United Nations
Peacebuilding

PBF PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT
COUNTRY: Myanmar
TYPE OF REPORT: SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL SEMI-ANNUAL
DATE OF REPORT: JANUARY TO JUNE 2018

Project Title: Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee - Support Platform Project (JMC-SPP)	
Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:	

PBF project modality:	**If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:**
☒ IRF ☐ PRF	☐ Country Trust Fund ☐ Regional Trust Fund **Name of Recipient Fund:**

List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc):
UN/DP: UNDP is the project administrator of the Project Initiation Plan (PIP), and the project is co-led with UNRCO, utilising DPA/MSU's ceasefire expertise
List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:
The Responsible Party is the Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee - Technical Secretariat Center (JMC-TSC) receiving the funds on behalf of the tri-partite JMC. The JMC is comprised of signatories of the Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) with represeatives of the Government, including the Tatmadaw / Myanmar Armed Forces and Ethnic Armed Organisations (EAOs). The JMC is also in the process of identifying Local Ceasefire Monitors (LCMs) who will monitor the ceasefire at local levels and be trained by Civil Society and Community Based Organisations (CSO, CBOs)

Project commencement date[1]: The PBF-IRF funding was received 14 December 2016, the IRF began 1 January 2017, and the JMC-SPP PIP began formally on 1 April 2017
Project duration in months:[2] The IRF duration is proposed as 24 months (14-Dec-16 to 13-Dec-18), with two six-month no-cost extensions in 2018; the PIP is 24 months, initially 1-Apr-17 to 31-Mar-18, then entended 1 more year to 31-Mar-19

Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below:
☐ Gender promotion initiative
☐ Youth promotion initiative
☐ Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions
☐ Cross-border or regional project

Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization):
PBF: $ 2,363,641
JPF : $ 2,996,607
NORWAY : $ 946,803
UNDP : $ 300,000
Total: $ 6,607,051

*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

---

[1] Note: 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.

How many tranches have been received so far: 1; the request for tranche 2 was subnmitted

Report preparation:
Project report prepared by: Adrian Morrice, Chief Technical Adviser / Project Manager; Cleared by Aung Naing Oo, Executive Director, JMC-TSC; Seng Pan, Deputy Executive Director, JMC-TSC; Joerg Stahlhut, Chief of Governance and Sustainable Peace Unit, UNDP; Peter Barwick, Peace and Development Advisor, UNRCO
Project report approved by: Peter Batchelor, Country Director, UNDP
Did PBF Secretariat clear the report:
Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report:
Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach: The UN has supported several assessment exercises for the JMC, including two Technical Needs Assessments - TNA1 in 2017, and TNA2 is ongoing. These looked at the JMC's progress on NCA implementation. Two micro-capacity assessments were also conducted, reviewing JMC institutional capacity - HACT1 in 2017, and HACT2 in 2018. A Project Management Lessons Review (PMR) was completed in July 2018, to be used to guide the transition from the Phase 1 JMC-SPP to Phase 2 JMC's Multi-Support Platform (JMC-MSP). A Functional Needs Assessment (FNA) was completed in July 2018, to review the JMC's needs and options to transition to Phase 2 JMC-MSP. It identified new posts, new policies and other capacities and processes the TSC might need to perform all programme finance, donor fund management and programme governance, much of which is currently carried out by or jointly with UN/DP. The final PBF independent project evaluation process has been initiated, to review the full PIP project outputs.

PART 1: RESULTS PROGRESS

1.1   Overall project progress to date

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit):
The project – a Project Initiation Plan (PIP) mechanism – began from 1 April 2017. Designed to be a 1-year initial project before a 2-year subsequent phase, in its 13th meeting in November 2017 the JMC decided to begin steps to transition to a JMC-managed funding mechanism. Subsequent details were outlined in its 14th and 15th meetings in January and March. At the same time, implementation on both the JMC and UN/DP sides has been slower than planned in the results, activities, budget and indicators, the reasons for which have been outlined in quarterly progress reports.
Following the JMC-U decisions, on 3 April 2018 the project board then endorsed several new elements of the project timeline and implementation cycle: 1) in response to a 7 February 2018 request to the UN from the three JMC-U joint Chairs, the PIP project overall was extended 12 months with an annual work plan to March 2018, approved by UNDP headquarters; 2) two donors – the Joint Peace Fund (JPF) and Norway – decided on 19 February to proceed with a 6-month no-cost extension, concluding on 30 September, and; 3) a 6-month extension to TSC as Responsible Party was made with a new Letter of Agreement to 30 September, decided by resolution in the JMC-Union level 15th meeting 21-23 March. From 1 October the JMC would transition to Phase 2, a JMC-managed Multi-Support Platform (JMC-MSP). On 26 July the JMC hosted stakeholders and potential donors for a Call for Contributions towards the JMC-MSP.

Given the recent/current political/peacebuilding/ transition situation/ needs in the country, has the project been/ does it continue to be **relevant** and well placed to address potential conflict factors/ sources of tensions/ risks to country's sustaining peace progress? Please illustrate. If project is still ongoing, are any adjustments required? (1500 character limit)
The JMC and project continue to be relevant and well placed to address state / region and local level mitigation, prevention and resolution of armed conflict. At JMC-U/S levels the output has largely been achieved, for JMC set up, carrying out its core functions. The JMC-U convened according to its schedule and met 3 times during the 6 months. Five JMC-S committees are fully established and meet monthly, to jointly problem solve and create trust. Each JMC-S committee has conducted at least one community public consultation per month. The JMC is putting in place fundamental elements of a joint peace architecture learning organisation, which allows it to make adjustments to its policies and practices. It utilizes monitoring, reporting and negotiation strategies that lead to regular consultation and feedback among the signatory parties to address issues. It is also moving towards more decentralisation on some issues to aid implementation in a manner customised to each state and local level situation.
Yet only 2/10 planned JMC-L committees are established, and no armed group demarcation and disengagement has been jointly agreed. Agreeing JMC-L location and composition is a political and generally confidential negotiation, impacted by broader political currents. The

JMC has responded by adjusting original plans and budgets, while continuing dialogue and planning, including for local monitors in the 2 established local committees.

In a few sentences, summarize **what is unique/ innovative/ interesting** about what this project is trying/ has tried to achieve or its approach (rather than listing activity progress) (1500 character limit).
The JMC is a particularly risky yet necessary project, given the legacy of over 60 years armed conflict, and the interplay of political, security and economic (legal and illegal) activities that are at stake, and the current lack of progress on interim arrangements. Armed clashes have reduced in NCA signatory areas, and committee members state that some trust and confidence is beginning to be built, though evidence of this also awaits a community level perception survey. With ceasefire support globally normally led by political-military and peacekeeping-related actors and instruments in UN mission settings, this project uses a development mechanism, with challenges and opportunites in this approach.
Inside the joint structures, three key elements are emerging: 1) growing responsibility, cohesion and effectiveness of the civilian members, who while recommended by one side or the other, seek to function independently, in the interests of the NCA; 2) slow but continuing development of the local civilian monitor concept under the two JMC-L committees, and; 3) the institutional development that is being felt in the U/S/L technical secretariat centre, which backstops the whole operation, makes possible the conduct of all committee and other meetings, trainings and verifications, and manages all finances, procurement and administration.

Considering the project's implementation cycle, please **rate this project's overall progress towards results to date**:
on track

In a few sentences summarize **major project peacebuilding progress/results** (with evidence), which PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):
Although broader political challenges remain unresolved, and armed conflict between some signatories continues, the elements of Myanmar's only and first joint subnational peace architecture are now coming into place, reducing armed conflict in signatory areas.
JMC-State committees are now conducting regular public consultations at the village level, commanders and former combatants wearing the same blue JMC vest, briefing on their joint responsibilities to implement provisions of the military code of conduct, including its protection of civilian provisions.
The JMC has demonstrated by its actions that joint decision making among former combatants is possible, contributing to a path to end some of the world's longest lasting civil wars. It has shown the importance of joint peace institutions to implementing peace agreements.

In a few sentences, explain how the project has made **real human impact**, that is, how did it affect the lives of any people in the country – where possible, use direct quotes that PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):
Although slower than planned, an ambitious roll out of local level joint (Tatmadaw, EAO and civilian member) committee structures has begun with two offices becoming operational. They will be accompanied by local civilian monitors who are being identified and a curriculum developed to train them, with support from civil society and community based organisations.

If the project progress assessment is **on-track**, please explain what the key **challenges** (if any) have been and which measures were taken to address them (1500 character limit).
Challenges remain: the continued roll out of the JMC-L and LCMs while slow, is getting attention from the JMC joint leaders, including curriculum development and SOPs; project management across and between national and international stakeholders, with Project Management Review recommendations aimed to be taken up in the coming months; armed group demarcation and disengagement training and dialogue plans continue; transition to phase 2 JMC-MSP, with a proposal and detailed plans being finalised for donor consideration, for funding agreements and fund transfer and donor allocation to follow.

If the assessment is **off-track**, please list main reasons/ **challenges** and explain what impact this has had/will have on project duration or strategy and what **measures** have been taken/ will be taken to address the challenges/ rectify project progress (1500 character limit):

Please attach as a separate document(s) any materials highlighting or providing more evidence for project progress (for example: publications, photos, videos, monitoring reports, evaluation reports etc.). List below what has been attached to the report, including purpose and audience. The annual progress report, required by the PIP document and project board terms of reference, is being completed and shared now; the QPR5 April to June project quarterly progress report is also being prepared, based first on JMC-TSC reporting

1.2 Result progress by project outcome

The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes. If your project has more approved outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.

<u>**Outcome 1:**</u> JMC is set up and carries out its core functions

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: *Describe main progress under this Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration), including major output progress (not all individual activities). If the project is starting to make/ has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context. Where possible, provide specific examples of change the project has supported/ contributed to as well as, where available and relevant, quotes from partners or beneficiaries about the project and their experience. (3000 character limit)?*
Outcome 1 contains the central purpose for this project and PBF expenditure: all of the funding required for the effective functioning of the JMC and its 4 core functions, namely the key instrument to implement provisions of the NCA, monitor adherence (of the parties) to the Military Code of Conduct, investigate alleged violations and undertake problem-solving functions. As mentioned above, at JMC-U/S levels, the outcome has largely been achieved. The JMC-U is fully established and passed its 2nd anniversary on 20 November 2017, meeting 3 times in January to June. The 5 JMC-S committees are now fully established (see attached LogFrame).

While only quantitative measures, the regular meetings and ability of the union and state level committees to continue collaboratively coming to decisions reflects the progressive creation of trust and cooperation among the tripartite membership. This is during a time with the perception of limited progress on the political front, some continuing allegations of

violations, and numerous complaint letters received, being verified and resolution sought. The JMC's Complaint Management System, operational since July 2017, allows the JMC to better understand the pattern of complaints. Nearly 80% of all 353 official complaints received were resolved and closed up to March 2018. At the local level, while 2 JMC-L committees were established during the first year of the project, 10 JMC-Ls was an original operational target, but political issues tied to the peace process are seen to have slowed progress.

In terms of the TSC, overall, the union and state level TSC offices are now operating at interim operational capability and the operational tempo of the TSC at all levels gained during the six months with the increasing number and regularity meetings, workshops and public outreach events. Progress of TSC local level office functioning has been slower; offices were arranged and equipped quickly, but staff recruitment has been challenging and the offices have required backstopping from TSC state level staff. Key administrative systems and policies were put in place in January to June, with support from the UN/DP-PMU. The procurement and installation of most TSC equipment and capital assets at the union and the state levels have largely been accomplished or are in process. The TSC-U continues to put in measures to support TSC-S offices to become operationally independent.

The JMC continued training and development activities during Year-1 to develop knowledge and skills of committee members and TSC staff, guided by the September 2017 UN TNA (see below). Other partners such as the Siem Reap based Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (CPCS) continue to provide technical expertise and support exposure visits.

Outcome 2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*
The JMC has continued to call on the UN to be one of its key partners in providing expert assistance across its core mandate areas. In part guided by the first TNA exercise, the JMC continued to carry out training and capacity building of its members, member organisations and technical staff. Much of the training is conducted in-house, and some with external expertise. It is important to note that determining and planning technical assistance for a tripartite political-security peace process entity such as the JMC is inherently sensitive. While the TNA is important, JMC members themselves need to assess and build their own internal consensus of priorities and plans.

During the January to June period, ceasefire technical assistance and capacity development activities of the UN/DP Project Management Unit (PMU) focused on four key areas: i.) facilitation, dialogue, mediation and negotiation skills: The PMU supported the Clingendael Academy, under its global partnership with UNDP, to hold the 2nd and 3rd Insider Mediation trainings with JMC members and staff in April and June; ii.) comparative international mine action experience: After coordinating with UNICEF and UN/DP PMU on the invitation, during February 2018 the JMC sent a 3-person delegation for the first time to the UN mine action conference in Geneva, Switzerland, to learn of demining experiences from other countries.; iii.) communications and media capacity development: the UN/DP-PMU supported the coordination, training development and conduct of the first media training for

JMC-U/S/L Secretaries who are mandated to speak to the media, with UN/DP, Joint Peace Fund (JPF) and other media experts.

Finally, the UN/DP-PMU coordinated the second UN TNA to support the JMC in identifying its technical and capacity needs. A year since the last assessment, the first of two field missions deployed in June, with the two same DPA/MSU ceasefire experts and a third Maj. Gen. (Retd.) expert joining. Their preliminary report was presented to the 17th JMC-U meeting 3 July.

Outcome 3:
JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: on track

Progress summary: *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*
Through the six months the UN/DP-PMU continued to act as a "one-stop window" for UN support to the JMC, harnessing and integrating inputs from across the UN system. It also succeeded in developing positive relationships with the JMC and TSC; constructive relationships steadily developed and enabled staff on both sides to openly discuss issues, operate flexibly when needed and frequently prevent, solve and mitigate problems.

UN/DP-JMC project management and institutional capacity development activities focused on:
i.) conduct of the second Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT2) micro-capacity assessments of the TSC: the assessment resulted in another moderate rating of the TSC, a good outcome for a new institution, while identifying gaps in the TSC's administrative policies and practices, primarily for financial management but also for programme management, staffing and procurement;
ii.) management of the cash-advance cash transfer system: the UN/DP-PMU supported the TSC's implementation of the cash advance system based on quarterly advances transferred only when reaching 80% or more expenditure, seeking to address over-budgeting and cash management, though challenged with a two currency requirement of the JMC and a single currency policy and methodology of UNDP;
iii.) institutional capacity development through UNDP 'SURGE' support: UN/DP-PMU deployed a second international expert from the UNDP global SURGE roster to provide international best practice advice and inputs into the development of TSC administrative and operational polices and systems, in particular on finance and anti-fraud measures and policies;
iv.) programme management and preparation for the transition to Phase 2 JMC-managed multi-channel support platform (JMC-MSP): the Project Management Review assesses issues for not only the current platform, but provided recommendations for the JMC and donors to consider to improve capacity and more efficient processes to manage and support this complex and unique ceasefire mechanism and platform for international engagement. The PMU experienced significant staff instability in the six months. At this time also, PMU needed to shift its focus from substantive issues to focus significant resources, as well as UN/DP management time, on the new vision for Phase 2. This undermined ceasefire capacity building and expert assistance, as well as institutional development assistance. Project management time and resources shifted to manage a 6-month no-cost extension for two donors, a six-month extension of the letter of agreement for the JMC-TSC, with a 12 month

extension to the PIP. All work plans, budgets and contracts were subsequently revised during February to April.

Outcome 4:

Rate the current status of the outcome progress: Please select one

Progress summary: *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

1.3   Cross-cutting issues

National ownership: How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit)	As above, the JMC tripartite committee members and all TSC staff are 100% Myanmar, and the government has representatives at all three U/S/L levels. The project is grounded in legitimate joint requests and approval: the JMC-U co-Chairs first requested UN support in February 2016; in March 2016 the State Counsellor also requested UN support; in November 2016 the JMC-U co-chairs requested PBF funds, and; the State Counsellor-led Joint Coordinating Body for peace process funding (JCB) approved the PIP in February 2017. The TSC contribute to and clear all reports, including this one. A role the parties requested the UN to perform was to facilitate cordinated international support, so that at inception the JMC-TSC could stay focused on implementing the NCA across its members. While the peak body is the JMC-U, the Project Board is key for fiduciary oversight and programme monitoring. The Project Board is not only unique in Myanmar, also possibly globally for ceasefire bodies. The PMU facilitated negotiation on board Terms of Reference (ToRs) which led to the UN co-lead the body with the Tatmadaw JMC-U Chair, who requested he be joined on the board by his co-chairs - the senior EAO General and the senior civilian member (Vice Chairs 1 and 2). Other JMC-U members routinely join the meetings to monitor and learn how it operates.
Monitoring: Is the project M&E plan on track? What monitoring methods and sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. *(1500 character limit)?*	The JMC continues to focus on its role as a monitoring body, one of the four core NCA functions. Ambition in this regard is substantial: it requires joint consensus-based civil-military processes. In the January to June period the M&E for the JMC continued to be the further development of its "MVR" efforts described above. The U bi-monthly and S monthly meetings remained primary mechanisms for reporting, evaluating and resolving complaints. These allow the parties to respond to local and regional armed conflict dynamics, and peace process progress. The set-up and impact of M&E project / donor systems have been more mixed. After the HACT1 baseline, HACT2 was completed in May. After the TNA1 baseline,

	the first field mission of TNA2 was complete in June. Most basic project M&E systems are in place, but no indicator criteria or community perception surveys have been set. There remains no full-time M&E capacity in the TSC, PMU, or JPF. The development approach of pre-set LogFrame indicators has not been broadly accepted by the JMC as adding value to the achievement of the JMC's core mandate. The PMR reported that it is accepted that indicator ambition has been too high. Attention has now been diverted to the Phase 2 transition and its new proposal, budget and LogFrame. The PMR provided analysis and recommended actions to address some of these issues to be learnt for Phase 2.
Evaluation: Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. *(1500 character limit)*	The PMU has received guidance from PBSO, and opened discussions on the final evaluation with UN/DP and JMC-TSC. The independent evaluation, required by the PBF-IRF, is planned to be conducted to cover the whole project (not just PBF funding) in project quarter 7 (October to December) and will be budgeted in the next annual work plan presented for approval to the next project board meeting.
Catalytic effects (financial): Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from whom and how much? If not, have any specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? *(1500 character limit)*	Yes, both by attracting the final funding and by helping establish what is (currently) Myanmar's most effective conflict resolution institution: former enemy combatants sitting across the table and identifying, negotiating and resolving disputes and alleged violations of the NCA, as well as having joint training on future NCA implementation, such as on disengagement of forces. PBF funding was also critical February to April by providing stability through the uncertain no-cost extension negotiation and re-drafting of all plans and agreements. The JMC-U's decision to move to the JMC-managed mechanism in phase 2 from 1 October presents challenges and opportunities for programme and donor finance and management, leaving less time for TSC capacity building, and to identify (see Functional Needs Assessment Report) and recruit new staff and approve new policies and systems to manage it. The PBF funds have already been catalytic to stabilise UN support to the TSC, while two other donors are ending their support from 30 September to fund the TSC directly under the JMC-MSP.
Catalytic effects (non-financial): Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. *(1500 character limit)*	Many challenges remain, but most strategic risks are beyond the JMC committees' mandate, and ceasefires between the Tatmadaw and now 10 EAOs have largely held. A multi-actor joint peace institution has been established and conflict resolution ToRs/SOPs have been agreed and many elements of the NCA and ToRs/SOPs are being implemented.
Exit strategy/ sustainability: What steps have been taken to prepare for end of	There is not yet a clear path to exit the PIP and for the JMC to move to its own JMC-MSP funding mechanism. The

project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? *(1500 character limit)*	TSC and PMU have been working together on the transition, with a notable transfer of greater leadership and direction to and by the TSC and its JMC-U policy-making body. The JPF have indicated they plan to fund the JMC directly from 1 October. Otherwise the UN awaits a new request for support from the peace process NCA signatories to consider future activities.
Risk taking: Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. *(1500 character limit)*	The JMC is a high risk yet necessary project, given the legacy of over 60 years armed conflict, the interplay of political, security and economic (legal and illegal) activities that are at stake, and the current lack of progress on interim arrangements. Armed clashes have reduced in NCA signatory areas, and members state that some trust and confidence is beginning to be built, though evidence of this is - to date - indirect.
Gender equality: In the reporting period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women's empowerment? *(1500 character limit)*	The JMC continued to take concerted efforts to strengthen the gender and inclusion provisions of its work (see attached LogFrame statistics). The civilian women members are significant because Myanmar Army and EAOs have few and seldom nominate women commanders as committee members, as well that civilian members are essential for the conflict resolution in the JMC setting in general, and are specifically receiving SGBV cases.
Other: Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? *(1500 character limit)*	A second no-cost-extension to 13 December has been submitted.

1.3: LogFrame Progress Table for PBF-IRF, 6-months January to June 2018

1.3 INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT: *Using the **Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments**- provide an update on the achievement of **key indicators** at both the outcome and output level in the table below (if your project has more indicators than provided in the table, select the most relevant ones with most relevant progress to highlight). Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation.* Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (300 characters max per entry)

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Jun 2018)[1]
Objective: **JMC effectively undertakes ceasefire monitoring in accordance with NCA and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law**			
Indicator 1. # and % of NCA violations addressed effectively against established criteria (criteria to be developed, with the TSC, including on civilian protection)	0# (0%)	100# from Apr 2017	**In Jan-Jun 2018**: • 132/174 or 76% NCA ceasefire violation cases were resolved/closed • Q4 had 63/83 cases; Q5 had 69/91 cases **Total since Apr 2017**: • 344/436 or 79% complaints received resolved/closed
Indicator 2. Perceptions of confidence of NCA signatories in the JMC against established criteria (criteria to be developed, with the TSC, including on jointness)	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	• Pending the establishment of criteria and baseline survey of JMC members and signatories
Indicator 3. % of public who express understanding of the JMC's mandate and functions in respective areas	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	• Pending community perception survey baseline
Result #1: JMC is set up and carries out its core functions			
Indicator 1.1: # and % of sampled ceasefire violations under the mandate of the JMC, where JMC members report being satisfied with the MVR process	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	• Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Indicator 1.2: % increase or decreases in reported incidents with analysis for increase/decrease	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	• Pending baseline

---

[1] Note that this data is provisional: this report precedes the reporting timeline of the JMC-TSC to the JMC-U, the JMC-TSC to the UN/DP, as well as the JMC-SPP to the project board. Final Jan-Jun 2018 data will appear when the approved annual progress report which includes Q4 (Jan-Apr 2018) is combined with Q5 progress report, covering Apr-Jun 2018.

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Jun 2018)[1]
Indicator 1.3: % of civilians who state that they (or someone they know) have reported violations into the ceasefire complaints mechanisms have been satisfied with the manner in which complaints were handled (Ranking to be developed for the satisfaction)	tbc (after baseline)	tbc (after baseline)	• Pending the establishment of ranking and baseline
Activity 1.1 The JMC tripartite mechanism established at central level in target states and in priority township locations			
Indicator 1.1.1: # of JMC committee bodies constituted and fully operational (against established criteria) at Union, State and Local levels (criteria to be developed)	n/a	1 JMC-U, 6 JMC-S and 10 JMC-L	• Pending the establishment of criteria **Total at end Jun 2018**: • 1x JMC-U • 5x JMC-S • 2x JMC-L
Indicator 1.1.2: # and % of women civilian members in JMC committee bodies at union, state and local levels (disaggregated by membership, i.e. Government/Tatmadaw, EOA, civilian)	tbc	30%	• Pending baseline and membership disaggregation • **At end Jun 2018**: 12%
Indicator 1.1.3: # and % of meetings held jointly (against established criteria including joint agenda-setting, meetings in mutually-agreed locations)	n/a	tbc	• Pending the establishment of criteria **In Jan-Jun 2018**: • 2 in Q4 + 1 in Q5= 3 JMC-U mgts • 14 in Q4 + 9 in Q5 = 23 JMC-S mgts • 2 in Q4 + 3 in Q5= 5 JMC-L mgts **Total at end Jun 2018**: • 16x JMC-U mtgs; • 15x JMC-S Shan mtgs; 17x JMC-S Tannitharyi mtgs; 16x JMC-S Kayin mtgs; 16x JMC-S Mon mtgs; 16x JMC-S Bago mtgs; • 8x JMC-L Langkho mtgs; 1x JMC-L Hpa'pun mtgs
Activity 1.2 JMC-TSC offices are functioning and staffed, at central level, in target states and in priority local areas			
Indicator 1.2.1: # of JMC TSC offices functional against established criteria (criteria to be developed)	n/a	1 TSC-U, 6 TSC-S and 10 TSC-L	• Pending the establishment of criteria **Total at end Jun 2018**: • 1x TSC-U • 5x TSC-S • 2x TSC-L

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Jun 2018)[1]
Indicator 1.2.2: # and % of women employed at TSC at all levels (disaggregated by role: management, programme, operations, and support services level (union, state, local) and location)	n/a	30%	• Pending disaggregation by role and location • Across JMC-TSC U/S/L, 36/93 female staff in Q4; 36/94 female staff in Q5 • **At end Jun 2018**: 38.5% TSC are female
Activity 1.3 The JMC undertakes MVR activities in response to ceasefire violations and complaints based on pilot SOPs for MVR complaint handling, verification and joint mobile monitoring			
Indicator 1.3.1: # of new SOPs drafted and applied that are informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law	n/a	5	• **Jan-Jun 2018**: 1x Q4 + 4x Q5 = 5x ToR/SOPs adopted • **Total adopted to Jun 2018**: 18 Adopted
Indicator 1.3.2: % and # of ceasefire issues/violations/complaints received by the JMC that are in the mandate of the JMC (disaggregated by source and type)	tbc	tbc	• Pending source and type disaggregation • This data is confidential between the parties
Indicator 1.3.3: # and % of ceasefire issues/violations/complaints verified by the JMC (disaggregated by source and type)	tbc	tbc	• Pending source and type disaggregation • See Indicator #1 above
Indicator 1.3.4: % and # of ceasefire issues/violations/complaints resolved by the JMC (disaggregated by source and type)	tbc	tbc	• Pending source and type disaggregation • See Indicator #1 above
Activity 1.4 JMC members and staff have knowledge and skills to implement core functions			
Indicator 1.4.1: Training curricula on MVR and related undertaking (interview case management case referrals etc.) developed and adopted by the JMC	n/a	tbc	**In Jan-Jun 2018**: • Q4: 1) Photography training for JMC-TSC Staffs; 2) media training for JMC-U/S/L trainings; 3) JMC orientation workshop; 4) Insider Mediation Training; 5) JMC EAO workshops; 6) JMC workshops; 7) Nepal trip; 8) Switzerland trip. • Q5: 1-2) 2nd & 3rd Insider Mediation Training; 3-6) 4 JMC orientations; 7) JMC orientations for JMC members; 8) JMC orientations for both side commanders and administrators; 9) JMC orientation for NMSP ; 10) MVR internal capacity building training • Events involved JMC members & TSC staffs at all levels

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Jun 2018)[1]
Indicator 1.4.2: # of JMC members and TSC and LCM staff completing function specific training courses on agreed curricula (disaggregated by topic/course, level and gender)	n/a	120	**In Jan-Jun 2018**: • In Q4 928 + 264 Q5 = **1,192**
Indicator 1.4.3: % of training participants who report increased levels of understanding of training topics following training (disaggregated by topic/course and gender)	n/a	tbc	• Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Indicator 1.4.4: # and % of JMC members and TSC and LCM staff who are satisfied with the training and capacity development initiatives (by type, by gender, by topic/workshop type)	n/a	tbc	• Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Activity 1.5 Communities in ceasefire areas understand the JMC core functions			
Indicator 1.5.1: # of regular joint public consultation by JMC (by location and type)	tbc	40	• Location and type of consultation shown in progress report tables **In Jan-Jun 2018**: • 18x Q4 + 17x Q5 = 35 Public consultations **Total since Apr 2017**: • **79** Public consultations
Indicator 1.5.2: # of civilians attending briefing meetings with JMC (disaggregated by sex, by location)	tbc	1 per month x 200 x 7 (S/L) locations per SOP (4000)	**In Jan-Jun 2018:** • In Q4 4,868/12,102 female + Q5 3,594/8,668 female = 8,462/24,024 female **Total since Apr 2017**: • 30,779 to-date (41% women)
Result #2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law			
Indicator 2.1: # and descriptions of instances in which training concepts were applied as reported by JMC members	n/a	tbc	• Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline
Indicator 2.2: Reflections of JMC members on the quality of technical assistance provided by the Platform (quality includes: usefulness, relevance, timeliness etc.)	n/a	tbc	• Pending JMC Member and Staff Survey baseline

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Jun 2018)[1]
Activity 2.1 The JMC is supported to draw a validated technical assistance provision plan			
Indicator 2.1.1: Multi annual technical assistance plan developed	n/a	Aug-17	• TNA1 report finalized and presented to JMC-U Sep-17; Report included a table of Recommendations on Technical Assistance (TA) and Capacity Development Plan (TA Matrix) • Through Jan-Jun 2018 the JMC continues to be guided in part by TNA1 report • TA plans have been approved in JMC-U bi-monthly meetings, including that JMC-U have directed TSC to develop a JMC Capacity Development Plan (Course Directive) • TNA2 mission funding was confirmed by the project board on 3 April 2018, new ToRs drafted, and the first of two missions deployed in June
Indicator 2.1.2: # and % and descriptions of recommendations from the TNA that are planned to be applied to the programme (by type of support)	n/a	10	• Baseline % was not finalised, nor how disaggregation by type of support would be counted • JMC-U does not track its decisions in relation to the TNA recommendations, but indirect indications are that the TNA process substantially contributes to the JMC committees' work, negotiations and joint decision-making
Activity 2.2 The JMC benefits from access to technical assistance, capacity-development and exposure to international comparative experience including on key cross-cutting areas			
Indicator 2.2.1: # of JMC TSC staff, JMC members and LCMs receive capacity development and support on cross-cutting issues (disaggregated by course, gender, function)	n/a	tbc	• Pending baseline, target setting and disaggregation by course, gender, function • JMC-U bi-monthly and JMC-S monthly meetings agree frequency and participation of military code of conduct training, including on protection of civilians and other cross-cutting topics • See Annual Progress Report for "Participants across JMC capacity building activities during Year 1" • Insider Mediation Training (IM2), Clingendael Academy with UN/DP support, Yangon, April • UN Ceasefire Mediation Course, with Norway support, 4 JMC participants (3 men, 1 women), Oslo, April

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Jun 2018)[1]
Indicator 2.2.2: # of JMC members and TSC staff participating in international training courses and in-country and foreign exchange visits (disaggregated by gender and type)	n/a	tbc	• See Annual Progress Report "Participants by group across JMC capacity building activities during Year 1" • See above (IM2, Oslo course)
Result #3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development			
Indicator 3.1: Project meets its bi-annual and annual financial delivery targets	n/a	n/a	• Financial delivery targets have been redeveloped in the context of the JMC request for the no-cost extension, with the AWP endorsed in the 4th project board meeting 3 April. • Delivery remains lower than planned, budgeting and planning challenges remain
Indicator 3.2: # and descriptions of Project Board recommendations that are applied to the Project	n/a	5	• 3 April board meeting had 4 endorsements, and the 25 June meeting had 1 action and 2 endorsements • Since April 2017: 4 project board meetings, with 4 action points and 12 endorsements were applied by the project
Activity 3.1 Core delivery and governance structures for the JMC support platform set up and maintained			
Indicator 3.1.1: Project is audited in line with UNDP corporate standards	n/a	1	• The JMC-TSC external audit field work was concluded in May and the draft and final reports in June 2018 • The JMC-SPP project will be audited per UNDP CO schedule
Activity 3.2 The administrative capacities of the TSC are strengthened			
Indicator 3.2.1: # of short-term consultants providing on-site support to TSC on institutional topics (by type)	n/a	5	• 2 part-time in-kind UNDP SURGE staff • 2 international and 1 national consultant • Other in-kind UNDP Country Office support • The second SURGE staff deployed Jan – Apr 18, focused on finance and anti-fraud policies, and advised on the design of the Project Management Review, and Functional Needs Assessment • 1 international consultant conducted Project Management Review in May, final report in June • 1 international and 1 national consultant formed

Results and activities / Indicators	Baseline	Targets (Yr 1)	Progress towards targets (Jan-Jun 2018)[1]
			Functional Needs Assessment team in late June, report in July
Indicator 3.2.2: # of training events on institutional topics (by type, # of participants and sex)	n/a	5	• The second SURGE staff conducted training on anti-fraud on 26 March 2018
Activity 3.3 Phase 2 JMC managed multi-channel funding systems and capacities are in place and tested			
Indicator 3.3.1: # and % and descriptions of key lessons learned through meetings with JMC, workshops and consultations	n/a	6	• When JMC articulated emerging plans for a Phase 2 with a JMC-managed funding mechanism, this activity focused on preparing for the transition • Jan to Mar 2018 meetings and consultations with JMC and donors on options to extend PIP project, and transition to Phase 2 • Drafted Overview of Capacity Development Approach, 23 March 2018, submitted to the 3rd Project Board meeting • Design of two independent assessments to support evidence-based decision-making for JMC's Phase 2 transition: i) Project Management Review, and ii) Functional Needs Assessment

PART 2: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS

2.1 Comments on the overall state of financial expenditures

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, delayed, or off track, vis-à-vis project plans and by recipient organization: *delayed*

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and what is the overall level of expenditure against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far (500 characters limit): One tranche (1st Tranche) out of 2 tranches has been received. The overall level of expenditures against the total budget is 58% and 83% against received first tranche

When do you expect to seek the next tranche, if any tranches are outstanding: As soon as possible

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters limit): Although there is 83% PBF first tranche utilisation rate, the overall project financial expenditure is delayed, as explained above, with several project extensions, and challenges in the peace process and ceasefire / NCA implementation, and the transition to the JMC's Phase 2 funding mechanism

Please state what $ amount was planned (in the project document) to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women's empowerment and how much has been actually allocated to date: As a start-up ceasefire project, M&E and financial systems were not designed to perform this tracking, however, gender equality is in-part embedded in the JMC's ToRs, and in their increasing success in attracting senior women managers in the TSC, and JMC-S and JMC-L women civilian committee members.

Please fill out and attach Annex A on project financial progress **with detail on expenditures/ commitments to date using the original project budget table in Excel**, even though the $ amounts are indicative only.

Activity	Activity Description	Sum of USD Amount
For the year of 2017		
Activity	**Activity Description**	**Sum of USD Amount**
	Unrealised Loss	1,675.41
Objective: JMC engages effectively in ceasefire monitoring in accordance with NCA and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
Output / Result #1: JMC has capacity to carry out its core functions		
ACTIVITY1.1	The JMC tripartite mechanism established at central level in target states/regions and in priority township locations	171,191.44
ACTIVITY1.2	JMC-TSC offices are functioning and staffed, at central level, in target states/ regions and in priority local areas	205,731.04
ACTIVITY1.3	The JMC undertakes MVR activities in response to ceasefire violations and complaints based on pilot SOPs for MVR, dispute resolution, confilct de-escalation and civilian monitoring	179,659.82
ACTIVITY1.4	JMC members and staff have knowledge and skills to implement core functions	173,853.70
ACTIVITY1.5	Communities in ceasefire areas understand the JMC core functions	86,717.88
Output / Result #2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
ACTIVITY2.1	The JMC is supported to draw a validated technical assistance provision plan	34,172.01
ACTIVITY2.2	The JMC benefits from access to technical assistance, capacity-development and exposure to international comparative experience including on key cross-cutting areas	39,708.57
ACTIVITY2.3	* See below	(1,680.11)
Output / Result #3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development		
ACTIVITY3.1	Core delivery and governance structures for the JMC support platform set up and maintained	(51,643.23)
ACTIVITY3.2	The administrative capacities of the TSC are strengthened	5,098.73
	Grand Total for Year 2017	**844,485.26**

Activity	Activity Description	Sum of USD Amount
For the year of 2018		
Activity	**Activity Description**	**Sum of USD Amount**
	Unrealised Gain	(7,950.38)
Objective: JMC engages effectively in ceasefire monitoring in accordance with NCA and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
Output / Result #1: JMC has capacity to carry out its core functions		
ACTIVITY1.1	The JMC tripartite mechanism established at central level in target states/regions and in priority township locations	149,984.80
ACTIVITY1.2	JMC-TSC offices are functioning and staffed, at central level, in target states/ regions and in priority local areas	48,069.38
ACTIVITY1.3	The JMC undertakes MVR activities in response to ceasefire violations and complaints based on pilot SOPs for MVR, dispute resolution, confilct de-escalation and civilian monitoring	35,694.68
ACTIVITY1.4	JMC members and staff have knowledge and skills to implement core functions	157,419.09
ACTIVITY1.5	Communities in ceasefire areas understand the JMC core functions	4,696.76
Output / Result #2: JMC's capacities are strengthened and informed by international humanitarian law and international human rights law		
ACTIVITY2.1	The JMC is supported to draw a validated technical assistance provision plan	-
ACTIVITY2.2	The JMC benefits from access to technical assistance, capacity-development and exposure to international comparative experience including on key cross-cutting areas	43,872.31
ACTIVITY2.3	* See below	1,680.11
Output / Result #3: JMC Support Platform Project facilitates support to the JMC through project management, quality assurance and institutional capacity-development		
ACTIVITY3.1	Core delivery and governance structures for the JMC support platform set up and maintained	72,260.85
ACTIVITY3.2	The administrative capacities of the TSC are strengthened	16,533.61
ACTIVITY3.3	The upcoming financial strategies for JMC support platform are designed and set up	7,264.77
	Grand Total of Year 2018	**529,525.98**

Contribution Received	**1,654,548.00**
Tranche 1 utilization rate	**83.0%**

* This sub activity was in the PIP document, but was removed in the September 2017 JPF UN2UN agreement, reflected in the first quarterly progress report and subsequently agreed in the first project board

Annex A to JMC-SPP PBF Mid-year Report:
Table 2: PBF Project Expenses By Cost Category, as of 13th May 2018

CATEGORIES	Amount Recipient Agency UNDP		Total tranche 1	Total tranche 2	PROJECT TOTAL
	Tranche 1 (70%)	Tranche 2 (30%)			
1. Staff and other personnel	300,671		300,671		343,065
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	35,685		35,685		2,636
3. Equipment, Vehicles, and Furniture (including Depreciation)	47,658		47,658		28,595
4. Contractual services	106,088		106,088		53,071
5.Travel, Workshops & Confereences	250,000		250,000		211,754
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	721,143		721,143		580,787
7. General Operating and other Costs	85,062		85,062		63,321
Sub-Total Project Costs	1,546,307		1,546,307		1,283,228
8. Indirect Support Costs (7%)	108,241	-	108,241		90,783
TOTAL	1,654,548		1,654,548		1,374,011