

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



PBF PROJECT DOCUMENT

Country (ies): Solomon Islands	
Project Title: PBF/SLB/H-1 Empowering Youth as Agents for Peace and Social Cohesion in the Solomon Islands	
Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway (if existing project): 00113271	
PBF project modality: <input type="checkbox"/> IRF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRF	If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund: <input type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund Name of Recipient Fund: <hr/>
List all direct project recipient organizations: UNDP (UN), ILO (UN) List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental: Ministry of National Unity, Reconciliation, and Peace; Ministry of Women, Youth, Children, and Family Affairs; Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce and Industry/Young Entrepreneurs' Council (CSO); Solomon Islands Women in Business Association (CSO); World Vision (NGO)	
Expected project commencement date¹: 04/12/2018 Project duration in months²: 24 30 Months (24 + 6 months extension), 30 June 2021 Geographic zones for project implementation: Honiara Settlements, Weather Coast, North Malaita, Western border communities with Bougainville	
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: \$ 1,481,228 ILO: \$ 317,255 Total: \$1,798,483 <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> Other existing funding for the project: UNDP contribution \$120,000 Project total budget: \$1,918,483	

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 (%): UNDP: \$ 1,036,860 ILO: \$ 216,729 Total: \$1,253,588	PBF 2nd tranche* (%): UNDP: \$ 444,368 ILO: \$ 100,526 Total: \$544,894	PBF 3rd tranche* (%): XXXX: \$ XXXXXXX XXXX: \$ XXXXXXX XXXX: \$ XXXXXXX Total:
Project Description: <p>The Solomon Islands is entering a critical phase in its peacebuilding journey; the Regional Assistance Mission has now fully withdrawn, national and provincial elections in early 2019 are a potential flashpoint in a context where government spending is increasingly dominated by discretionary spending managed by MPs, and a referendum on independence in neighboring Bougainville risks reigniting violence along the porous border.</p> <p>In this context, and in support of the recently launched National Youth Policy, this project will empower marginalized young Solomon Islanders, particularly young women, both to engage in decision-making and as pro-active social entrepreneurs to address local sources of grievances. It will take peacebuilding efforts in a new direction, and into new locations that have traditionally been beyond the reach of development efforts and government services to help nurture a new generation of effective peace advocates and nation builders.</p>		
Project Consultation and Endorsement Process: <p>Working with youth has always been a focus of the UN's peacebuilding work in the country. UNDP has worked closely with the Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs in facilitating the country's first ever Youth Dialogue, as well as in developing the National Youth Policy. This has involved thorough analysis of the challenges and constraints facing youth, and detailed consultations with young people from across the Solomon Islands, summarized in the 2018 Solomon Islands Youth Status Report, supported by the ongoing peacebuilding project of UNDP/UN Women.</p> <p>Through the existing PBF-supported project, and working closely with the Ministry of National Unity, Reconciliation, and Peace, detailed nationwide consultations were also held on the status of peacebuilding and the main threats to peace, summarized in the National Perceptions Survey on Peacebuilding for the Solomon Islands.</p> <p>This project was developed to support the implementation of recommendations from these documents through nationwide consultation processes. In June 2018, a joint UNDP-ILO mission held close consultations with relevant Government Ministries, potential implementing partners, and other development partners, including those already working in the peace building space. A round table bringing together Government and implementing partners was held on Thursday 23rd August to agree on the approach, focus areas, and main activities prior to submission to PBSO. This was followed by one-on-one consultations with implementing partners to clarify and agree on roles and responsibilities.</p>		
Project Gender Marker score: 2³		

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

<p>A minimum of \$589,225, or 31% of the total project budget has been specifically reserved for direct action on gender equality as part of project activities.</p> <p>A minimum of half of project participants will be female, however by working explicitly to put young women on an equal footing to young men in both engagement with decision makers and the creation of community groups, the project aims to contribute to changes in perceptions about what women can and 'should' do for both men and women. The project will create opportunities for constructive contact between young men and women as equals, and so help to break down gender stereotypes.</p> <p>The budget calculation excludes staff costs, although all project staff are expected to actively reflect gender considerations throughout the implementation of the project. A detailed breakdown of the proportion of the budget allocated to activities in direct pursuit of gender equality and women's empowerment for each output is provided at Annex D.</p>	
<p>Project Risk Marker score: 1 ⁴</p>	
<p>Select PBF Focus Areas which best summarizes the focus of the project (<i>select ONLY one</i>): _____ ⁵</p> <p>The project is fully aligned with agreed UN priorities, contributing directly to UN Pacific Strategy Outcome 5: By 2022, people and communities in the Pacific will contribute to and benefit from inclusive, informed and transparent decision-making processes; accountable and responsive institutions; and improved access to justice.</p> <p>The project will make substantive contributions to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals: Goal 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), Goal 10 (Reduced Inequalities), Goal 8 (Decent work and Economic Growth), and Goal 5 (Gender Equality) through effective implementation of Goal 17 (Partnerships for the Goals).</p>	
<p>Type of submission:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> New project</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project amendment</p>	<p>If it is a project amendment, select all changes that apply and provide a brief justification:</p> <p>Extension of duration: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional duration in months (number of months and new end date): <u>6 months, 30 June 2021</u></p> <p>Change of project outcome/ scope: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Change of budget allocation between outcomes or budget categories of more than 15%: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Additional PBF budget: <input type="checkbox"/> Additional amount by recipient organization: USD XXXXX</p> <p>Brief justification for amendment:</p>

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

⁴ **Risk marker 0** = low risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

⁵ **PBF Focus Areas** are:

(1.1) SSR, (1.2) Rule of Law; (1.3) DDR; (1.4) Political Dialogue;


(2.1) National reconciliation; (2.2) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Conflict prevention/management;

(3.1) Employment; (3.2) Equitable access to social services

(4.1) Strengthening of essential national state capacity; (4.2) extension of state authority/local administration; (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources (including PBF Secretariats)


	<p><u>The effects of the COVID-19 pandemic related restrictions and of the start-up delays related to the launching of the project, faced at its initial stage, including the challenges with recruitment of the team and the political instability following the April 2019 elections, have had an impact on the timely delivery of the project results. The latter ultimately deferred the start of the implementation so that until August 2019, the activities under both outcomes were affected. Following the arrival of the project manager, the project marked solid progress till March 2020, when all non-essential activities were restricted as a result of COVID-19 pandemic and the proclamation of the State of Emergency by the SI Government, which inevitably hampered the active implementation of the project.</u></p> <p><u>In spite of challenges encountered, however, since the resumption of the activities in June 2020, important achievements have been reached under both of the outcomes: in particular, the role of the young women and men in the decision making process is strengthened through the 20 youth caucuses, established in the targeted areas, which now serve as inclusive fora for addressing the development and social challenges at community and provincial levels. This network of the youth caucuses, which is advancing through a detailed capacity building program, has proven critical in hearing and transmitting the concerns of the isolated communities in rural zones and raising red flags of potential grievances at the times when they were out of the reach of the authorities and/or development partners. Overall project monitoring has suggested that, communities in the targeted areas are now more resilient to conflict with more socially and politically empowered youth, in particular young women, who are now actively engaged; through these platforms as peace builders.</u></p> <p><u>However, while the youth caucuses capacity building program (under Outcome 1) is foreseen to be accomplished by the end of December 2020, community/peace projects, guided through a mentorship program (Outcome 2), initiation of which was conditioned to the finalization of the subsequent trainings, require an additional time frame for meaningful implementation. Assuming that no COVID-19 pandemic related restrictions will be imposed by the authorities in the country which still has no a single confirmed case yet, it is assessed that additional 6 (six) months, 2 of which will be used for project compilation and award , and other 3 in implementation and mentoring, are required in reaching the project objectives and, in addition, in conducting an independent evaluation. The requested no cost extension implies no changes to the project outcomes or project activities and will be solely used in delivery of the agreed project results, confirmed by both recipient organizations.</u></p>
--	--

PROJECT SIGNATURES:

<p><u>Recipient Organization(s)</u></p> <p>Name of Representative: Malin Kannli</p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Name of Institution: International Labour Organization</p> <p>Date & Seal: 22 September 2020</p> <p></p> <p>Name of Representative:</p> <p>Signature:</p> <p>Name of Agency:</p> <p>Date & Seal:</p>	<p><u>Representative of National Authorities</u></p> <p>Name of Government Commissioner: Dr. Cedric Alepenev</p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Title: Permanent Secretary</p> <p>Date & Seal: 02 Oct 2020</p> <p></p>
<p><u>Head of UN Country Team</u></p> <p>Name of Representative: Sanaka Kumara Samarasinghe</p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Title: Deputy Resident Coordinator</p> <p>Date & Seal: 21.09.2020</p> <p></p>	<p><u>Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)</u></p> <p>Name of Representative: </p> <p>Signature: </p> <p>Title: Assigned Secretary-General, Peacebuilding Support Office</p> <p>Date & Seal: October 20, 2020</p>

Head of UN Country Team

Name of Representative: **Sanaka Kumara Samarasinghe**

Signature: 

Title: **UN Resident Coordinator**

Date & Seal:

I. Peacebuilding Context and Rationale for PBF support

a) Conflict Analysis

Violent Conflict

Conflict in the Solomon Islands, locally referred to as ‘The Tensions’, began in 1998 when a group of militant youths from the island of Guadalcanal attacked settlements of islanders predominantly from Malaita in northwest Guadalcanal, bordering the capital Honiara. Analysis of the violence concluded that their actions were prompted by failures to address root cause issues, including: compensation for people of Guadalcanal who were victimized, over the years, by settlers from neighboring islands; demands for a review of the Land and Title Act and land and natural resources management reform; squatter settlements on Guadalcanal’s provincial and tribally-claimed lands; the decentralization of governance functions to provincial and local governments.

During the Tensions, many young men joined the militants because they supported the causes that the militants espoused. Others took advantage of the breakdown in law and order to engage in theft and lawbreaking without specifically identifying with militant groups. The militants built support for their cause by building on resentment over the lack of government services and support, political and economic exclusion, and exploitation by outsiders. However, while communities supported militants at first, often this quickly turned to fear of their violent and intimidating behavior, which soon deviated into exploitation. Rigorous statistical estimates of youth involvement is not available, but the involvement of young men in fighting is perceived as particularly high amongst a group formed on the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal. None who were young during the Tensions would still be classified as youth now.

The clear majority of the perpetrators of violence during the Tensions were male. Women’s roles during the conflict were typically more oriented towards promoting peaceful dialogue and non-violence. However, there were smaller groups of women that were actively involved in supporting the conflict, including by: harboring militants, spying, and even carrying out violent attacks. During the conflict, extensive violence against women (including gender-based violence targeted specifically at women) occurred, including torture, rape, sexual violence, murder, beatings, arson, kidnapping, looting, and extrajudicial detention.⁶

For young girls in particular, in the context of unrest and economic hardship, many young women felt obliged to go with men who demanded sex, or did so in exchange for goods or money. Others were willingly involved with militants. No young girls are known to have participated as militants, although a small number did support armed groups for example with transporting weapons.

In August 2000, Australia and New Zealand assisted in negotiating a ceasefire and, in October 2000, convened the Townsville Peace Conference at which belligerent parties, the provincial governments of Malaita and Guadalcanal and central government of the Solomon Islands agreed the Townsville Peace Agreement (TPA). Following ratification of the TPA, weapons were collected, and reconciliation ceremonies facilitated; however, apart from these efforts,

⁶ “Women and Peace: The Role of Solomon Islands Women in Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding”, UNDP Pacific Centre, 2015

TPA implementation was limited. The environment became characterized by rampant lawlessness with theft and beatings especially common in and around Honiara.

In 2003, the Pacific Islands Forum responded to a request from the newly-elected Solomon Islands Government and deployed a multilateral Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI), led by Australia, to support the restoration of rule of law. More than 2,000 police and soldiers from 15 contributing countries began arriving from July 2003 with a mandate to “reinforce and uphold the legitimate institutions and authorities in Solomon Islands, and restore respect for the Constitution and laws”.

A Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was set up in 2008 which issued a report with far-reaching recommendations for key governance changes in addition to reparations, in 2012. Follow-up has been hampered by lack of political will to publicly discuss recommendations in Parliament.

Since 2013, RAMSI operations have gradually scaled down, with the withdrawal completed in June 2017. The small police force which had been re-trained by RAMSI was partially re-armed and emphasis was put on community policing. Australia and New Zealand keep police advisors in the country.

However, conflicts, sometimes violent, between and within communities, continue to surface years after the end of the Tensions. While the capacity of the police force has been significantly strengthened with the support of RAMSI, some are concerned that the drawdown of RAMSI was premature. Some communities and victims, particularly in the Weather Coast, continue to fear that tensions might return, and other ‘hot spots’ such as emerging settlements in and around Honiara have developed.

Current Peacebuilding Challenge

The country faces many challenges, including unreliable, difficult and costly transport and connectivity; inequality in development investment between Honiara and outer provinces; heavy reliance on primary products and aid; corruption in business practices and resource allocation; elevated illiteracy and un/underemployment, particularly among women and youth; a high incidence of violence against women; uncontrolled land development, land conflict and settlement patterns; rapid urbanization and squatter settlements around Honiara (undermining community cohesion); weak capacity of governance systems to deliver services (undermining legitimacy, political stability, and affecting social attitudes and behaviors); and persisting inter and intra-island tensions dating back to colonial times.

At the same time, Solomon Islands is a very young country; seven out of ten Solomon Islanders are younger than 35 years old. The implications of this demography have not been recognized enough by development assistance and peacebuilding work. The 2018 Solomon Islands State of Youth Report reveals challenges faced by youth: they feel disadvantaged, disempowered and have low self-esteem. Youth are marginalized from social, economic and political activities in their communities. They are keenly aware of their inability to contribute and lack the necessary knowledge or skills to make informed decisions. As evidenced from the 2006 Chinatown riot, youth are vulnerable to be manipulated into criminal and militant activities.

Young women growing up in the Solomon Islands have a very different experience to young men, typically with more responsibilities and constraints. They do not have the same freedom

of movement, owing to fears about their vulnerability, and are more likely to be tied to domestic work and under the care of older relatives. Gender-based violence remains highly prevalent, with two out of three women having experienced physical and or sexual violence from an intimate partner.

Many young people move to Honiara from rural provinces, particularly Malaita, in search of opportunities. While the population of Honiara keeps growing, in general opportunities for youth remain limited and many find themselves being economically idle.

This large, frustrated, and marginalized young population is typically seen as a risk to stability. In the 2018 National Perceptions Survey on Peacebuilding for the Solomon Islands, the public identified youth as the group most likely to cause disputes, followed by adult men. However, at the same time, youth were identified as one of the most likely groups to be victims of disputes, underlining the profound and complex ways that young people interact disproportionately with the risk of violence.

Women are less positive and less involved in decision making than men. The Peacebuilding Perceptions Survey confirmed that most Solomon Islanders do feel that women can play leadership roles, but mainly in domains such as women's groups or within the household. The most common reasons given for not believing that women could be leaders more broadly were culture, and social norms within communities. Of particular relevance to this project, only 62 percent of respondents from North Malaita believed women could be leaders in their community, compared to 92 percent nationally, underlining the need to take a gender-informed approach to activities in that context.

Young women face the double disadvantage of both social expectations of their age, and their gender. Women have played an important role as advocates for peace, but that role is limited by their influence on decision making processes.

In recognition of this, the Status of Youth in the Solomon Islands Report made a recommendation to draw on the five pillars of UN Security Council Resolution 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security, which aims to encourage youth-inclusive development. It also proposed reform of employment and livelihood projects, mentorship and internship opportunities, while targeting assistance to disadvantaged groups (particularly young mothers and people with disabilities). Rural youth projects, training opportunities, and community-based education are emphasized in the recommendations.

The recent adoption of the National Youth Strategy, which incorporates Resolution 2250, presents an opportunity for the UN to work with national stakeholders to address the root causes of the tensions and cement peace dividends by effectively engaging the youth.

Bougainville

The North-West of the Solomon Islands borders the autonomous Bougainville region of Papua New Guinea, with some islands sufficiently close to be easily reachable by small boat. During the 1990s, disputes relating to the Panguna copper mine in Bougainville were at the center of a civil war. A condition of the agreement that ended the conflict was a referendum on the political status of the region, scheduled for June 2019. This is widely considered to be a high-risk period, with a significant risk of violence occurring.

The proximity and relative remoteness of the region results in frequent unofficial crossings. For example, the Solomon Islands police announced plans to increase patrols along the border in April 2018 in response to reports of increasing numbers of illegal crossings. Therefore, any outbreaks of violence in Bougainville are likely to have consequences for neighboring areas of the Solomon Islands.

b) Alignment with Existing Initiatives

The Solomon Islands Government's over-arching strategic policy framework is set out in the National Development Strategy 2016-2035. This articulates five key long-term objectives, including a 'unified nation with stable and effective governance and public order'. The strategic policy frameworks for the UN system as a whole (articulated in the UN Pacific Strategy), and UNDP and ILO in particular, are closely aligned to this.

In June 2017, an inclusive National Dialogue on Sustaining Peace and Stability in the Solomon Islands was convened, bringing together national and provincial government, women leaders, youth leaders, and representatives from church-based communities and civil society. In the resulting Communique, the Dialogue identified youth empowerment and opportunity development as a key issue to be tackled, specifically identifying the potential of young people to contribute to maintaining peace.

Within the National Development Strategy framework, the Government launched the National Youth Policy 2017-2030, and accompanying Strategic Framework for Youth Development and Empowerment in the Solomon Islands, in August 2018. These set out 6 Priority Policy Outcomes (PPOs), of which this project will directly support the implementation of PPO 5; "(i)youths are empowered as agents of positive change, participating in leadership, decision making and governance mechanisms including traditional leadership and governance at all levels including household, village, community, provincial and national levels; and (ii) contributing to long-term social harmony and cohesion, peace and security, gender equality, equal opportunity and national unity that leaves no one behind." Later in 2018, Government plans to launch the National Youth Employment & Entrepreneurial Strategy.

Under previous and ongoing peacebuilding projects in the Solomon Islands, initiatives to empower youth have simultaneously demonstrated the potential high returns to engagement with this demographic, and the importance of a more concerted effort in order to fully realize that potential. Processes such as that leading up to the Youth Peacebuilding Innovation Forum in 2017 and the most recent Malaita provincial Innovation Forum show that young people can generate innovative new approaches to addressing challenges in the communities to contribute to peace and development. The selection of the participants was carefully done in close consultation with the police and community leaders to extend opportunities to the most marginalized. The youths realized their potential to become solution providers to problems faced in communities. However, the short-term nature and broad focus of previous projects has meant that follow-up support was inadequate to meet needs.

II. Project content, strategic justification and implementation strategy

a) Brief Description of Project Content.

This project will work to empower young Solomon Islanders so that rather than becoming frustrated and being seen as potential threats to peace, they can be effective advocates for peace and nation builders. Recognizing the peacemaking role played by women during the Tensions, and the history of sexual violence, the project will make particular efforts to empower young women in the peacebuilding process. This will be done through activities that support the achievement of two mutually-reinforcing outcomes:

1. Outcome 1: Young people's, particularly young women's, voices in decision making processes related to issues identified in the Perceptions Survey on peacebuilding are strengthened in Honiara, North Malaita, the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal, and border communities in the West.

Through the establishment of innovative 'youth caucuses' as platforms for youth engagement in hot spot areas. This will be supported by activities to improve the capacity of marginalized young people, particularly women, to engage provincial, community, and private sector leaders in meaningful dialogue on the one hand, and decision makers' buy-in to the need for constructive youth engagement in decision making on the other. As an accountability mechanism, written declarations of commitments to address the challenges faced by young people would be negotiated and drafted through the consultations. Problem-driven methodologies will be used to guide the focus of efforts to influence, but potential areas could include provincial government budgets, environmental and marine management, recruitment processes, or the allocation of scholarships. Given differences in experience, expectations and constraints, particular attention will be paid to ensure that the perspectives of marginalized young women are adequately reflected through the platform. Under the ongoing peacebuilding project, women's caucuses have been established. Whilst they are at the nascent stage, they have already proven to be an effective mechanism for women as a marginalized group to have a regular dialogue with policy makers to concretely follow up on recommendations put forward during the National Peace Dialogue, as well as other fora.

Effort will focus on improving youth agency in the issues identified by existing peacebuilding work as the root causes of tensions, including: land disputes, corruption/integrity, environment and resource management, social cohesion, access to livelihoods, and public services. Through this, the project will work to address the marginalization of young people in the decision-making process that both undermines their ability to make contributions to the peace- and nation-building process, and contributes to the frustration that may lead to resentment of the status quo.

2. Outcome 2: Communities in the hotspot areas are more resilient to conflict with more socially, economically and politically empowered youth, in particular young women, engaging as peace builders.

Joint ILO, PBSO, World Bank and UNDP research⁷ has found that decent work deficits and lack of access to livelihoods can be key contributing factors to conflict: a lack of contact across

⁷ ILO, PBSO, UNDP, World Bank 2016: Employment programmes and peace, a joint statement on an analytical framework, emerging principles for action and next steps

different social groups; the existence of grievances over inequality and exclusion; and a lack of opportunity. The project will address these drivers including through constructive engagement among different groups; addressing individual and collective grievance and frustration; and increasing opportunities for economic empowerment of young women and men.

To contribute to this, the project will tailor locally available ILO global enterprise tools and approaches, such as Know About Your Business (KAB)⁸ Start & Improve Your Business (SIYB)⁹, Cooperatives¹⁰ and Conflict & Disaster Risk Reduction for Enterprises¹¹ to support grassroots social entrepreneurship for marginalized youth in at-risk areas to build their capacity to plan, manage and implement community projects that address local sources of grievances that could develop into triggers for violence.¹² The project will therefore establish a process to organize youth groups, with mixed ethnic (where relevant) and gender backgrounds, to identify causes of frustration, and collectively identify and implement locally-owned solutions. This reflects one of the key messages from both the ILO/PBSO/UNDP/World Bank report and the UN-World Bank Pathways for Peace report- that the best way to prevent societies from descending into crisis is to ensure that they are resilient through investment in inclusive and sustainable development.¹³ Again, given differences in social expectations and experiences across gender lines, particular efforts will be made to support marginalized young women to take active leadership roles in the groups.

Through this, the project will empower young women and men to make use of their energy and creativity and take positive actions and create opportunities to defuse potential sources of disputes that could become threats to peace. This will help to create a constructive focus for efforts, concentrate project resources on the issues that resonate most strongly with marginalized young members of at-risk communities, and -in line with the National Youth Policy- help to change the perception of young people from being threats to social cohesion to potential solutions to shared challenges.

The existing peacebuilding project works directly on the underlying causes of the tensions, including: corruption issues, leadership quality, land disputes/reforms, and access to and management of natural resources in the context of climate change. Under outcomes 1 and 2 of this project, young people will be empowered to identify and drive new solutions to these challenges.

b) Project Result Framework, see Annex B.

c) Project-level Theory of Change

⁸ <http://knowaboutbusiness.org/>

⁹ <https://www.ilo.org/empent/areas/start-and-improve-your-business/lang--en/index.htm>

¹⁰ <http://libguides.ilo.org/c.php?g=259877&p=2709798>

¹¹ <https://conflictdisaster.org/>

¹² Issues and projects would be identified and developed by participants themselves in order to address the issues that resonate in target communities. However, an example of the type of issue that could be addressed could be the impact of logging activities that are often cited as causing substantial environmental damage with few benefits for local communities, leading to increasing resentment, particularly among the young (especially young women) that are typically not involved in the decision-making process and may be victims of exploitation.

¹³ World Bank Group and United Nations, “Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict”, 2018

We know that inclusive decision making is fundamental to sustaining peace.¹⁴ Despite their size as a demographic group, the evidence is clear that young Solomon Islanders- particularly young Solomon Islander women- are, and feel themselves to be, marginalized from decision-making processes. They are not able to take initiative to address the challenges that they face, contributing to frustration and the perception that that they are the most frequent source of disputes. This project will work to address this by implementing two complementary approaches to empowering marginalized youth to become agents for peace and giving them meaningful opportunities for a good life.

Activities to support achievement of outcome 1 are based on the premise that the act of increasing young women and men's ability to influence the processes by which key decisions are made will reduce their sense of powerlessness and marginalization, and result in decisions that better address the sources of frustration for young people that could undermine peace.

Activities to support achievement of outcome 2 are based on the premise that young people have the potential to create and implement innovative solutions to local issues that could become sources of disputes, disharmony and fragmentation of social cohesion and trust, but are constrained from doing so by a lack of support and low social expectations of what young people can and 'should' do. In particular, it is assumed that the 'double disadvantage' faced by young women places particularly binding constraints on their ability to act on their initiative, and so there will be especially high returns to empowering them.

Therefore, the underlying theory of change is that **IF** young Solomon Islanders in at-risk communities, particularly young women, are empowered to create their own solutions to sources of frustration, have a stronger voice in decision making, and have more meaningful opportunities for a good life, **THEN** they will be better able to use their creativity and energy to address pertinent social problems that might otherwise contribute to the grievance, and thereby reduce the risk of violence re-emerging during the upcoming critical period, or thereafter.

This assumes that, with the right engagement, decision makers will be willing to give marginalized young people space in the decision-making process. Recognizing that this will not occur without proactive effort, the project will implement targeted activities to establish buy in amongst provincial and community leaders to enable a constructive youth engagement in the decision-making processes and structures at the provincial and community level. Support will be provided to ensure that any concerns or objections that leaders may have will be discussed and addressed before bringing the two parties together.

It also assumes that at least some of the potential triggers for conflict can be addressed locally, and that with the right support marginalized young people can lead an effective response. The project will devote substantial effort and resources to working with participants to improve their ability to identify important yet tractable problems, develop potential solutions, and then successfully implement them.

d) Project Implementation Strategy

¹⁴ World Bank Group and United Nations, "Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict", 2018

The project will prioritize work in 4 areas across 4 provinces- aligning closely with the Government's priorities- with the specific composition of activities in each project area tailored to local priorities and constraints. These were identified based on findings from the National Perceptions Survey on Peacebuilding and in close consultation with the Solomon Islands Government about areas of emerging risk:

1. Selected informal settlements around Honiara ¹⁵.
2. 'Hotspot' rural communities:
 - a. The Weather Coast of Guadalcanal Province;
 - b. North Malaita Province.¹⁶
3. Bougainville border communities.

Project activities on the Weather Coast will be implemented by World Vision, under the supervision of project staff. This makes use of World Vision's proven experience in implementing projects in remote regions, including the Weather Coast in the past, and existing networks and relationships to allow the project to be implemented swiftly.

Activities in North Malaita will also be implemented in coordination with World Vision, which has recently begun implementation of a major New Zealand-funded youth entrepreneurship initiative in the same area- aiming to reach 2,000 out-of-school youths.

Within each community, individual participants will be identified during the inception phase in partnership with local communities, villages, and churches, but with active involvement by implementing UN agencies to ensure that the most marginalized are reflected.

The target group for participants will be aged 16-24 high school graduates and below. A maximum of one participant will be allowed per household. A minimum of 50 percent of participants will be female, with a target of 10 percent young mothers.

The project aims to work directly with a minimum of 400 youths from these communities. However, the project will be catalytic, so although the number of direct participants will be relatively small, by design the project will empower them to make changes that lead to improvements for a wider number of people indirectly.

Common participants across both outcome streams of the project would facilitate synergies. However, given the different focus of activities under each outcome, it is likely that they may appeal to different people, and each individual will likely have limited time available to engage with the project. Therefore, whilst some overlap is anticipated and welcome, the project will retain the flexibility to include different sets of participants in each set of activities.

Implementation of the project will begin with a rapid inception phase. This will build on the past and ongoing peacebuilding work, formalize relationships with project partners and implementers, identify participants in consultation with target communities, and finalize a detailed implementation plan. Following this, implementation of activities under both outcomes will take place concurrently.

¹⁵ The specific settlements that will be targeted will be based on further consultation with police to target new and emerging settlements.

¹⁶ With support toward outcome 2 achieved in partnership with another planned project funded by New Zealand MFAT and implemented by World Vision.

Lastly, to ensure timely achievement of intended results, as was and is the case with previous and ongoing PBF projects, this project will be through the Direct Implementation Modality.

III. Project Management and Coordination

a) Recipient Organizations and Implementing Partners

UNDP is the Convening Organization and has led the development of the project. UNDP has a substantial permanent office in Honiara, and is successfully implementing its second PBF-funded project in the Solomon Islands.

The **ILO**, is a specialized UN agency with particular expertise in creating entrepreneurial thinking and capacities, including working in conflict and disaster recovery. It is a proposed recipient organization. ILO does not have a permanent presence in the Solomon Islands, but does have a visible foot print and is successfully delivering projects particularly on youth empowerment and private sector development, including institutionalization of training programmes and certification of local trainers. Recruitment and certification of activities will be done through the integrated project management team, based in Honiara.

World Vision is an international faith-based advocacy and development organization, with a well-developed and extensive presence in the Solomon Islands. World Vision has developed particular expertise in implementing projects in remote communities that are often beyond the reach of other development organizations, in particular on the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal.

The **Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce and Industry (SICCI)** is the peak representative organization for the private sector in Solomon Islands, with over 200 members covering approximately 80 percent of the Solomon Islands private sector workforce. SICCI hosts the recently-formed **Young Entrepreneurs Council (YEC)**, established with support from the ILO. Together, these will allow the project to partner efficiently and effectively with the private sector to establish and manage mentorship relationships which will provide consistent support to participants.

The **Solomon Islands Women in Business Association (SIWIBA)** is a non-profit organisation. SIWIBA will partner with the project in recognition of the specific challenges that young women are likely to face in working in mixed-gender groups. The project emphasis on forming diverse teams to solve social problems through entrepreneurship aligns closely with SIWIBA's vision to "inspire women to realize their full potential, importance and status, and be increasingly recognized and heard in Solomon Islands' society". Currently SIWIBA has members in Honiara, the Weather Coast, Malaita and Central Province.

b) Project Management and Coordination

Six staff, some of which are on a cost-sharing basis with the ongoing PBF project to ensure smooth transition and project coherence, will be employed by the project. This will be led by a Project Manager (International, P4) to be based in Honiara. This position will be supported by an Administrative Support Officer (national, SC), a Communications Officer (UNV- part cost-shared with an existing UNDP project), and Community Liaison and Grants Coordination Officer (national, SB4) and a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (UNV- part cost-shared with an existing UNDP project). The project will also fund part of a Mentorship Coordinator based

at the Young Entrepreneurship Council. Under the overall guidance of the UNDP Country Manager, the Project Manager will supervise all staff funded by the project.

A Project Management Team will provide technical level coordination and advisory support. This will meet regularly to support internal coordination and timely implementation. It will call for a monthly meeting between ILO, UNDP, and project implementing partners (World Vision, SICCI, SIWIBA) and will be comprised of a representative or delegated representative of ILO and UNDP based in Solomon Islands and Fiji and senior technical representatives of each participating UN agency as and when required, and representatives from implementing partners.

A Project Board will include all the signatories to this Joint Project Document (or respective delegated officials) plus the Government of Solomon Islands, represented by the Ministry of Traditional Governance, Peace and Ecclesiastical Affairs, ~~Ministries of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace~~; Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs; and Development Planning and Aid Coordination. The board will be jointly chaired by the responsible Government Ministry and the UNDP Country Manager in Honiara, under delegation from the UN Resident Coordinator in Fiji, and will ordinarily meet quarterly.

c) Risk Management

Overall, the project is assessed as **medium risk**. It sets out to achieve ambitious objectives in parts of the Solomon Islands that are logistically very difficult to reach and during a high-risk period. However, key project implementers, including UNDP as the convening agency, have a demonstrated track record in being able to deliver challenging projects and to manage risks.

Specific risks identified include:

1. **Logistical challenges make ongoing support to remote target communities costly and at times impossible.** UNDP will build on experience of implementing the existing peacebuilding project in remote areas to ensure that adequate risk management and flexibility is built into travel plans. For the Weather Coast, World Vision will act as an implementing partner, as the only major development project implementer with a proven track record in that location. Vulnerability to natural disasters poses risks in terms of travel to the provinces.
2. **Cultural expectations limit female participation.** Early engagement will be prioritized with target communities to explain the project and provide assurances to local leaders (reflecting accumulated learning on best practices in rural Solomon Islands). SIWIBA are included as partners in the project specifically to address this issue.
3. **Mistrust undermines the effectiveness of social entrepreneurship groups.** Lack of trust between groups has been identified as a key factor behind historical violent unrest. Rolling out proven training methods to overcome this will be a key activity of the project.
4. **Youth caucuses not seen as sufficiently legitimate to influence decision makers.** Substantial effort will be invested in identifying young people from a range of different backgrounds, as well as working with policy makers to communicate the

importance of ensuring that marginalized young people have meaningful voice in decision making.

d) Monitoring and Evaluation

In the project budget \$141,729 is earmarked for monitoring and evaluation activities, equivalent to 7% of the overall project cost or 8% of funding from the Peacebuilding Fund. Of this, \$54,486 will fund part of the cost of a monitoring and evaluation officer for the project (first 6 months cost shared with the existing PBF project), and the remainder will fund a robust evaluation including perceptions surveys that will inform the results framework indicators.

In addition to periodic monitoring activities and pre-post assessments for targeted interventions, the final evaluation will assess progress toward target outcomes during the 18-month implementation period, conducted by an independent consultant. This will build on ongoing monitoring activities, including the collection of qualitative feedback from participants and provincial and community decision makers on the effectiveness of the Caucuses in helping to identify provincial priorities. The project timeframe is likely to be too short a period to identify changes in provincial budget allocations, given likely time taken to establish the Caucuses, but early indications for relevance and likelihood of effectiveness can be assessed.

The evaluation will also include collecting information on changes in perceptions of project participants, changes in perceptions of a sample of communities where social enterprises are supported, and changes in perceptions of a sample of communities in target areas with similar characteristics but that are not part of the project as a control group (communities in settlements around Honiara are likely to be closely connected to identify a credible control group). Such evaluative work will also draw data from other existing studies and research supported by the UN, including the planned second Peacebuilding Perceptions Survey. All data points collected will be triangulated to ensure rigor in analysis.

The project will make use of an ILO guide defining peace-related results of employment and livelihood projects, which will be tracked through surveys. A simple baseline survey will be conducted at the beginning of the project, through a set of key informant interviews, focus group discussions and/or participants' surveys. The data will be monitored during the implementation of the project and reassessed at the end.

In line with the UNEG norms and standards and evaluation criteria, detailed evaluation design will take place during the project implementation phase.

UNDP will take the lead in collating and recording detailed information on project implementation- collecting and verifying inputs from partner organizations as appropriate- and taking overall responsibility for the quality of project monitoring. ILO is responsible for building in rigorous monitoring instruments in all activities led by the organization and sharing data against indicators, as well as qualitative results stories with UNDP on a quarterly basis. ILO is also required to share financial reporting so that the project manager can collectively prepare a progress report for submission to PBSO. On a day-to-day basis, this will be overseen by the dedicated Project Manager with support from the cost-shared monitoring and evaluation officer, under the supervision of the UNDP Country Manager.

e) Project Exit Strategy

For activities in support of outcome 1, the sustainability of the political empowerment structure created through the provincial Youth Caucuses will depend on its perceived usefulness for participants and decision makers. Support provided under the planned project will be time-limited, so continuation of the process beyond the 18-month window would be dependent on the initiative being able to convince potential funders that it is effective within that timeframe.

Given that this will be a new, untested structure in this context, it is right that this hurdle on whether it should be continued is built in- we clearly would not want to establish a permanent bureaucratic structure that did not add sufficient value. However, given the issues highlighted in the Peacebuilding Survey and the priorities set out in the national Youth Policy, there is a valid case for trialing this approach. The project evaluation will likely be an important element in informing that decision. If successful, potential funders could include the national government, provincial government, or development partners.

For activities under outcome 2, it is anticipated that upon the completion of the project both YEC and SIWIBA will have enhanced capacities not only to provide support to its members but also to reach out to other communities in Solomon Islands to offer mentorship and other related. This would mean that the opportunity for more people to be reached in the near future would also increase as new membership would mean that people from other provinces will have access to similar services and opportunities.

IV. Project budget

The total budget for the project is \$1,918,483. Of this amount, \$120,000 will be funded by UNDP, with the remaining \$1,798,483 funded by the Peacebuilding Fund. Additional in-kind contributions from both UNDP and ILO will support additional staff and travel costs not funded by the project. A detailed budget breakdown is provided at Annex D.

Reaching remote regions of the Solomon Islands is time consuming and expensive. However, a failure to meaningfully involve marginalized rural communities in the development and peacebuilding process has consistently been identified as contributing to the risk of unrest, and part of what the project seeks to address. Therefore, compromising on travel would be detrimental to the success of the project.

Experience of project implementation has shown that employing dedicated, full-time staff in key management roles is crucial for projects that require rapid implementation. For this reason, resources are allocated to recruit an international P4 grade project manager. All other staff employed by the project will be national staff. Where possible, the project will make use of existing expertise (including staff implementing the existing PBF-funded project), and cost share for access to specialist skills. The well-established UNDP's operations team will provide operational services to the project as per the agreed cost-recovery mechanism or Direct Project Support policy.

Regional expertise that will support implementation will not be charged to the project. This will include the regional UN Peace and Development Advisor, UNDP Regional Economist, UNDP Effective Governance Team, and specialist ILO staff based in Fiji through its regional office.

Annex A.1: Project Administrative arrangements for UN Recipient Organizations

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

AA Functions

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

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

Accountability, transparency and reporting of the Recipient United Nations Organizations

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

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

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

Type of report	Due when	Submitted by
Semi-annual project progress report	15 June	Convening Agency on behalf of all implementing organizations and in consultation with/ quality assurance by 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reporting:

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

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

Financial reports and timeline:

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

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

Ownership of Equipment, Supplies and Other Property

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

Public Disclosure

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

Final Project Audit for non-UN recipient organization projects

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

Special Provisions regarding Financing of Terrorism

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

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 project¹⁷
- Demonstrates at least 3 years of experience in the country where grant is sought
- Provides a clear explanation of the CSO's legal structure, including the specific entity which will enter into the legal agreement with the MPTF-O for the PBF grant.

¹⁷ 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/Progress to date
Outcome 1: Young people's, particularly young women's, voices in decision making processes related to issues identified in the Peacebuilding Perceptions Survey strengthened in Honiara, North Malaita, the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal, and border communities in the West.		<p>Outcome Indicator 1a</p> <p>Percentage of young people in target communities satisfied with government performance in addressing youth issues.</p> <p>Baseline: 45.4% (2018 Peacebuilding Perceptions Survey) .</p> <p>Target: to be established after the inception phase.</p>	Perception survey, Project reports, Project Evaluation	First draft of the perception study report has been received. Draft report highlights findings of some interesting focused areas of project in comparison with last perception study (2018). Quantitative status of the indicator will be updated once the report is finalized.
		<p>Outcome Indicator 1b</p> <p>Percentage of people in target communities that feel women can be leaders in their community in 1) dispute resolution and 2) community chief roles.</p> <p>Baseline: 32.2% (dispute resolution), 16.1% (community chiefs) (2018 Peacebuilding Perceptions Survey).</p> <p>Target: to be established after the inception phase.</p>	Perception survey, Project reports, Project Evaluation	First draft of the perception study report has been received. Draft report highlights findings of some interesting focused areas of project in comparison with last perception study (2018). Quantitative status of the indicator will be updated once the report is finalized.
	Output 1.1	Output Indicator 1.1.1	Participant Surveys	Training evaluation and pre and post training test analysis echoed highly satisfactory remarks by participants (35% female & 56% Male) about the relevancy of training contents and reported increased knowledge and understanding of training participants as a result of the training component of the project. The training component focused on Gender Equality, Peacebuilding, Leadership and Governance. 167 young training participants (M: 96 and F: 71) have successfully been trained in North Malaita and Honiara.
	<p>Marginalized young men and women capacitated to engage in decision-making processes and structures at the provincial and community level.</p> <p>List of activities under this Output:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training to build the confidence of young men and women, improve communication skills, provide an understanding of provincial and community decision-making processes and how to 	<p>Percentage of male and female participants (aged 16-24) with increased skills and competencies to engage in decision making processes and structures at the provincial and community level.</p> <p>Baseline: Nil.</p> <p>Target: At least 60% of female project participants and 60% of male project participants report substantive improvement in their capacity to engage with relevant decision makers.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.2</p>	Pre- and Post- Project Surveys, Project Evaluation	Community leaders have extensively been engaged throughout different project activities and demonstrated positive support in terms

	<p>influence them, and to learn about conflict and peace and local ways of resolving conflict.</p> <p>2. Targeted support provided to provincial and community leaders to establish buy in and consensus to enable a constructive youth engagement in the decision-making processes and structures at the provincial and community level.</p>	<p>Percentage of provincial and community leaders willing and able to engage youth systematically in decision making.</p> <p>Baseline: to be established through pre-perception survey.</p> <p>Target: At least 60% of surveyed decision makers in project communities report increased ability and willingness to engage youth in making decisions.</p>		<p><u>encouraging young men and women in the decision-making processes at community level. 25 successful consultations and meetings/dialogues were held with various community leaders (women and men) including tribal chiefs, young leaders, religious leaders, women leaders etc. and relevant government authorities (both national & provincial). These consultations and meetings/dialogues ensured active participation and ownership of the initiatives initiated by the project.</u></p>
	<p>Output 1.2</p> <p>Youth caucuses established in the hot spot areas of Weather Coast, North Malaita, Bougainville Border Communities, and settlements in and around Honiara as inclusive forums for youth views to be collected and amplified</p> <p>List of activities under this Output:</p> <p>1. Facilitate the establishment of youth caucuses as a platform for regular dialogue.</p> <p>2. Support regular dialogue between youths and community and provincial leaders.</p> <p>3. Support regular dialogue between youths and selected representatives from the private sector.</p> <p>4. Support cross-culture exchange between project participants.</p>	<p>Output Indicator 1.2.1</p> <p>Number of regional youth dialogues with leaders, representatives from government and private sectors on youth issues and priorities.</p> <p>Baseline: Nil (2018)</p> <p>Target: 4; one forum in each of the 4 target locations for the project.</p>	<p>Dialogue & consultation (workshop) reports</p>	<p><u>20 Youth Caucuses/forums have been established at cluster level by holding 20 participatory dialogues/consultation meetings with the young men and young women from target project locations including: Honiara, Weather Coast, North Malaita and Shortlands. The representation of young women in the youth Caucuses is 47% (98 young women out of total 208).</u></p>
		<p>Output Indicator 1.2.2</p> <p>Percentage of project female and male participants (aged 16-24) that report improved access to key public and private sector decision makers affecting their communities.</p> <p>Baseline: Nil (2018)</p> <p>Target: At least 60% of female participants and 60% of male participants report improved access to key decision makers relevant to their communities.</p>	<p>Participant Surveys, Project Evaluation</p>	<p><u>Total 480 young men and women (260 M and 220 F) have been profiled from the project target locations including: Honiara, Weather Coast, North Malaita and Shortlands. The objective of the youth profiling exercise was to identify and engage underprivileged/vulnerable youth, based on criteria, in the contextually innovative interventions initiated by the project.</u></p>
<p>Outcome 2: Communities in the hotspot areas are more resilient to conflict with more</p>		<p>Outcome Indicator 2</p>	<p>Project Evaluation</p>	<p><u>First draft of the perception study report has been received. Draft report highlights findings of some interesting focused areas of project</u></p>

socially, economically and politically empowered youth, with special attention to young women, engaging as peacebuilders.		Percent of young people (50% women) in target communities that feel involved in community decision making. Baseline: 56.3% (2018 Peacebuilding Perceptions Survey) Target: to be established after the inception phase.		<u>in comparison with last perception study (2018). Quantitative status of the indicator will be updated once the report is finalized.</u>
	Output 2.1 Marginalized young women and men capacitated to coherently plan, implement and sustain community projects using the tools of social entrepreneurship. List of activities under this Output: 1. Development of tailored training and facilitation materials. 2. Project promotion and gender sensitization with youths and community leaders. 3. Facilitation meetings for youths on community mobilizing using cooperatives tools. 4. Technical facilitation with youths to identify challenges/conflict ignitors and proactively develop solutions, using principles of conflict resolution, leadership and youth rights, with particular attention to empowering female leaders. 5. Identification of mentors for social entrepreneurship groups, with particular effort to identify female role models.	Output Indicator 2.1.1 Percentage of project participants (aged 16-24 and 50% females) that have increased in skills and competencies to participate and/or lead community social entrepreneurship projects. Baseline: Nil Target: At least 80% of female participants and 80% of male participants.	Participant Surveys, Project Evaluation	<u>The COVID-19 crisis has negatively affected the implementation of training component for social entrepreneurship. An agreement between ILO and World Vision has been reached and trainings will commence soon.</u>
		Output Indicator 2.1.2 Percentage of project participants (aged 16-24) that have improved perceptions of women's potential to play leadership roles. Baseline: Nil Target: At least 80% of female participants and 80% of male participants.	Participant Perception Surveys, Project Evaluation	<u>Inferences drawn from the qualitative data collected during the trainings and dialogues/consultation meetings from various project stakeholders including: community leaders, religious leaders, young men and women echoed positive change in perception about the leadership roles of women, particularly, young women. Additionally, an increasing trend of active participation by underprivileged female community members in project activities has been observed which implies the positive contribution of the project to promote gender equality and sensitization on role of women as leaders.</u>
		Output Indicator 2.1.3 Change in percentage of project participants (aged 16-24) viewing their community as socially cohesive. Baseline: Nil Target: To be established during inception phase.	Participant Perception Surveys, Project Evaluation	<u>The project interventions adopted diverse and inclusive approach of implementation in the target communities. Various communities/villages from the target project locations were clustered together which resulted a positive contribution to enhance the social cohesiveness in the target communities, particularly this aspect has explicitly been observed during the recent youth trainings held at community level. Training related arrangements, at community level, were led by the young men and women</u>

				caucus members, including single mothers, from various villages which provided a vibrant opportunity to lead, promote social cohesion and peacebuilding, particularly during the COVID-19 crisis. Additionally, Youth Caucus members (both young girls and boys) from North Malaita led the reconciliation process and successfully mediated a communal dispute around youth issue.
	Output 2.2 Community projects of marginalized youth groups prioritized and support mechanisms established. List of activities under this Output: 1. National event organized for youth groups to pitch their project ideas and share experiences. 2. Mentors sensitized and introduced to youth group community projects. 3. Successful Mentor-Mentee relationships established to guide implementation of projects. 4. Youth community projects provided initial funding to start implementation.	Output Indicator 2.2.1 Number of youth community projects implemented with project support, with minimum 50% female members. Baseline: Nil Target: To be determined during inception phase	Dialogue and Consultation (workshop) Reports	The COVID-19 crisis has negatively affected the implementation of community projects. The results against this indicator will be reported once community projects' component is started. As per the agreed and reasonable order of the project interventions, community projects' component will be implemented after the training component of social entrepreneurship.
		Output Indicator 2.2.2 Share of projects supported for which mentors and mentees are still in regular contact at the end of the project. Baseline: Nil Target: 100%	Project Evaluation	As per the revised workplan, the community project related interventions will be held during the first quarter of 2021.
	Output 2.3 Community projects of marginalized youth groups implemented, monitored and celebrated. List of activities under this Output:	Output Indicator 2.3.1 Percentage of youth community projects supported by the project that successfully achieve their objectives in contributing to improved community cohesion. Baseline: Nil Target: At least 80% of projects supported.	Project Evaluation	As per the revised workplan, the community project related interventions will be held during the first quarter of 2021.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the launch of youth community projects in respective communities. 2. Weekly project monitoring and reporting. 3. Review of and strengthening of mentorship programme. 			
--	--	--	--	--

Annex C: Checklist of project implementation readiness

Question	Yes	No	Comment
1. Have all implementing partners been identified?	Y		
2. Have TORs for key project staff been finalized and ready to advertise?	Y		TORs for the Project Manager have already been developed. Sharing resources with the existing peacebuilding project (including staff time) also contributes to project readiness.
3. Have project sites been identified?		N	Focus areas for the project have been identified, but specific communities that the project would work with would be identified with project partners during the inception phase.
4. Have local communities and government offices been consulted/ sensitized on the existence of the project?	Y		Government has been consulted closely throughout the development of the project. Local communities will be consulted during the inception phase of the project.
5. Has any preliminary analysis/ identification of lessons learned/ existing activities been done?	Y		
6. Have beneficiary criteria been identified?	Y		
7. Have any agreements been made with the relevant Government counterparts relating to project implementation sites, approaches, Government contribution?	Y		The project focus regions and approaches have been agreed with government.
8. Have clear arrangements been made on project implementing approach between project recipient organizations?	Y		
9. What other preparatory activities need to be undertaken before actual project implementation can begin and how long will this take?		N/A	