

**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): Nigeria	
Project Title: Integrated Approach to Building Peace in Nigeria's Farmer-Herder Crisis	
Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway (if existing project): 00113675	
PBF project modality: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRF <input type="checkbox"/> PRF	If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund (instead of into individual recipient agency accounts): <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): <u>UNDP, UN Women, FAO and OHCHR</u> List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:	
Expected project commencement date ¹ : January 2019 Project duration in months: ² 18 months Geographic zones (within the country) for project implementation: <u>Benue (Logo and Guma Local Government Areas), Nasarawa (Awe and Keana Local Government Area's) and Taraba States (Wukari and Ibi Local Government Area's).</u>	
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): UNDP: \$1,683,283.41 UN Women: \$321,058.85 FAO: \$692,890.54 OHCHR: \$302,767.20 Total: \$3, 000, 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):	

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.

PBF 1st tranche (%) Recipient: UNDP: \$1,178,298.39 UN Women: \$ 321,058.85 FAO: \$485,023.38 OHCHR: \$302,767.20 Total: \$2,287,147.82	PBF 2nd tranche* (%) UNDP: \$504,985.02 UN Women: - FAO: \$207,867.16 OHCHR: - Total: 712,852.18	PBF 3rd tranche* (%) N/A
<p>Two-three sentences with a brief project description and succinct explanation of how the project is time sensitive, catalytic and risk-tolerant/ innovative: This project supports Benue, Nasarawa and Taraba states in addressing the farmer-herder crisis through: enhancing their preventive capacities by promoting dialogue and proactive engagement; building mutually beneficial economic relationships between farmers and herders following years of deadly conflict with thousands of casualties and destruction of property; improving the effectiveness of the security response through strengthened human rights monitoring and accountability; and providing an impartial and evidence-based narrative to defuse the politicized debate and help mobilize a broader response.</p> <p>The project is time sensitive especially as the implementation is timely – it comes at a period when the farmer-herder crisis has heightened across the Middle Belt and extending to other parts of the country therefore, efforts through this project is expected to yield positive results in reducing the violent conflict which has been the trend for over a decade – the risk threshold of the project is low especially as the project is being implemented with UN partner agencies where each agency is contributing to the project from their core mandate and specialty using the one area approach in implementing the project and, the State and Federal Governments have indicated full-buy in to the project. The project is utilizing the Farmers Feed School model in implementing trainings for farmers across the three states while working closely with other UN Agencies such as ILO, IOM not initially included in the Project Document through the modality of using the United Nations inter-agency agreement in the implementation of vocational trainings across the three states to enhance the cohesive relationship between farmers and herders and improve the livelihood opportunities at agricultural/pastoral interface to incentivize farmer-herder cooperation.</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, including whether civil society and target communities were consulted and how:</p> <p>Multiple missions to the affected states have built the groundwork for conceptualizing this project. In addition, it builds off experiences and expertise amongst the four UN agencies involved in doing similar work in other areas in Nigeria and beyond. Prior to submission of this first draft, the four agencies have engaged the liaison officers and focal points of all three states, as well as the Ministry for Budget and National Planning.</p> <p>Consultation processes since the inception of the project has included Civil Society Organization implementing on the farmer-herder crisis and Early Warning Early Response in the Middle Belt, the local communities across the states especially the target communities in Logo and Guma LGA's of Benue State, Awe and Keana LGA's of Nasarawa State and Wukari and Ibi LGA's of Taraba State – consultations have included cluster meetings with CSO's and community dialogue meetings with the communities. The UN also engaged the Ministry of Agriculture and the Office of the Vice President in charge of the development of the 10 Year National Livestock Transformation Plan (NLTP- 2019-2028) and contributed to ensuring the NLTP considered the peacebuilding and empowerment of herders and farmers and as well as emphasized synergies and partnerships with stakeholders.</p> <p>The Project Steering Committee has been established and the Inaugural meeting conducted (– please see Annotative Agenda attached).</p>		
<p>Project Gender Marker score: <u>2</u>³</p> <p>Specify % and \$ of total project budget allocated to activities in direct pursuit of gender equality and women's empowerment: <u>\$928,596.50 (32.9%)</u></p>		

³ Score 3 for projects that have gender equality as a principal objective and allocate at least 80% of the total project budget to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE)

Score 2 for projects that have gender equality as a significant objective and allocate at least 30% of the total project budget to GEWE

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

Project Risk Marker score: 2¹

The project is implementing using an innovative approach utilising an area-based approach working closely with four (4) NGO's in a consortium model and establishing prototypes in each state with the farmers and herders forming into cooperatives and linked to markets utilising a Public Private Partnerships.

- i. The three states (Benue, Nasarawa and Taraba States) are actively engaged and committed to the success of the project – the Governors of all three states have appointed focal persons.

Select PBF Focus Areas which best summarizes the focus of the project (*select ONLY one*): 2.3 - Conflict Prevention/Management²

If applicable, UNDAF outcome(s) to which the project contributes: Outcome 2: Humanitarian Response, Peacebuilding and Security.

If applicable, Sustainable Development Goal to which the project contributes: Goal 16.5.

If applicable, National Strategic Goal to which the project contributes: Pillar 3 on creating an enabling environment through Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention in the National Livestock Transformation Plan (NLTP)

Type of submission:

- ☐ New project
☒ Project amendment

If it is a project amendment, select all changes that apply and provide a brief justification:

Extension of duration: ☒ Additional duration in months (number of months and new end date): Six (6) months - 16 December 2020

Change of project outcome/ scope: ☐

Change of budget allocation between outcomes or budget categories of more than 15%: ☒

Additional PBF budget: ☐ Additional amount by recipient organization:

Brief justification for amendment:

- I. This project experienced significant delays during the first year of implementation. This was largely due to the political situation in the country as a result of the 2019 general elections. With key national counterparts at Federal and State level engaged in the electioneering politics (Benue and Taraba were key battleground states), it was challenging to get the project off the ground – especially Output 1 which involved working very closely with senior government officials in the establishment of peace agencies at state level.
- II. Following the electoral cycle that culminated in July 2019, the participating UN Agencies used the 3rd and 4th quarter of 2019 to initiate key enabling actions that would form the basis for accelerated delivery. This included stakeholder sensitizations, advocacy and re-engagement with State level officials to ensure local leadership and ownership of the programme. Secondly, key consultations with community stakeholders were convened to refine the project priority areas – determine the geographical focus at local government level and profile the beneficiaries for economic empowerment

¹ Risk marker 0 = low risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

² 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)

	<p>pillars of the programme. Thirdly, the project commissioned key baseline mapping exercises as a basis upon which specific programmatic responses would be designed. Lastly recruitment of key human resource capacities was initiated to ensure effective project implementation and management. These efforts have been sustained in the first quarter of 2020 albeit undermined by the COVID19 pandemic.</p> <p>III. With COVID 19 global pandemic, and subsequent spread of the disease in the 3 project states, programme activities at the various locations have come to a halt. The disease containment measures at Federal and State levels including complete ban on inter-state travels have necessitated the halting of programme activities. This has had a bearing on pace of delivery largely because significant amount of the activities require people-to-people interaction and stakeholder engagement which goes against the social and physical distancing and other restrictive measures.</p> <p>IV. While recognising the lost time (before and during this COVID19 period), a no-cost extension of 9 months is requested with a project end date of December 2020 – and final reporting the much needed closure and evaluations taking place during the 1st Quarter of 2021.</p> <p>V. The project activities will be implemented in accordance to the approved project document and the reason for the No-Cost Extension is to grant enough time for the full implementation of project activities which remain extremely relevant in creating a conducive environment for COVID19 response and post-COVID19 planning and recovery; while also addressing residual conflict risks which existed prior to the outbreak of the pandemic.</p> <p>VI. Key activities, as per the original results framework, will include operationalising mechanisms for early detection of conflict risks, and will be adjusted to include new risks emerging due to COVID19, without affecting original budget or outcome: enhancing preventative capacities of state and non-state actors through establishment or strengthening Peace infrastructures one specific area is the expanded scope of the ICT-based EWERS to integrate health, environment and food security dynamics into the conflict risk model for monitoring and response at state and LGA levels and rebuilding mutually beneficial economic relationships between farmers and herders through social cohesion activities and sustained dialogue. COVID has threatened livelihoods in the Region with threat to food security. As such implementing the initially planned livelihood and economic empowerment activities in the Project states will help strengthen livelihood resilience in the face of COVID pandemic. A total of US\$484,000 which was already budgeted for normal Project implementation as earlier explained will support Project adjustment for COVID-related new risks.</p> <p>VII. To accelerate delivery over the next 6 months and complement state level capacities, key partnership arrangements have also been brokered through a consortium of strategically selected CSO's (<i>Search for Common Ground, Mercy Corps, Humanitarian Dialogue and West Africa Network for Peacebuilding -WANEP</i>) as responsible parties to work alongside UN agencies. These NGO's have extensive experience implementing peace building initiatives across Nigeria and especially in the Middle Belt, and their collaborative and comparative advantage building on ongoing efforts will ensure accelerated delivery, while also enhancing coordination for greater impact.</p> <p>VIII. The NCE will not affect the project budget, nor the submission of the project deliverables. The project budget will be extended for the period of this No-Cost Extension and will cover minor human resource and administrative costs within the budget flexibility terms.</p> <p>IX. Budget revision is needed to adjust the internal allocation among different budget categories under FAO's budget component. This adjustment is needed to align better the requirements for carrying out the activities to be implemented by FAO and does not affect either the project outcomes or the overall FAO budget allocation.</p>
--	--

PROJECT SIGNATURES:

Recipient Organization(s)⁶ Mohamed Yahya Signature  Resident Representative in Nigeria United Nations Development Programme Date & Seal 24-Jul-2020	Recipient Organization Comfort Lamprey Signature  Resident Representative in Nigeria UN Women Date & Seal 02/07/20
Recipient Organization AlHassan Cisse Signature  Country Representative in Nigeria a.i. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Date & Seal 01/07/2020	Recipient Organization Michelle Bachelet Signature  The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Date & Seal 23 July 2020 
Head of UN Country Team Edward Kallon Signature  Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator United Nations System in Nigeria Date & Seal 27/07/2020	Representative of National Authorities Prince Clem Agba Signature  Honourable Minister of State, Budget and National Planning Date & Seal
Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) Oscar Fernandez-Taranco Signature  Assistant Secretary-General, Peacebuilding Support Office Date & Seal November 2, 2020	

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

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.
- 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.

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).
- 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.

- 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.

(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.

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.

- 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**.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

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.

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 close 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 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>).

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 been refunded and a notification sent to the Administrative Agent, no later than three months (31 March) of the year following the completion of the activities.

Ownership of Equipment, Supplies and Other Property

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

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 project⁷
- Demonstrates at least 3 years of experience in the country where grant is sought
- Provides a clear explanation of the CSO's legal structure, including the specific entity which will enter into the legal agreement with the MPTFO for the PBF grant.

⁷ Annualized PBF project budget is obtained by dividing the PBF project budget by the number of project duration months and multiplying by 12.

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

Outcomes	Outputs	Indicators	Means of Verification/ frequency of collection	Indicator milestones
Outcome 1: Effective and gender-sensitive infrastructure for peace in place at the state level to support conflict prevention		Outcome Indicator 1 a. Number of peacebuilding structures established per state and percentage of women and youth participating in these structures Baseline: 0 Target: 3 (1 per state; 35% women/youth participation)	Constitution meeting minutes, PB structure reports	6 months: Agreements with governor's offices on PB structures 12 months: PB structure constitution meeting held in each state
		Outcome Indicator 1 b. Percentage of women and youth surveyed who perceive that peace infrastructure adequately reflects and addresses their concerns Baseline: 0 Target: 50% women/youth	Survey reports monitoring CSO	6 months: Monitoring CSO baseline survey complete 12 Months: 50% of gender sensitization workshops completed
		Outcome Indicator 1c. Percentage of conflicts reported through EVERS in project area and percentage of reports responded to by Peacebuilding structures Baseline: 0	Monitoring CSO's reports, EVERS data outputs	6 months: ICT component of EVERS complete 12 months: PB structures linked and sensitized to EVERS system

		Target: 50% capture; 25% response		
	<p>Output 1.1 Establishment of state-level agency/commission/structure to drive gender-sensitive peacebuilding agenda</p> <p>List of activities under this Output:</p> <p>Mapping and review of State Agencies / Commission / structures, CSOs engaged in peace and security, and existing EWEERS available in the states and make practical recommendations</p> <p>Advocacy and provision of technical support to establish an Agency / Commission / structure</p> <p>Inter-state exchange for learning and sharing of good practices</p> <p>Output 1.2 State peacebuilding Agency / Commission / structure supported to drive gender-sensitive response to farmers-herders crisis</p>	<p>Output Indicator 1.1.1 Number of agreements with state governors' offices on supporting the establishment of agency/commission/structure</p> <p>Baseline: 0 Target: 3 agreements</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.2.1 Number of institutions supported to drive gender sensitive response</p> <p>Baseline: 0 Target: 15 (at least 5 per state)</p>	<p>Signed agreements, law/or decree establishing the agency, public statements by state officials, press releases</p> <p>Perception survey by monitoring CSOs, meeting/workshop minutes, letters of appreciation, interim monitoring reports provided to project</p>	<p>6 months: 1 signed agreement for each state 12 months: n/a activity completed</p> <p>6 months: key institutions needing support identified 12 months: 50% of identified institutions have received needed support</p>

	List of activities under this Output:		partners and structures	
	Support through facilitating coordination meetings with ministries, departments, CSOs/CBOs, traditional and religious institutions, and women and youth networks to promote coordination around peace			
	<p>Targeted support to peacebuilding Agency / Commission / structure in operationalizing relevant elements of UNSCR 1325</p> <p>Support to CSOs to engage in community monitoring activities on farmers-herders crisis and reporting to peacebuilding Agency / Commission / structure</p> <p>Targeted support to enable early response from Agency / Commission / structure based on early warning signs to promote gender-sensitive dialogue and mediation as a first step to resolving a crisis</p>	<p>Output Indicator/dialogues led by peacebuilding structure</p> <p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: 5 documented dialogue interventions</p>	<p>Dialogue records, local level agreements</p>	<p>6 months: dialogue training protocol for PB structures developed</p> <p>12 months: dialogue sensitization and support to PB structures initiated</p>

	Output 1.3 Gender-sensitive early warning and early response capacity developed, supported and improved	Output Indicator 1.3.1 Number of functional EVERS established Baseline: 0 Target: 3 (1 EVERS per state receives warnings, processes data and communicates threat to appropriate offices to initiate response)	Procurement report of completion of EVERS, EVERS database for logged warnings, threats transmitted, responses initiated	6 months: ICT component of EVERS complete 12 months: EVERS generating reports and linked to PB structures
	<p>List of activities under this Output:</p> <p>Develop and implement ICT-based EVERS</p> <p>Capacity building and system strengthening to the EWER institutions in target states</p> <p>Advocacy at national and state levels with top government officials and security agencies to enhance effective response to conflict early warnings</p>			
	Output 1.4 Constructive dialogue promoted through interethnic and inter-religious exchanges	Output Indicator 1.4.1 Number of verifiable peacebuilding activities achieved Baseline: 0 Target: 30	CSO monthly assessments document progress	6 months: CSO baseline completed and activities agreed 12 months: 50% of activities delivered
	List of activities under this Output:			

	<p>Support one CSO to build capacity and raise awareness with traditional rulers and religious leaders on peaceful coexistence, strengthening local level conflict prevention mechanisms, convening town hall meetings, and providing safe spaces for dialogue to take place.</p> <p>Consultative meetings with stakeholders on legislation around open grazing</p> <p>Sensitization and awareness raising activities amongst pastoralists, crop farmers, and members of the public on the cost of conflict and economic benefits of peaceful coexistence</p>	<p>Output Indicator 1.4.2 Number of relevant state institutions provided with validated outputs from open grazing consultations</p> <p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: 4 (at least 2 institutions in 2 states)</p>	<p>Meeting declarations, Response letters from State institutions</p>	<p>6 months: Consultation protocol agreed with relevant state agencies</p> <p>12 months: Initial round of consultations completed in 3 states</p>
Outcome 2: Strengthening Economic Interdependence between farmers and herders		<p>Outcome Indicator 2 a. No of new co-operative initiatives between farmers and herders demonstrating mutually beneficial economic interdependence.</p> <p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: 3 instances of new cooperation</p>	<p>Project report with pictures</p>	<p>6 months: Sensitization of planned assessments, pilots and project activities with key institutions, associations and private sector initiated</p> <p>12 months: high level recommendations brief</p>

			prepared to underpin advocacy
--	--	--	-------------------------------

Output 2.1 Improved land, fodder/feedstock and water management to reduce competition over natural resources		Outcome Indicator 2 b. No of target States that adopt concepts of pasture and alternative fodder system for scale-up	Project report	6 months: Discussions on project livelihoods and economic interventions held with relevant state agencies 12 months: Key recommendations arising from surveys, pilots and projects activity provided to relevant state agencies and workshops/roundtables planned
		Baseline: 0 Target: 2	Letters from State and community leaders	
		Outcome Indicator 2 c. No of people benefiting from new market opportunities in project areas Baseline: 0 Target: 485 direct beneficiaries and at least 50000 indirect beneficiaries (70% youth, 50% women)	Project report Beneficiaries disaggregated by farmer-herder-male/female-youth	6 months: M&E baseline identifies project beneficiaries and potential target groups 12 months: Project pilots and trainings 50% completed
Output 2.1 Improved land, fodder/feedstock and water management to reduce competition over natural resources		Output Indicator 2.1.1 Survey reports provided to relevant State institutions and validated	State survey reports	6 months: survey protocol designed; field experts hired 12 months: draft survey reports available
		Baseline: 0 Target: 1		

	Output Indicator 2.1.2 No of farmers and herders (disaggregated by gender and age) informed about alternative fodder/feedstock opportunities	CSO assessment meeting in 3 states, minutes, logbooks of 60 extension workers trained (50% women) and deployed with assessment report information	6 months: Agreements with Agriculture Dept on content and timing of trainings 12 months: 100% of trainings completed, extension outreach initiated
	Baseline: 0 Target:		

Commented [OA1]: 1800 farmers and herders informed about alternative fodder/feedstock opportunities

Commented [n2]: Yes

	Output 2.2 Livelihood opportunities at agricultural/pastoral interface improved to incentivize farmer herder cooperation	Output Indicator 2.2.1 No. of persons trained on value chain development around livestock production and markets Baseline: 0 Target: 300 disaggregated by men/women/youth and age	Training report on value chain development around livestock production and markets	6 months: Target states and beneficiaries identified and trainings planned 12 months: Trainings 50% completed
	List of activities under this Output:			

Outcome 3: Enhanced accountability promotes increased effectiveness of response to the farmers-herders crisis	Profile farmers, pastoralists, CBOs, vocational training centers, women and youths, and conduct an assessment on livelihood opportunities	Output Indicator 2.2.2 No of Platforms and CBOs reached with knowledge products, advisory services and sensitization activities Baseline: 0 Target: at least 6 (2 per state)	Project report with pictures Letters from cooperative platforms & CBOs acknowledging material and support received	6 months: Draft profiling report completed 12 months: at least 1 CBO/Platform engaged in each state
	Supporting vocational training for farmers, herders, women, youth and victims of conflict Providing startup kits for graduates of vocational training programmes	Output Indicator 2.2.3 No. of men/women/youths supported by vocational training Baseline: 0 Target: 125	Training report	6 months: Training package devised; training planned 12 months: vocational training 50% completed
	Strengthen existing cooperative platforms & CBOs through provision of knowledge products, advisory services and sensitization Conduct capacity building for 300 conflict affected people on value chain development around livestock production and markets Convene high-level meetings between private sector and state to raise awareness of fodder and feedstocks value chain and investment opportunities Provide catalytic support to alternative fodder production	Outcome Indicator 3 a. Number of states with a systematic monitoring of HR abuses Baseline: 0 Target: 1	Reports from target CSOs, Reports from NCHR	6 months: NGO/CSO partner in one state contracted and trained on reporting 12 months: Regular reporting achieved

		Outcome Indicator 3 b. Percentage increase in awareness of SEA and SGBV in project area Baseline: low awareness Target: 50% of surveyed population state being aware of SEA/SGBV	Perception reports	survey	6 months: Gender sensitization activities planned and agreed with security sector 12 months: Capacity building activities 50% complete
		Outcome Indicator 3 c. Degree of improvement in HR responsiveness of military and security apparatus Baseline: zero/low response Target: 30% improvement	Perception reports	survey	6 months: HR sensitization activities planned and agreed with security sector 12 months: Documented regular engagements with security outfit - 50% complete
	Output 3.1 Capacity of monitoring, investigation and follow up on human rights offences enhanced	Output Indicator 3.1.1 No and quality of reports referencing documented HR abuses	Trend analysis		6 months: CSO identified and active in pilot area 12 months: CSO submitting monthly reports
	List of activities under this Output:	Baseline: irregular reports of poor-quality Target: regular reporting that meets minimum standards			

	<p>Pilot human rights monitoring and reporting mechanism through National Human Rights Commission (NHRC)/NGO/CSO partnership in one state</p> <p>Support to NHRC in convening CSOs, CBOs involved in human rights monitoring in each state</p> <p>Capacity building and awareness raising on sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and sexual and gender based (SGBV) violence</p>	<p>Output Indicator 3.1.2 Percentage of reported HR abuses and violations that are investigated</p> <p>Baseline: low</p> <p>Target: 50% improvement</p>	Trend analysis	6 months: Assessment of pre-project HR reporting complete 12 months: Trend analysis shows improvement
	<p>Output 3.2 Increased civil military/security agencies cooperation and dialogue</p> <p>List of activities under this Output:</p> <p>Capacity building and sensitization of security agencies on codes of conduct and rules of engagement</p> <p>Advocacy to deploy human rights desk of Nigerian Army alongside any military deployment in the three states</p> <p>Support local level platforms for dialogue and exchange with security agencies and informal security actors (i.e. vigilante groups)</p>	<p>Output Indicator 3.2.1 No. of workshops and dialogue platforms supporting behavioral changes</p> <p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: 3</p>	<p>Workshop</p> <p>statement/attendance sheets, Nigerian Army HR desk deployment reports</p>	<p>6 months: Workshops/platforms planned and initial consultations with HR desk of Nigerian Army held</p> <p>12 months: Agreement on minimum standards achieved with security agencies</p>

Outcome 4: Improved understanding of the crisis encourages evidence-based		Outcome Indicator 4 a. Number of initiatives informed by Project-generated information and advocacy on farmers-herders crisis	CSO monitoring reports, organization's letters of request, declarations arising	6 months: n/a 12 months: 2 initiatives proposed
advocacy, targeted investments and innovative solutions		Baseline: 0 Target: 5 (at least 2 target women/youth)	from project documents	
		Outcome Indicator 4 b. Number of references in national and state media to Project-generated information and analysis on farmers-herders crisis Baseline: 0 Target: 12	Monitoring national and state media	6 months: Media monitoring system in place 12 months: Interim impact analysis complete
		Outcome Indicator 4 c. Total value of additional funds leveraged to address farmer herder conflict Baseline: 0 Target: \$5 million (at least \$1 million targets women/youth)	Project documents, requests for information, donor agreements, state/federal commitments	6 months: n/a 12 months: at least \$1 million leveraged
		Output Indicator 4.1.1 Number of verified and	Database, GIS system, regular	6 months: GIS and media officer hired, software

			objective information products based on the project's sources of information	reporting from field partners, access to reports, updates and infographics	procured, initial update and infographics on project baseline data produced 12 months: 1 report, 3 updates and 6 infographics produced
			Baseline: 0 Target: 3 Reports, 9 updates and 12 infographics produced (with gender and youth dis-aggregated data and analyses)		
			List of activities under this Output:		
			Information management Protocol developed to ensure gender and youth dis-aggregated data is gathered to enable project gender and youth targeted interventions and broader advocacy		
			Information gathered under the project and through partners are collated and analyzed		
			GIS-mapping capabilities enable spatial plotting of attacks to inform trends in the crisis		
			Production of analytical briefs and updates on the crisis in the three states help provide partners with a nuanced and well-informed understanding of the crisis		

	Output 4.2 Objective and verified information on the crisis is made publicly available	Output Indicator 4.2: (Social media analytics, press releases and public announcements by State Ministries of Information; State Information; State Ministry websites)	6 months: n/a
	List of activities under this Output:	Number of Reports, briefs, analytics, press releases and infographics that reach a wide audience	12 months: Creation of social media pages, membership in key social media forums, MoUs signed with SMOs on sharing of information
	Publishing outputs on online repositories and websites for wide distribution and sharing with the public	Baseline: 0 reached, 0 likes, 0 shares/retweets Target: 100,000 reached, 1,000 likes, 1,000 shares/retweets	
	Engagement with State Ministries of Information help ensure that state-level media houses are made aware of the information and analysis generated		
	Social media platforms disseminate reports, briefs and infographics widely		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
Outcome 1 Effective and gender-sensitive infrastructure for peace in place at the state level to support conflict prevention	Indicator 1.1 Number of peacebuilding structures established per state and percentage of women and youth participating in these structures	0	3 (1 per state; 35% women/youth participation)	1	1 (Taraba state)	Support and technical resources currently being deployed to institutional systems and fast track the legislative process for the establishment of peace agencies in Benue and Nasarawa states
	Indicator 1.2 Percentage of women and youth surveyed who perceive that peace infrastructure adequately reflects and addresses their concern	0	50% women/youth	35%	0	This is an end of project evaluation indicator to be conducted during project close out.
	Indicator 1.3 Percentage of conflicts reported through EWERS in project area and	0	50% capture; 25% response	25% capture; 15% response	0	EWERS still being installed

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
	percentage of reports responded to by peacebuilding structures					
Output 1.1 Establishment of state level agency/com mission/structure to drive gender-sensitive peacebuilding agenda	Indicator 1.1.1 Number of agreements with state governors' offices on supporting the establishment of agency/commission/structure	0	3 agreements	1	1	Legal drafter being recruited coupled with support from CSO network to strengthen the current capacity of relevant government institutions. This is to help fast track the legal process of constitutionally establishing Peace Agencies in Nasarawa and Benue states
	Indicator 1.1.2					
Output 1.2 State peacebuilding agency/com mission/structure supported to drive gender-	Indicator 1.2.1 Number of institutions supported to drive gender sensitive response	0	15	5	0	This will be carried out as a support to the state level peace agencies
	Indicator 1.2.2	0	5	2	0	This is contingent upon the establishment of state level peace agency

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
sensitive response to farmers-herders crisis	Number of mediation/dialogues led by peacebuilding structure					
Output 1.3 Gender-sensitive early warning and response capacity developed, supported and improved	Indicator 1.3.1 Number of functional EWERS established Indicator 1.3.2	0	3	1	0	The ICT- EWERS is currently being developed across all states as led by a consultant using a multisectoral approach to incorporate all stakeholders into the design
Output 1.4 Constructive dialogue promoted through inter-ethnic and inter-	Indicator 1.4.1 Number of verifiable peacebuilding activities achieved Indicator 1.4.2 Number of	0	30	10	0	This will happen when the Peace Agencies are fully set up and operational
		0	4	2	0	multistakeholder consultative forums on open grazing are yet to be held. Once held it

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
religious exchanges	relevant state institutions provided with validated outputs from open grazing consultations					will start the process of engagements with relevant state institutions to provide these validated outputs
Outcome 2 Strengthen economic interdependence between farmers and herders	Indicator 2.1 No. of new cooperative initiatives between farmers and herders demonstrating mutually beneficial economic interdependence	0	3	1	0	This will be borne out of the post vocational and other trainings graduation and empowerment of beneficiaries.
	Indicator 2.2 No. of target states that adopt concepts of pasture and alternative fodder system for scale-up	0	2	1	3	

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
	Indicator 2.3 No. of people benefiting from new market opportunities in project areas	0	485 direct beneficiaries and at least 50,000 indirect beneficiaries	200	125	Onboarding process for targeted beneficiaries are at its preliminary stages. This was slowed down because of COVID19 pandemic. The numbers will increase as we go further into the raining season which is known for planting of crops/ farming season and as lockdown measures are gradually lifted
Output 2.1 Improved land, fodder/feedstock and water management to reduce competition over natural resources	Indicator 2.1.1 Survey reports provided to relevant state institutions and validated Indicator 2.1.2 No. of farmers and herders informed about alternative fodder/feedstock opportunities	0	1 (5,000 hectares) 1800	1	0	All preparatory activities for this has been concluded. This activity will be carried out once the COVID19 lockdown is lifted
		0	600	600	0	60 (government agriculture extension agents) trainer of trainers have already been trained for this exercise which was put on hold due to lockdown directive of COVID19 pandemic
Output 2.2	Indicator 2.2.1 No. of persons trained on value chain development	0	300	100	0	Targeting and onboarding of beneficiaries had started in March with plans for training in April. However, the COVID19 pandemic put a stall to this. Nonetheless plans are

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
Livelihood opportunities at agricultural/pastoral interface improved to incentivize farmer herder co-operation	around livestock production and markets					already in the pipeline to innovatively implement this with Thrive Agric. This notwithstanding the pandemic while ensuring necessary safety measures are met This will be borne out of engagements of beneficiaries of vocational and other trainings at the later stage of their program
	Indicator 2.2.2 No. of platforms and CBOs reached with knowledge products, advisory services and sensitization activities	0	6	3	0	
	Indicator 2.2.3 No. of men/women/youths supported by vocational training	0	125	80	125	
Output 2.3	Indicator 2.3.1					
Output 2.4	Indicator 2.4.1					
	Indicator 2.4.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
Outcome 3 Enhanced accountability y promotes increased effectiveness of response to the farmers-herders crisis	Indicator 3.1 No. of states with a systematic monitoring of HR abuses	0	1	1	1	
	Indicator 3.2 Percentage increase in awareness of SEA and SGBV in project area	0	50%	25%	30%	
	Indicator 3.3 Degree of improvement in HR responsiveness of military and security apparatus	0	30%	10%	60%	
Output 3.1 Capacity of monitoring, investigation and follow	Indicator 3.1.1 No. and quality of reports referencing documented HR abuses	Irregular reports of poor quality	Regular reports that meet minimum standards	Irregular reports of high quality (meet)	Regular reports that meet minimum standards	

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
up on human rights offences enhanced				minimum standards)		
	Indicator 3.1.2 Percentage of reported HR abuses and violations that are investigated	0	50% improvement	25%	65%	
Output 3.2 Increased civil-military/secu rity agencies cooperation and dialogue	Indicator 3.2.1 No. of workshops and dialogue platforms supporting behavioral changes	0	3	2	3	
	Indicator 3.2.2					
Output 3.3	Indicator 3.3.1					
	Indicator 3.3.2					
Output 3.4	Indicator 3.4.1					
	Indicator 3.4.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
Outcome 4 Improved understanding of the crisis encourages evidence-based advocacy, targeted investments and innovative solutions	Indicator 4.1 Number of initiatives informed by project-generated information and advocacy on farmers-herders crisis	0	5	2	0	
	Indicator 4.2 No. of references in national and state media to project generated information and analysis on farmers-herders crisis	0	12	4		
	Indicator 4.3 Total value of additional funds leveraged to address farmer-herder conflict	0	\$5 million (at least \$1 million targets women/youths)	\$1million		

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
Output 4.1 Information management and analysis unit provides reliable and credible information	Indicator 4.1.1 No. of verified and objective information products based on the project's sources of information		3 reports, 9 updates and 12 infographics produced (with gender and youth disaggregated data and analysis)	1 report, 3 updates and 4 infographics		
Output 4.2 Objective and verified information on the crisis is made publicly available	Indicator 4.1.2 Indicator 4.2.1 No. of reports, briefs and infographics that reach a wide audience		100,000 reached, 1,000 likes, 1,000 shares/retweets	20,000 reached, 200 likes, 200 shares/retweet		
	Indicator 4.2.2					
Output 4.3	Indicator 4.3.1					
	Indicator 4.3.2					

	Performance Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of project Indicator Target	Indicator Milestone (30 September 2020)	Current indicator progress	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
Output 4.4	Indicator 4.4.1					

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 of 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		