworks for LNR governance and conflict resolution			60
Activity 1.1.1:	Assess policy, legal and institutional frameworks for the governance of LNR in The gambia against internationally accepted standards and best practises, including gender equitable land governance	30,000		
Activity 1.1.2:	Conduct empirical assessment of judicial and non judicial greivance mechanisms relating to Land disputs in The Gambia	35,000		
Activity 1.1.3:	Organise inclusive and participatory stakeholders consultation with a view to identify key causes of LNR conflict	5,000		
Activity 1.1.4:	Revise legislative frameworks and related policies	35,000		
Output 1.2:	Capacity of National and local institutions strengthened to enforce inclusive LNR governance and conflict resolution mechanisms			40
Activity 1.2.1:	Train national and local authorities in the application of inclusive LNR frameworks	50,000		
Activity 1.2.2:	Increase capacity of LNR institutions to facilitate LNR-conflict resolution	55,000		
Activity 1.2.3:	Gender and youth desk established at Ministry of Justice and regional levels	15,000		
Output 1.3:	Increased awareness of authorities and communities on revised legal frameworks/policies			40
Activity 1.3.1:	Advocate at national and local level for adoption and application of revised LNR frameworks	18,200		
Activity 1.3.2:	Conduct sensitization of community members on legal and statutory frameworks through media channels	50,000		
TOTAL \$ FOR OUTCOME 1:		293,200		

OUTCOME 2: National authorities and communities use dispute resolution mechanisms to address LNR disputes in conflict hot spots,				
Output 2.1: Information system to track land disputes and to inform policy and investments established				40
Activity 2.1.1:	Introduce and agree on scope and format of information system for the tracking of land disputes	100,000		
Activity 2.1.2:	Provide needed equipment and train concerned national and regional actors to populate and maintain information system	50,000		
Output 2.2: Strengthened capacity of rural communities to prevent conflict LNR disputes				
Activity 2.2.1:	Build consensus on re-demarcation of cattle tracks with established watering point in conflict regions (WCR & CRR);	179,626		60
Activity 2.2.2:	Re-demarcate forest parks and enhance community in conflict regions (WCR & CRR);	100,000		
Activity 2.2.3:	Establish livestock identification system, conduct sensitization campaign and conduct tagging 1 st wave of and tagging exercise	100,000		
Output 2.3: Enhanced capacity of Alkalos and local chiefs to facilitate community dialogue and resolve land disputes				60
Activity 2.3.1	Consultations with local chiefs on state of land conflicts	16,000		
Activity 2.3.2	Capacity needs assessment of local communities on land dispute resolution	20,000		
Activity 2.3.3	Sensitization and Training of Chiefs, Alkalos and VDCs in capacity gaps	21,211		
Activity 2.3.4	Development of guidelines for local land dispute resolution in local languages (UNDP)		280,374	
TOTAL \$ FOR OUTCOME 2:		586,837	280,374	
Project personnel costs if not included in activities above		54,000		
Project operational costs if not included in activities above		24,000		
Project M&E budget		70,000		
SUB-TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET:		1,028,037	280,374	
Indirect support costs (7%):		71,962.59	19,626.18	
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET:		1,100,000	300,000	

Table 2 - PBF project budget by UN cost category

Note: If this is a budget revision, insert extra columns to show budget changes.

CATEGORIES	Amount Recipient Agency FAO		Amount Recipient Agency UNDP		Amount Recipient Agency XX		Total tranche 1	Total tranche 2	PROJECT TOTAL
	Tranche 1 (70%)	Tranche 2 (30%)	Tranche 1 (70%)	Tranche 2 (30%)	Tranche 1 (70%)	Tranche 2 (30%)			
1. Staff and other personnel	37800.0	16200.0	0	0			37800	16200	54000
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	66938.0	28688.0	0	0			66938	28688	95626
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture (including Depreciation)	69981.1	29991.9	0	0			69981	29992	99973
4. Contractual services	361700.0	69300.0	56016	24007			417716	93307	511023
5. Travel	76606.6	32831.4	59500	25500			136107	58331	194438
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	94700.0	126300.0	65100	41251			159800	167551	327351
7. General Operating and other Direct Costs	11900.0	5100.0	6300	2700			18200	7800	26000
Sub-Total Project Costs	719626	308411	186916	93458			906542	401869	1308411
8. Indirect Support Costs (must be 7%)	50374	21589	13084	6542			63458	28131	91589
TOTAL	769999	330000	200000	100000			970000	430000	1400000

1100000 300000

0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07