

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



United Nations  
Peacebuilding

**PBF PROJECT DOCUMENT**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Country(ies):</b> Liberia  |  |
| <b>Project Title:</b> Sustainable and inclusive peace in Liberia through promoting women leadership and participation in civic and political life and their strengthened role in conflict resolution  |  |
| <b>Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway (if existing project):</b>  |  |
| <b>PBF project modality:</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRF<br><input type="checkbox"/> PRF   | <b>If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund (instead of into individual recipient agency accounts):</b><br><input type="checkbox"/> Country Trust Fund<br><input type="checkbox"/> Regional Trust Fund<br><b>Name of Recipient Fund:</b> |
| <b>List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed by type of organization (UN, CSO etc.):</b><br>Stichting ZOA – International NGO (Not for Profit Organization)  |  |
| <b>List additional implementing partners, specify the type of organization (Government, INGO, local CSO):</b><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Angie Brooks International Centre For Women’s Empowerment, Leadership Development, International Peace and Security – Local CSO</li> <li>- Impact Girls (Bong County), Bong County Women Organization (Bong County), Young Women Christian Association (Montserrado County) and Rural Women of Liberia (Montserrado County) – Local CSOs</li> <li>- Liberia Peacebuilding Office – Government</li> </ul>  |  |
| <b>Project duration in months<sup>1</sup>:</b> 18 months  |  |
| <b>Geographic zones (within the country) for project implementation:</b> Bong and Montserrado Counties  |  |
| <b>Does the project fall under one or more of the specific PBF priority windows below:</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender promotion initiative <sup>2</sup><br><input type="checkbox"/> Youth promotion initiative <sup>3</sup><br><input type="checkbox"/> Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions<br><input type="checkbox"/> Cross-border or regional project   |  |
| <b>Total PBF approved project budget* (by recipient organization):</b><br><b>ZOA: \$ 1,289,614.83</b><br>ZOA declares that no monies will be channeled through the for-profit activities of Stichting ZOA as part of the PBF grant.<br>Total:<br><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> |  |

<sup>1</sup> Note: actual commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer. Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months.

<sup>2</sup> Check this box only if the project was approved under PBF’s special call for proposals, the Gender Promotion Initiative <sup>3</sup> Check this box only if the project was approved under PBF’s special call for proposals, the Youth Promotion Initiative

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Any other existing funding for the project (amount and source):  |   |   |
| <b>PBF 1<sup>st</sup> tranche (35%):</b><br>ZOA: \$ 451,365.19<br>Total: \$ 451,365.19   | <b>PBF 2<sup>nd</sup> tranche* (35%):</b><br>ZOA: \$ 451,365.19<br>Total: \$ 451,365.19 | <b>PBF 3<sup>rd</sup> tranche* (30%):</b><br>ZOA: \$ 386,884.45<br>Total: \$ 386,884.45 |
| <b>Provide a brief project description (describe the main project goal; do not list outcomes and outputs):</b><br>This intervention is planned to take place in the aftermath of the December 2020 mid-term Senatorial Elections and the Constitutional Referendum, at the same time working towards the 2023 Presidential and Legislative elections. Target areas are Montserrado and Bong Counties. In both counties, there are large inter-generational tensions, political marginalization and the exclusion of women and youth from formal decision-making processes. ZOA and the ABIC aim to promote women’s leadership and participation in civic and political life and their strengthened role in conflict prevention and resolution among political actors. Through the Women Situation Room (WSR) mechanism and basic Appreciative Inquiry (AI), the project aims to enhance women’s capacity and agency within the political, civic and mediation spaces.  |   |   |
| <b>Summarize the in-country project consultation process prior to submission to PBSO, including with the PBF Steering Committee, civil society (including any women and youth organizations) and stakeholder communities (including women, youth and marginalized groups):</b><br>The impetus of this project stems from the shared aim of ZOA Liberia and the ABIC, a Liberian woman led organization. Both organizations have extensive experience and a good track record in implementing peacebuilding projects and interventions focused on inclusion and empowerment of women, youth and other vulnerable groups. In January 2020, ZOA and the ABIC commenced the implementation of an EU funded project focused on peacebuilding and national reconciliation. The design of this project has been developed through extensive engagement between ZOA and the ABIC. It builds upon the already established positive collaboration between both organizations and relies upon relative strengths, connections and methodologies that have yielded positive results in the past. Furthermore, consultations with civil society, including local-women led organizations, formal and informal youth and women’s groups in Bong and Montserrado, have contributed to providing direction to the intervention. These consultations have helped to outline expectations related to the upcoming elections and constitutional referendum as well as in identifying key barriers and entry points for women political and civic participation, and in conflict resolution; i.e. how to mobilize women to own peace processes in their communities in managing the expectations of political actors, parties and supporters whom the election does not favor. The Liberia Peacebuilding Office (PBO) and the PBF Secretariat have been consulted throughout the project design phase to coordinate and ensure the proposal aligns with national peacebuilding priorities. |   |   |
| <b>Project Gender Marker score<sup>4</sup>: 3</b><br>100 % and \$ 1,289,614.83 of the total project budget will be allocated to activities in pursuit of gender equality and women’s empowerment:  |   |   |

<sup>4</sup> **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 between 30 and 79% 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)

**Briefly explain through which major intervention(s) the project will contribute to gender equality and women’s empowerment <sup>5</sup>:**

Consultations with women and the conflict analysis (see section I) show that women face structural barriers to meaningful participation in societal and peacebuilding processes. This project aims to support women to overcome these barriers by involving key authorities, influential men and women, women’s groups, and female and male youth. The women-led WSR mechanism is implemented re-affirming the central role of women to conflict resolution and peacebuilding in the aftermath of the mid-term Senatorial Elections and Constitutional Referendum. Appreciative Inquiry visits are used to empower women to represent their needs and to promote positive perceptions among key public actors and men for women to take up leadership roles. Outputs and activities related to the creation of a more enabling environment and the strengthened role of women are identified as crucial for enhancing gender equality in political and civic participation and conflict resolution. Potential backlash of traditional male authorities will be mitigated through continuous dialogue. The MEAL framework focuses on these gender effects. 100% of the budget is allocated to GEWE.

**Project Risk Marker score<sup>6</sup>: 1**

**Select PBF Focus Areas** which best summarizes the focus of the project (*select ONLY one*)<sup>7</sup>:  
(2.3) Conflict prevention/management

If applicable, SDCF/UNDAF **outcome(s)** to which the project contributes:

Aligned with the government’s ‘Pro Poor Agenda for Development and Prosperity’, this project contributes to the UNSDCF 2020 – 2024 strategic priorities one ‘Power to the People’ and ‘Sustaining peace’ by enhancing gender equality and contributing to sustainable and inclusive peace.

**Sustainable Development Goal(s) and Target(s)** to which the project contributes:

This project contributes to three SDGs: SDG 5 which aims to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls, in particular target 5.5 to ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life. SDG 10 which targets to reduce inequalities, more specific target 10.2 to empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status. Similarly, the project contributes to SDG 16 aiming to promote peaceful societies at national levels, with target 16.7 committed to ensure responsive, inclusive and representative decision-making.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Type of submission:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>New project</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Project amendment</b></p> | <p><b>If it is a project amendment, select all changes that apply and provide a brief justification:</b></p> <p><b>Extension of duration:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Additional duration in months (number of months and new end date):</p> <p><b>Change of project outcome/ scope:</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Change of budget allocation between outcomes or budget categories of more than 15%:</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
|--|---|

<sup>5</sup> Please consult the PBF Guidance Note on Gender Marker Calculations and Gender-responsive Peacebuilding

<sup>6</sup> Risk marker 0 = low risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes

Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

<sup>7</sup> 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><b>Additional PBF budget:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Additional amount by recipient organization: USD XXXXX</p> <p><b>Brief justification for amendment:</b></p> <p><i>Note: If this is an amendment, show any changes to the project document in RED colour or in TRACKED CHANGES, ensuring a new result framework and budget tables are included with clearly visible changes. Any parts of the document which are not affected, should remain the same. New project signatures are required.</i></p> |
|--|--|

**PROJECT SIGNATURES:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Recipient Organization(s)*</b></p> <p>Name of Representative [Redacted]</p> <p>Signature [Redacted]</p> <p>Name of Agency <b>ZOAC</b></p> <p>Date &amp; Seal <b>from relief to recovery</b><br/>5-10-22</p> | <p><b>Representative of National Authorities</b></p> <p>Name of Government Counterpart [Redacted]</p> <p>Signature [Redacted]</p> <p>Title <b>Deputy Minister / Admin</b></p> <p>Date &amp; Seal <b>Oct. 8, 2020</b></p>     |
| <p><b>Head of UN Country Team</b></p> <p>Name of Representative [Redacted]</p> <p>Signature [Redacted]</p> <p>Title <b>Resident Coordinator</b></p> <p>Date &amp; Seal <b>Oct 8, 2020</b></p>                     | <p><b>Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)</b></p> <p>Oscar Fernandez-Taranco [Redacted]</p> <p>Signature [Redacted]</p> <p>Title <b>Assistant Secretary-General, Peacebuilding Support Office</b></p> <p>Date &amp; Seal</p> |



\* 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-responsive.

**Conflict factors** – The 2017 Elections marked a significant milestone for Liberia through a peaceful transfer of power from Africa’s first female head of state to her successor. However, the 2017 Elections were also characterized by political marginalization, tribalism, personality attacks, intimidation and violence, especially in Bong and Montserrado Counties. This causes concerns for peace relating to the mid-term Senatorial Elections and Constitutional Referendum (December 2020) as well as in the run-up to the 2023 Presidential and Legislative Elections. After his inauguration, the president appointed key political positions at national and local level. In both, elected and appointed positions women remain underrepresented thereby lacking access to decision-making. This poses threats to inclusive peace and development as the role of women is key to remedying structural inequities and other root causes of conflict.

Socio-economic disparities are conflict factors across Liberia. Unequal access to services, assets and justice is determined by ethnicity, gender, generation, social and political affiliations and economic status. Traditional norms confine women to family and domestic duties in the private sphere, whereas men are breadwinners and control decision-making, thereby causing gender unequal socio-economic outcomes. For example, 27% of women aged 15+ are literate compared to 60.8% of men and 24.1% more women are employed in the informal sector than men<sup>9</sup>. The marginalized socio-economic position of women, but also of youth (18 – 35 years old) and people with disabilities, hinders the civic participation and advocacy abilities of critical voices at decision-making levels. The gendered impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, now and in the near future, tend to worsen the socio-economic position of women due to increased care burdens, disruption of (informal) employment and education, increased domestic violence and lack of female decision-makers in the response.<sup>10</sup>

Liberia has a persistent, largely male dominated culture of violence and impunity. Domestic and Gender Based Violence are rampant, mostly affecting women, children and disabled persons as a result of unequal power relations in which men have asserted the right to control and use violence. This is exaggerated when men feel threatened by women in leadership roles challenging the traditional position of men in charge. Gender-based political violence and harassment are also deeply rooted in Liberian society; personality-based politics is more pronounced than issue-based politics compounded by social norms on the domestic role of women and results in unfairly and unjustifiably intimidation and attacks on them in the cycle of an election, swinging on a pendulum of unequal power relations.

In general, elections in Liberia are seen by many as an avenue to acquire wealth. This leads to a fault-line that presents potential for conflict within and between political parties, as well as between the local populations that support the different political parties. Male candidates engaged in elections against women exhibit high hopes of winning as they feel superior to them, especially older men (45 and above) competing against young women (18 - 35). Losing male candidates often turn to violence and (young) women suffer the full brunt of such acts, forcing them to sometimes concede early defeat with mounting pressure to preserve peace in their electoral constituencies. This also forms a potential risk during the upcoming senatorial elections with one female and seven male candidates competing for one seat in Bong, and four female and six male candidates for one seat in Montserrado.<sup>11</sup>

Structural barriers for women to participate in decision-making and politics are persistent due to unequal access to resources and discriminatory gender norms. Whereas men have a central role in formal processes, women’s voices remain largely confined to informal spheres. Around 12% of parliament seats are held by women and only 6% of local government positions (from town chief to

<sup>9</sup> UN Women: <https://data.unwomen.org/country/liberia> and Beijing+25 National Review Report Liberia (Feb, 2019)

<sup>10</sup> <https://lastmilehealth.org/2020/08/06/gendered-impacts-of-covid-19/>

<sup>11</sup> [https://www.necliberia.org/pg\\_img/2020%20nomination%20report2.pdf](https://www.necliberia.org/pg_img/2020%20nomination%20report2.pdf)

county superintendent).<sup>12</sup> Efforts have been undertaken to ensure more equal representation of women in decision-making. The ‘New Elections Law’ mandates political parties to include at least 30% women in the party hierarchy, the ‘Local Government Act’ reserves at least two seats in each county council for women and the 2016 ‘Equal Participation in Politics Act’ reserves seats in the legislature for women, the disabled and youth. In practice, the latter bill never passed, and enforcement of the quotas is weak as reflected in actual women participation compounded by gender norms.<sup>13</sup> Women who have attained leadership positions are, however, praised for characteristics such as perseverance, commitment, keeping promises, ability to listen, willingness to take action and their passion.<sup>14</sup>

In Bong and Montserrado Counties, rural women and female youth mostly experience marginalization and underrepresentation. Low educational attainment and poverty especially in rural areas causes girls to marry and start childbearing early, thereby emphasizing their role as care-givers in the domestic sphere.<sup>15</sup> The lack of education and access to resources limits their ability to finance political campaigns and increases fear of intimidation by male opponents. Although education levels, especially among women and girls, have improved in the past years, the low levels still remain one of the largest barriers for women leadership and participation, because it contributes to low self-confidence, perceived lack of skills and apprehension to enter politics.<sup>16</sup> For female urban elites, especially in Montserrado, these barriers are less pronounced due to more progressive gender beliefs among the elite, access to finance and education. In Bong, female participation furthermore intersects with ethnicity whereby Mandingos and Lormahs are subordinate to Kpelles. These tribal divisions are less persistent in Montserrado, however are replaced by divisions along party lines.

Corruption in the political system and the abuse of power by a small group of mainly male elites further contributes to exclusion and marginalization of women and youth. Among male dominated state and political actors, the struggle for power dominance and to exert influence, especially during election periods, has ascended the utilization of youth to instigate violence within communities. The weakened socio-economic status of young Liberians leaves them vulnerable to these mobilization attempts by political actors who promise financial incentives and better prospects, especially targeting disadvantaged male youth in urban Bong and Montserrado and male and female university graduates with limited employment perspectives. This type of political mobilization and violence is exaggerated by inter-generational tensions. Traditionally, elders (60 and above), predominantly men, make decisions and provide political direction to the country. Youth feels excluded and does not socially and economically benefit, causing mutual tensions and disrespect exaggerated by more progressive gender beliefs among both young (urban) women and men.

**Main peacebuilding actors, stakeholders and institutional response mechanisms** – In March 2018, United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) completed its mandate and consequently the Government of Liberia (GOL) assumed full responsibility over the security sector. However, corruption, lacking resources and capacity, challenges the effectiveness of the security institutions. In 2009, the Liberia Peacebuilding Office (PBO) was established as the Office of the Government responsible for peacebuilding and reconciliation at national level. PBO also promotes gender equality in its peacebuilding programmes as outlined in the Liberia National Action Plan (LNAP) to implement UNSCR 1325 and the Liberia Peacebuilding Plan (LPP). PBO has however capacity gaps to coordinate peacebuilding efforts, intervene in conflicts effectively and to mainstream gender. The County Security Councils (CSCs) and County Peace Committees (CPCs) are relevant coordination and conflict resolution mechanisms composed of influential and diverse members of government and communities. They respond to security matters, including political and tribal violence, and women’s and youth

---

<sup>12</sup> National Democratic Institute: Final report, Liberia Presidential and Legislative Elections 2017, p. 48 and 50.

<sup>13</sup> Revised National Gender Policy (2018 – 2022), Liberia, p. 44.

<sup>14</sup> USAID, National Democratic Institute (July 2018). Report on Women’s Empowerment in Liberia

<sup>15</sup> The proportion of women aged 20-24 years old who were married or in union before age 18 is 35.9% (UN Women), 33.5 percent of young women in Liberia ages 15-19 have begun childbearing (Beijing+25 National Review Liberia)

<sup>16</sup> USAID, National Democratic Institute (July 2018). Report on Women’s Empowerment in Liberia, p. 17.

issues. The CSCs in Bong and Montserrado are chaired by the female County Superintendent. Whereas the CSC and CPC are more active in Bong than in Montserrado, the effectiveness of these institutions in both counties is largely constrained by the lack of resources. Civil society, women and youth groups, women peace huts, religious and traditional leaders and elders are key in addressing women, peace and security related issues. In Montserrado however, these actors often have political affiliations and do not always represent citizens' interests. The National Elections Commission (NEC) is responsible for compliance to electoral laws ensuring fair, democratic and inclusive elections; the lack of resources, transparency and independence at times contributes to their limited effectiveness. Violence after the declaration of election results has been part of all elections held in Liberia since 2005, including violence against female candidates. It is expected that the upcoming senatorial elections and constitutional amendment, mainly on Dual Citizenship, will be hotly contested. Since 2011, the Women Situation Room (WSR) mechanism has been effective in elections across Liberia's 15 counties in brokering deals among conflicting political actors, de-escalating tensions and enhancing peace.

**Opportunities for peacebuilding and entry points for programming** – ZOA and the ABIC recognize that the immediate phase after the Senatorial Elections is critical for maintaining peace and enhancing the role of women. The following opportunities and entry points have been identified:

- The successful and timely mediation of conflicts between political actors and the management of expectations of losing male candidates contributes to lower levels of violence and more peaceful communities. The WSR mechanism is considered a viable methodology for ensuring peaceful co-existence through the involvement of women mediators.
- Newly elected political actors are an opportunity to advocate for women's issues and non-violence in communities. The project uses this opportunity by promoting women's contributions to peace in electoral constituencies and by building their confidence and skills to represent women's needs.
- Social norms on the domestic and informal role of women are persistent among (traditional, elderly) men in key decision-making positions. They do not always recognize the important contributions of women and other marginalized groups to inclusive development and peace and subsequently the need for their representation in decision-making. It is known that changing these social norms is a long-term and complex process, as such this project intends to foster more positive perceptions and attitudes of local authorities and traditional leaders on women participation and leadership, as a steppingstone towards transforming (harmful) gender norms.
- The lack of education among women contributes to their low confidence, skills and apprehension to enter politics. This project intends to develop the potential of women to voice their unique needs, advocate for their rights, to become leaders and participate in civic and political life.
- Liberia is known for the first African female head of state and has several other great examples of the key role of women in politics and peacebuilding, including the 'Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace Campaign'<sup>17</sup>. This project intends to use the stories and positive traits of women leaders, such as female county superintendents, to inspire and set an example for other Liberian women.

- b) A brief description of how the project aligns with/ supports **existing** Governmental and UN **strategic frameworks**<sup>18</sup>, how it ensures **national ownership**. If this project is designed in a PRF country, describe how the main objective advances a relevant strategic objective identified through the Eligibility Process

This project aligns with Liberia's main policy document; the 'Pro-Poor Agenda for Prosperity and Development', which prioritizes sustaining peace and aspires to enhance inclusiveness and gender equality. This project supports Pillar One 'Power to the People' and Pillar Three 'Sustaining the Peace'. It also contributes to the strategic priorities one 'Power to the People' and three 'Sustaining peace' of the UNSDCF 2020 – 2024. Moreover, the project is in line with 'The 'Strategic Roadmap for National Peacebuilding, Healing and Reconciliation' which is Liberia's national peacebuilding

<sup>17</sup> Liberia's Second Phase National Action Plan (NAP) on Women, Peace and Security 2019-2023, p.9.

<sup>18</sup> Including national gender and youth strategies and commitments, such as a National Action Plan on 1325



strategy. The 2018 revision led to the incorporation of gender mainstreaming and youth participation. Furthermore, this project contributes to objectives under the Liberia Peacebuilding Plan (UNSCR 2333 – 2016), and the Liberia National Action Plan (LNAP) to implement UNSCR 1325 by emphasizing the contributions of Liberian women to peacebuilding and conflict mitigation, mostly aligning with Pillar Three ‘Participation of women, young women and girls’ in decision-making processes related to the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts and countering terrorism.”<sup>19</sup> Another key framework of the GOL is the National Gender Policy which this efforts complements. The project is designed in consultation with national actors and encourages national and local ownership through bottom-up and contextualized approaches and the strong involvement of local stakeholders. PBO is involved to ensure alignment with GOL efforts and to foster learning. The project is mostly implemented by local women-led organizations, thereby enhancing embedding in the local context.

- c) A brief explanation of how the project fills any strategic gaps and complements any other relevant interventions, PBF funded or otherwise. Also provide a brief **summary of existing interventions** in the proposal’s sector by filling out the table below.

Progress is made towards empowering women and their participation in peacebuilding and decision-making, however participation remains limited to the informal sphere and policies with gender quotas are not fully put in practice. This intervention aims to increase women participation in formal spheres contributing to filling the gap between policy and practice. It leverages on and aligns with the results of existing PBF projects in Liberia which contributed towards inclusion of women and youth in peacebuilding and electoral processes, and the implementation of the LNAP.

| <b>Project name (duration)</b>  | <b>Donor and budget</b>            | <b>Project focus</b>   | <b>Difference from/ complementarity to current proposal</b>   |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Strengthening Inclusive Civic and Political Participation and promoting constructive election campaigning (2019 – 2020) | Irish Aid<br>€ 400,000             | Women political/ civic participation non-violent election campaigning      | Builds further on positive results of AI method but in different geographic locations.                  |
| Support to EWER, CPC and District Level Political Reconciliation Dialogues and Civic Engagement (2019 – 2020)           | Sweden Embassy<br>SEK<br>8,964,419 | Conflict resolution, Political and Civic Engagement.                       | Situation room in the run-up to elections, WSR can build further upon this.                             |
| Reconciliation through enhanced co-existence, resilience and civic engagement and responsibility (2020 – 2022)          | European Union<br>€ 789,473        | Individual well-being, co-existence, civic engagement                      | Complements efforts for inclusive civic and peacebuilding processes                                     |
| Enhancing Youth Participation in the 2017 Legislative and Presidential Electoral Process                                | UN PBF<br>\$ 2,477,861             | Conflict prevention and mitigation around elections.                       | National project focusing on youth, with mixed approaches.  |
| Reel Peace: Using Film to Support Stability in Liberia (2018 – 2019)  | UN PBF<br>\$433,129.70             | Build a national network of women using film to support peace.             | Geographic overlaps. Complements efforts to improve role of women in peacebuilding by film              |
| Advancing implementation of UNSCRs on WPS through strengthening accountability frameworks, innovative financing and GRB | UN PBF                             | Implementation of WPS/WHR, strengthening accountability, transparency, GRB | Overlaps in geographic scope. Strategic complementary with different approaches on implementing LNAP II |

<sup>19</sup> Liberia’s Second Phase National Action Plan (NAP) on Women, Peace and Security 2019-2023



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

- a) A brief **description of the project** focus and approach – describe the project’s overarching goal, the implementation strategy, and how it addresses the conflict causes or factors outlined in Section I (must be gender- and age- responsive).

The overarching goal of this project is to promote women’s leadership and participation in civic and political life and their role conflict prevention and resolution in Bong and Montserrado Counties. The project aims to enhance women’s capacity and agency within the political, civic and mediation spaces. Simultaneously, it intends to foster a more conducive environment for women’s leadership and participation by addressing (negative) perceptions and norms. The intervention applies and expands the successful methodologies of the ABIC and ZOA; the Women’s Situation Room (WSR) and basic Appreciative Inquiry (AI). In both methodologies, local ownership, inclusiveness, adaptation and contextualization are central to enhance culturally sensitive and sustainable interventions. The WSR mechanism reaffirms the centrality of women’s significant contributions to peace in the electoral constituencies. It aims to balance the inequity of women in negotiating and mediating political conflict by highlighting peace processes during elections as a strategic entry point for the actualization of UNSCRs 1325 and 1820. Women leaders and women peace activists lobby with conflicting political actors to calm tensions and prevent the escalation of violent incidents in the aftermath of elections. Part of the engagement stresses on advocacy for issue-based rather than personality-based politics which affects female candidates disproportionately. Against this backdrop, issues such as inferiority complex and political marginalization are addressed. The WSR also embraces the constituency of youth to advocate for peace among disadvantaged peers. The inclusivity and diversity of actors using a common platform to mediate difference is the strength of the WSR. The basic AI methodology involves a multi-level, positive strategy encompassing existing grassroots women’s groups, building capacity and facilitating dialogue and advocacy with local authorities and traditional leaders to establish more inclusive and accountable decision making. To enhance ownership over the process and to ensure contextualized approaches, the AI visits are facilitated by four local women-led organizations. AI fosters culturally sensitive, iterative and explorative processes in which participants take ownership, provide in-depth analysis and identify the ‘why’, the institutions and structures, underlying gender inequality in decision-making and political and civic life. This enables them to overcome negative perceptions on women participation and foster more gender equal relations.

- b) Provide a **project-level ‘theory of change’** – explain the assumptions about why you expect the project interventions to lead to changes in the conflict factors identified in the conflict analysis. What are the assumptions that the theory is based on? Note, this is not a summary statement of your project’s outcomes.

Overarching project goal: *Envisaged change:* Increased women’s leadership and participation in civic and political life and women’s strengthened role in conflict prevention and resolution; *Theory of change:* If women have an increased sense of agency, capacity and confidence, this will lead to women feeling empowered to take up positions in formal decision-making processes, conflict resolution and peacebuilding initiatives, thereby ensuring their needs and aspirations are represented<sup>20</sup>; *Assumptions:* Women are willing to increase their participation and to mediate in conflict; Influential actors will allow women to take up positions in formal decision-making and peacebuilding; Women’s key role in decision-making is recognized for sustainable development and peace; *Project approach:* the Women Situation Room mechanism and Appreciative Inquiry.

Outcome one: *Envisaged change:* Strengthened role of women in promoting cohesion and resolving conflict among political actors and their constituencies after the senatorial elections; *Theory of change:* If political, electoral, civic and media platforms are engaged in continuous gender-sensitive advocacies that are based on strengthened agency and capacities of women mediation teams, then there will be

---

<sup>20</sup> Evidence for this approach comes from WSR interventions in Liberia and other African countries since 2011.

acceptance of these women to ensure the timely intervention in rising tensions and resolution of conflict in electoral constituencies<sup>21</sup>; *Assumptions*: The WSR mechanism, including Eminent Women, is socially accepted as a neutral mediator and is effective in settling conflict between political actors; Women are willing to take up mediation roles and acknowledge their lacking skills to do so; Women's and Youth groups are willing to collaborate to promote non-violence and co-existence in communities; Women and youth can positively influence their peers to remain peaceful; *Project approach*: dialogue and mediation between conflicting political actors by eminent women, women's peace marches and male and female youth enhancing co-existence among their peers.

*Outcome two: Envisaged change*: Improved perceptions and commitment among influential (male) actors for women participation and leadership; *Theory of change*: If key stakeholders, including men and influential members of society, have more positive perceptions towards women participation in decision-making and recognize their important contributions to society, women will feel more supported and empowered to become leaders and meaningfully participate in civic and political processes<sup>22</sup>; *Assumptions*: Influential (male) actors are willing to challenge traditional gender norms; Traditional power holders (men in charge) are willing to let women take up formal decision-making positions; Women have the willingness and courage to step forward in leadership positions; *Project approach*: dialogue with empowered women and influential (male) stakeholders to discuss barriers to female participation and to commit to tangible solutions.

- c) **Provide a narrative description of key project components** (outcomes and outputs), ensuring sufficient attention to gender, age and other key differences that should influence the project approach. In describing the project elements, be sure to indicate important considerations related to sequencing of activities.

**Outcome 1: Women promote co-existence and peaceful conflict resolution among political actors in the aftermath of the mid-term Senatorial Elections using the Women's Situation Room (WSR) mechanism** – To manage post-election violence, resolve conflicts and promote co-existence between political actors and their supporters in Bong and Montserrado, the women-led WSR mechanism is implemented re-affirming the central role of women to peacebuilding. The WSR is an early warning mechanism to respond to threats. Its composition is a key to success; a team of Eminent Women supported by the Group of the Wise – elderly men supportive of gender equality. They actively respond to and mediate in conflicts between political actors and manage the expectations and grievances of losing candidates by enhancing mutual understanding, trust and inclusive and constructive dialogue, thereby reducing the risk of mobilization of the constituencies of political actors. The women's groups, of which the Eminent Women are part, are involved in grass-roots activities to promote co-existence and peace in their communities. Through peace messages on the radio and peace marches to political parties' headquarters, the women are calling upon their fellow citizens to maintain peace. Youth groups support the peace efforts of the women. They have direct links to disadvantaged youth who are vulnerable to mobilization by political actors. Through peer-to-peer sessions, youth groups advocate for nonviolence in their communities, thereby ensuring their crucial role in stability and peace.

Output 1.1: Selected women have knowledge on the WSR mechanism, methodology in delivering Track II mediation and have the skills to convene mediation dialogues to manage post-election expectations between conflicting political actors – The physical WSR will be established in both counties at the start of the project. The WSR members collect information on potential elections related threats from grass-roots level. This informs decision-making linked to the mediation dialogues with political actors. Information on potential threats in other counties will be referred to by the WSR to relevant response mechanisms such as the CSC and CPC. For the mediation aspect of the WSR,

---

<sup>21</sup> Evidence for this approach comes from WSR interventions in Liberia and other African countries since 2011.

<sup>22</sup> Evidence from ZOA and PBO project on women political participation (Irish Aid funded); ABT (2017) *Thinking and Working Politically: Are we seeing the emergence of a second orthodoxy?*; Cislighi, Beniamino. (2019) *The potential of a community-led approach to change harmful gender norms in low- and middle-income countries*

Eminent Women are selected from the women's groups (output 2.2) to become Women Mediators (15 per county). They are trained by experts in Track II mediation and the WSR mechanism to acquire skills and knowledge on the management of post-election expectations. The women set up consultations with conflicting political actors and organize Women's Mediation Dialogues in which they explore ideas for resolution. The Women Mediators continuously follow up with political actors to support agreements. The mediation dialogues add credibility to women's agency in peace processes.

Output 1.2: Local women's groups are capable of advocating for citizens' rights and responsibilities and promote peace in their communities –

The WSR mechanism brings together diverse women's groups (10 per county which include youth, elderly women, disabled women, different political affiliations and socio-economic, ethnic and religious backgrounds) to ensure their different needs and experiences are reflected. Consultation meetings outline their multiple views on the post-election situation and inform the women's peace marches. They reach out to influential women, men, youth, and political leaders, and demand they maintain peace and promote co-existence. Visibility materials support the women in their cause as well as recorded and broadcasted peace messages from women peace advocates and political actors. The trained Women Mediators return to the women's groups and transfer the acquired knowledge and skills to their fellows, who become aware and have knowledge on their civic rights and responsibilities, enhancing their agency and civic capacity as peace advocates.

Output 1.3: Youth groups (male, female) have the knowledge and skills to advocate nonviolence in their communities and support women's groups in conflict resolution and mediation –

Four local youth groups (two per county) are identified to support the women's groups in the WSR mechanism to advocate for nonviolence and peaceful co-existence in their communities. These youth groups include female and male members aged 18-35, including people living with disabilities. Their leaders are selected to become peace monitors (5 female, 5 male) to oversee the youth activities. The youth groups receive conflict resolution training and then coordinate youth peer-to-peer peace processes to prevent and reduce post-elections violence. Peace monitors follow up to monitor progress.

**Outcome 2: Local authorities and traditional leaders have improved perceptions on and increased commitment to women participation and leadership at local and county level** –

Mutual reinforcing processes, at formal level (local authorities and traditional leaders – hereafter referred to as key public actors) and informal level (women's groups), are fostered to establish a more conducive environment in which women feel empowered to meaningfully participate in civic and political life. Through AI visits, key public actors are encouraged to challenge existing (negative) perceptions and social norms on women's participation in formal decision-making. They become aware of their own role in denying or enabling women's leadership, thereby aiming to enhance more positive perceptions and find solutions for increased women participation. Simultaneously, local women's groups are supported to identify (harmful) gender norms, barriers and opportunities relevant to their local context which influence their civic and political participation. The AI sessions empower women to represent their needs and aspirations. Inclusive dialogue is promoted among the key actors and women's representatives to commit to locally-led solutions for improved women participation in formal spaces.

Output 2.1: Local authorities and traditional leaders reflect on and understand the barrier's women face to participate in decision-making –

Local authorities and traditional leaders are selected through a power analysis to identify the most suitable actors for promoting women participation, the 'drivers' (six per county), as well as influential actors who are unsupportive of women participation, the 'blockers' (four per county). The type of actor could range from village to county level, however, will at least include four female 'drivers' who function as role models as well as the Women Mediators (output 1.1). Six AI visits will be conducted per public actor to explore (negative) gender norms and perceptions, barriers to and opportunities for increased civic and political participation of women and other marginalized groups (e.g. disabled people). The actors are challenged and encouraged to develop potential pathways for increased women leadership and participation and to take up leadership roles.

Output 2.2: Local women's groups have the confidence, knowledge and skills to represent women's issues, demands and aspirations at local and county level decision-making processes –

builds further on achievements under output 1.2. The same women's groups participate each in ten AI sessions to explore gender dynamics, female ambitions, barriers and opportunities for equal representation and participation. The AI sessions allow women to identify their hidden potential and to build their confidence and skills through a creative and interactive process, which is unique to each group and location. The safe space of the women's groups and the iterative process enables learning, practicing of skills and developing contextualized solutions. Each women's group selects a male counterpart, such as a male chief, elder or husband, to explore similar topics. The aim of male involvement is to have their buy-in in empowering women to take up leadership roles. Representatives from each group, and potentially their male counterparts, come together twice per county to explore commonalities and differences in their experiences linked to women civic and political participation.

Output 2.3: Inclusive dialogue with key public actors and representatives of women's groups to discuss contextualized solutions for women's civic and political participation – As part of the AI methodology, key public actors and women's groups discuss women's participation and develop potential solutions in a parallel process. Then, they are brought together in a joint workshop per county in which inclusive dialogue is fostered to share experiences, learn and to find and commit to the implementation of tangible solutions to enable and improve women political and civic participation. The groups develop action plans and are encouraged to put commitments in writing. Follow up sessions will take place in the communities of the women's groups to ensure the outcomes of the county level dialogues are communicated and to followed up on. **Use Annex C to list all outcomes, outputs, and indicators.**

- d) **Project targeting** – provide a justification for geographic zones, criteria for beneficiary selection, expected number and type of stakeholders/beneficiaries (must be disaggregated by sex and age). Indicate whether stakeholders have been consulted in the design of this proposal. Do not repeat all outputs and activities from the Results Framework.

**Geographic zones** – Bong and Montserrado Counties are targeted based on consultations with local stakeholders and (county) level reconciliation plans. In both counties, intergenerational tensions, political marginalization and the exclusion of women and youth from decision-making are persistent. The capital of Liberia is in Montserrado. Political tensions involving party politics and decisions at the National Legislature begin here and spread across the country. Due to the diversity of the people and competing interests, the risk of potential conflict is high. In addition, recent by-elections have been violent; including the 2019 District #15 Representative by-election and senatorial by-election in Montserrado. It is generally expected that the upcoming elections and referendum will be hotly contested, and tensions will be high, increasing the potential for violence in Bong and Montserrado. The project targets five to ten communities per county (rural and urban)<sup>23</sup> which are selected based on potential for violence and through engagements with stakeholders in ZOA and the ABIC's networks.

**Project beneficiaries and stakeholders** – this project targets beneficiaries in urban and rural Bong and Montserrado. All stakeholders have been consulted and provided direction to the proposal. Stakeholders and beneficiaries are: 20 women's groups (10 per county) are selected through established connections. They convene the WSR mechanism and participate in AI. Diversity of groups will be ensured (see output 1.2). 30 women (15 per county, eminent women, 40+ years) become Women Mediators. Total: 2,000 women; Four local youth groups (two per county, female and male members aged 18 – 35) are identified to support women's groups as well as peace monitors (5 females, 5 males). Total: 2,000 youth; 20 local authorities / traditional leaders (10 per county) are selected by a power analysis. These can range from county to village level and include at least four women; 20 male counterparts are identified by the women's groups themselves; Four local women-led CSOs (Impact Girls, Bong County Women Organization, Young Women Christian Association and Rural Women of Liberia) implement the AI under outcome 2; PBO has a key role in M&E and coordination.

---

<sup>23</sup> Suggested communities: Montserrado: Old Road, Barnesville, New Kru Town, Black Genie Area, Westpoint, Somalia Drive, Duport Road Community, Todee and Bentol. Bong: Gbarnga, Salala, Bong Kpelle, Cuttington, Totota.

### III. Project management and coordination (4 pages max)

- a) **Recipient organizations and implementing partners** – list all 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 knowledge and existing capacity.

ZOA will be the convening organization with the ABIC as the local implementing partner. ZOA has been active in Liberia since 2003 and has extensive experience in the peacebuilding sector in various projects with a wide range of donors. The innovative AI approach has been a tested-and-tried methodology in a current project and lessons learned and best practices can easily be transmitted. The ABIC, since establishment in 2010, partnered with various (inter)national institutions and initiated and the WSR approach. The ABIC's track record focusses on women empowerment, leadership development and international peace and security. Furthermore, ZOA and the ABIC are currently jointly implementing a peacebuilding project with a three-year project duration (2020-2022) and can leverage the fine partnership and improve efficiency. The extensive experience of both organizations coupled with the strong collaboration between an international partner with strong policies and experience in leading partnerships and a national partner with close ties to the situation on the ground provides a strong combination to ensure quality implementation, stakeholder buy-in and sustainability. The combination of the innovative AI methodology and the WSR approach multiplies this relationship.

| Agency  | Total budget in previous calendar year | Key sources of budget (which donors etc.)          | Location of in-country offices  | No. of existing staff, of which in project zones             | Highlight any existing expert staff of relevance to project                                   |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Convening Organization:</b><br>Stichting ZOA                           | USD 2,105,429                          | SIDA, Irish Aid, ECOWAS, EU, FAO                   | 12 <sup>th</sup> Street, Sinkor, Monrovia                                       | 45 (Total # of staff employed for ZOA Liberia) <sup>24</sup> | Project Coordinator managing 3 Peacebuilding projects, Sector Specialist                      |
| <b>Implementing partners:</b><br>Angie Brooks International Centre (ABIC) | USD 505,550                            | UNITAR, AWDF, Swedish Embassy, Resilience Fund, EU | 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Bldg, Capitol Hill, Monrovia | 15   | Initiator of the WSR (ABIC Establishment Coordinator), WSR Int. Coordinator (Project Officer) |

- b) **Project management and coordination** – Indicate the project implementation team, including positions and roles and explanation of which positions are to be funded by the project (to which percentage). Explicitly indicate how the project implementation team will ensure sufficient gender or youth expertise. Explain project coordination and oversight arrangements and ensure link with PBF Secretariat if it exists. Fill out project implementation readiness checklist in **Annex A.1** and attach key staff TORs.

ZOA and the ABIC can leverage cooperation since January 2020 and build on existing coordination mechanisms. To execute the project effectively and efficiently, dedicated staff will be assigned to the project. For ZOA, the implementation team constitutes the following members: a full-time project manager (new, 100%) and MEAL officer (new, 100%). They are supported by the program manager (existing, 7.5%), the Manager of Program Quality (existing, 7.5%) and support staff (Country Director,

<sup>24</sup> 10 out of the 45 are 100% dedicated to peacebuilding projects, 5 are MEAL staff, 13 are support staff



finance, HR, logistics – existing, all 7.5%). ABIC’s implementation team is as follows: Initiator of the WSR / Establishment Coordinator (existing, 25%), WSR International Coordinator / Project Officer (existing, 35%), Peacebuilding Project Administrator (existing, 20%), MEAL Officer (existing, 20%) and support staff (existing, 13 – 20%). A project accountant will be recruited (new, 100%).

The ABICs project manager is responsible for executing the project and reports to the administrator who subsequently reports to the Coordinator. The ABIC will report to lead partner ZOA. For ZOA, the project manager is responsible for daily management of the project and reports to the programme manager who subsequently reports to the Country Director. For both partners, the support department (Finance, HR, logistics) and the MEAL department support all project activities. Both partners have (international) staff available to support as well; most notably project staff in other peacebuilding projects, HQ office (ZOA), the Initiator of the WSR / Establishment Coordinator (the ABIC) and a Sector Specialist peacebuilding (ZOA, HQ in The Netherlands).

ZOA will lead the overall partnership. The ABIC is the lead on activities and achievements under Outcome 1, whereas ZOA takes responsibility for Outcome 2 in line with respective expertise. Learning and strengthening capacities are key within this project; therefore, mutual exchange visits and involvement of both organizations in all aspects of the project is encouraged.

To ensure technical support in coordinating all activities and efficient utilization of resources for maximum impact, ZOA and the ABIC will convene meetings to discuss project progress, planning, challenges and opportunities. Finance and support staff will regularly provide BvAs to ensure the project is not only activity-wise on track, but the burning rate is keeping appropriate pace. Partners will ensure close collaboration and coordination with the PBF Secretariat in Liberia to successfully implement the project. Regular updates will be provided the donor on project activities and challenges, and joint fieldtrips will be planned to monitor project results. In addition, PBF will be asked for updates on evolvments in the peacebuilding sector which will inform project directions.

Youth and gender considerations are made. More than 80% of the ABIC’s project team is made up of young women, aged 22 – 32 years. The ABIC’s existing staff has vast experience in managing women and youth empowerment programs. Both organizations are gender-transformative and for recruitment, both women and people living with a disability will be encouraged to apply.

- c) **Risk management** – Identify project-specific risks and how they will be managed, including the approach to updating risks and making project adjustments. Include a Do No Harm approach and risk mitigation strategy.

| <b>Project specific risk</b>   | <b>Risk level (low, medium, high)</b> | <b>Mitigation strategy (including Do No Harm considerations)</b>  |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| Spread of COVID-19 in target communities                                     | MEDIUM                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strictly follow guidance MoH/GoL/WHO</li> <li>- COVID-19 sensitive project programming</li> </ul>  |
| Political tensions between government factions and/or as a result of the SSE | MEDIUM                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitor the situation</li> <li>- Strict adherence to security policies</li> <li>- Close collaboration with key stakeholders</li> <li>- Access to information through UNPBF enabling to adapt project strategies</li> </ul> |
| (Perceived) partiality of one or both project agencies                       | LOW                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adhere to DO NO HARM strategy</li> <li>- Maintain neutral status as NGOs</li> <li>- Monitoring of project partners</li> <li>- Proportionate attention to various project beneficiaries</li> </ul>                          |
| Lack of participation of Government of Liberia                               | LOW                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular involvement in project activities</li> <li>- Build on established working relationships</li> </ul>   |

|  |        |   |
|--|--------|---|
|  |        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Align project to GOL policies and strategies</li> <li>- Request support from UNPBF</li> </ul>  |
| (Sexual) exploitation and abuse of beneficiaries by staff of ZOA and the ABIC (and volunteers), contractors, and service providers paid under this project | MEDIUM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All staff paid under this project understand and sign ZOA Code of Conduct</li> <li>- Reference check during recruitment process</li> <li>- All contracted parties sign ZOA Code of Conduct as annex to contract</li> <li>- Zero-tolerance policy for misconduct</li> <li>- Focal phone numbers (toll free) for SEA concerns (Orange and Lonestar)</li> </ul> |
| Resistance to female empowerment   | LOW    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change agents throughout project period</li> <li>- Gender-transformative project approach</li> <li>- Continuous dialogues with resistance factors</li> <li>- Local authorities and male buy-in for project</li> </ul>  |
| Challenges in partnerships ZOA-the ABIC  | LOW    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure commitment on proposed objectives and set up clear working and reporting structures</li> <li>- Engage in regular meetings with project staff</li> <li>- Continue and expand fruitful cooperation since Jan 2020 (<i>as part of separate project</i>)</li> </ul>   |
| Financial risks, including mismanagement of funds (fraud)  | LOW    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and transparent (financial) processes</li> <li>- Zero tolerance on financial mismanagement</li> <li>- Regular checks, monitoring - internal controls</li> <li>- Support audit at the end of the project</li> </ul>   |

All risks will be entered into the logbook of ZOA's Sharepoint-based project quality management system, including severity, likelihood and risk owner. An audit trail keeps track of mitigation measures. The system thus allows for continuous updates and real-time risk monitoring.

- d) **Monitoring and evaluation** – Describe 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 budget break-down for both monitoring and evaluation activities, including collection of baseline and end line data and an independent evaluation, and an approximate M&E timeline. Fund recipients are obligated to reserve at least 5-7% of the project budget for M&E activities, including sufficient funds for a quality, independent evaluation.

In tune with the project goals, ZOA and the ABIC's approach to monitoring, evaluation, accountability and lesson-learning (MEAL) places emphasis on utilizing participant-led, inclusive processes. A comprehensive MEAL system will be developed. Monthly monitoring is emphasized as this allows to challenge and update assumptions as outlined in the ToC and to track progress towards desired outcomes. Besides monitoring progress against indicators, emphasis will be placed on monitoring contextual changes and its impact on the project. ZOA and the ABIC will ensure adaptive programming, informed by continuous data collection and analysis. To ensure smooth data collection and analysis, a digital data collection system based on KoBo Toolbox will be used as much as possible.

A baseline study will be conducted to measure relevant outcome level indicators and establish baseline values which allows to measure progress against targets. The context and power analysis compose part of the baseline study and will be embedded in the MEAL approach. Methods of monitoring will include, but are not limited to, focus group discussions, most significant changes, surveys, key informant interviews, activity reports, on site visits and regular communication. All data is disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity, religion, people living with disabilities and other relevant aspects. Success in the project will be measured by testimony, learning reports and data on knowledge,

attitudes and behaviors. Participants in this project will play an important role in defining the lessons learnt and disseminating them among key stakeholders and other actors in the peacebuilding and social development sectors. An external, independent end line study will be conducted to assess the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and impact of the project.

The ZOA Manager of Programme Quality supported by the MEAL Officer, together with the ABIC M&E Officer and Project Assistant will be responsible for all MEAL related aspects, including adaptive learning, sharing success stories and drawing out ideas from the community. This team has diverse experience ranging from development of monitoring tools, digital data collection, data analysis and visualization, execution of baseline studies and end evaluations adhering to the OECD/DAC evaluation guidelines. To enhance national ownership and learning for the peacebuilding sector at large, PBO will have a central role in regular monitoring and in the end evaluation. The PBF Secretariat in country will closely work with the project to ensure rigorous monitoring. The Secretariat will from time to time provide technical M&E support and ensure PBF guidelines are followed.

| <b>M&amp;E activity</b>  | <b>Budget (excl 7% overheads)</b> | <b>Timeline</b>                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Collection baseline data | 7,500 USD                         | First two months of the project |
| Regular monitoring       | 73,550 USD                        | Monthly                         |
| PBO M&E                  | 7,500 USD                         | Quarterly                       |
| External end evaluation  | 10,000 USD                        | Last two months of the project  |

- 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 concretely and pro-actively to try to ensure this support from the start. Consider possible partnerships with other donors or IFIs.

ZOA and the ABIC, in line with the Core Humanitarian Standards – ZOA is CHS certified – will contribute to the aim of locally-driven programming to ensure that interventions are contextualized, maximize impact and build continuity in target areas. PBO and four local-women led organizations are involved to embed project approaches in local actors. The overall project will ensure progress is made towards empowering women and increase their participation in peacebuilding and decision-making. Despite several (ambitious) policy efforts in the past, participation has remained limited, largely in the informal sphere. This intervention aims to increase women participation in formal spheres contributing to filling the gap between policy and practice. The project contributes to more positive perceptions on women participation in peacebuilding and decision-making processes. It is expected that the women supported through the project are empowered and have increased agency to participate in society in leading positions and will subsequently act as a role model in the community. his project also contributes to an improved environment characterized by enhanced civic engagement and peaceful coexistence and increased resilience. An improved environment characterized by peace and stability allows individual Liberians, groups and institutions to develop themselves and Liberia sustainably without the destructive effects of conflict. Learning within the project is emphasized and will be documented. Lessons learned and best practices will be shared among relevant stakeholders working on peacebuilding and gender equality in Liberia to enhance visibility and advocate for successful approaches. Accountability to affected populations (AAP) will be a continuous priority. Beneficiaries will be involved from inception stage onwards and will be informed about implementing organizations, the donor of the project, timelines, objectives and complaints handling mechanisms from the start of the project onwards. The external end line evaluation will further provide guidance on (additional) measures that can be taken to improve sustainability.

#### IV. Project budget

The project is based on existing expertise within the two partnering organizations. In order to carry out activities a few new staff will be recruited, but the main parts of the work are done through a part-time allocation of existing staff members. The project strongly focusses on empowering, and bringing ownership and capacity to national and local actors and CSOs and invests heavily in that. Grants and service contracts with CSOs and representatives from CSOs will be put in place to materialize this. USD 64,000 is set apart for grants to CSOs, and with ABIC as a National CSO, this brings the Budget allocated to CSOs to almost 70%

To properly do, mentor and monitor this, the project emphasizes continuous travel and support to these actors, which is also reflected in travel costs and justifies the purchase of a project vehicle.

Provide brief additional information on projects costs, 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.

Please note that in nearly all cases, the Peacebuilding Fund transfers project funds in a series of performance-based tranches. PBF's standard approach is to transfer project funds in two tranches for UN recipients and three tranches for non-UN recipients, releasing second and third tranches upon demonstration that performance benchmarks have been met. All projects include the following two standard performance benchmarks: 1) at least 75% of funds from the first tranche have been committed, and 2) all project reporting obligations have been met. In addition to these standard benchmarks and depending on the risk rating or other context-specific factors, additional benchmarks may be indicated for the release of second and third tranches.

Please specify below any context-specific factors that may be relevant for the release of second and third tranches. These may include the successful conduct of elections, passage of key legislation, the standing up of key counterpart units or offices, or other performance indicators that are necessary before project implementation may advance. Within your response, please reflect how performance-based tranches affect project sequencing considerations.

The project consists of quite a few ongoing activities (appreciative inquiry visits, ongoing monitoring) , although expenditures will be considerably higher in the first part of the project, due to baseline and power analysis, as well as the set up of the Women Situation Room, and initial trainings of participants and beneficiaries of the project. This means that the second tranche will be likely to be requested before 35% of the project period has expired. No context-specific factors are expected to be able to influence this. The senatorial elections in December 2020 could have an uncertain aftermath, but this is also the context that the project specifically addresses.

To set a marker between the second and third tranche is slightly more complicated, but it should have the refresher training in the Women Situation room, as well as 75% of Output 2.1 and 2.2 realized. Output 2.3 and end evaluations will all be planned during the last tranche of the project.

In principle it is anticipated that the project has been designed in a natural way that performance based tranches would not create any hindrances, or delays in activities due to lack of available funds at any given moment.

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

In the first Excel budget table in Annex D, please include the percentage towards Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) for every activity. Also provide a clear justification for every GEWE allocation (e.g. training will have a session on gender equality, specific efforts will be made to ensure equal representation of women etc.).

### Annex A.1: Checklist of project implementation readiness

| Question  | Yes | No  | Comment   |
|---|-----|-----|---|
| <b>Planning</b>   |     |     |   |
| 1. Have all implementing partners been identified? If not, what steps remain and proposed timeline  | Y   |     | Partnership agreed upon, PBO and 4 CSOs identified  |
| 2. Have TORs for key project staff been finalized and ready to advertise? Please attach to the submission   |     | N   | Existing staff have job descriptions, for to be recruited staff this is not yet finalized   |
| 3. Have project sites been identified? If not, what will be the process and timeline  | Y   |     | Counties and target locations identified, but the project is intended to be flexible in response, pending SSE   |
| 4. Have local communities and government offices been consulted/ sensitized on the existence of the project? Please state when this was done or when it will be done.                       | Y   |     | PBO and representatives from local youth and women's groups were involved during proposal writing. The inception meeting will bring all relevant stakeholders together                                  |
| 5. Has any preliminary analysis/ identification of lessons learned/ existing activities been done? If not, what analysis remains to be done to enable implementation and proposed timeline? | Y   |     | AI and WSR are tested and tried approached  |
| 6. Have beneficiary criteria been identified? If not, what will be the process and timeline.  | Y   |     | Criteria (age, gender etc) identified but the project also wishes to remain flexible in response (location, aftermath SSE)  |
| 7. Have any agreements been made with the relevant Government counterparts relating to project implementation sites, approaches, Government contribution?                                   | Y   |     | PBO agreed on coordination and monitoring responsibilities  |
| 8. Have clear arrangements been made on project implementing approach between project recipient organizations?  | Y   |     | Partners already have ongoing project partnership and this project will build on the approach. Division of labour (Outcomes I and II) and cross-cutting issues are clear. ZOA will lead the partnership |
| 9. What other preparatory activities need to be undertaken before actual project implementation can begin and how long will this take?  |     | N/A |   |
| <b>Gender</b>   |     |     |   |
| 10. Did UN gender expertise inform the design of the project (e.g. has a gender adviser/expert/focal point UN Women colleague provided input)?  | Y   |     | ZOA's HQ advisor was consulted, ZOA attended feedback rounds UNPBF (on ToR and first draft proposal)  |



|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| 11. Did consultations with women and/or youth organizations inform the design of the project?                                | Y | Informal and formal women's groups and organizations have been consulted as well as youth groups. |
| 12. Are the indicators and targets in the results framework disaggregated by sex and age?                                    | Y | See logframe  |
| 13. Does the budget annex include allocations towards GEWE for all activities and clear justifications for GEWE allocations? | Y | See budget  |

### Annex A.2: Checklist for project value for money

| Question  | Yes | No | Project Comment   |
|---|-----|----|---|
| 1. Does the project have a budget narrative justification, which provides additional project specific information on any major budget choices or higher than usual staffing, operational or travel costs, so as to explain how the project ensures value for money?   | Y   |    | Justifications are provided if necessary.   |
| 2. Are unit costs (e.g. for travel, consultancies, procurement of materials etc) comparable with those used in similar interventions (either in similar country contexts, within regions, or in past interventions in the same country context)? If not, this needs to be explained in the budget narrative section.            | Y   |    | Budget is based on costs made during similar the ABIC and ZOA interventions in the country.   |
| 3. Is the proposed budget proportionate to the expected project outcomes and to the scope of the project (e.g. number, size and remoteness of geographic zones and number of proposed direct and indirect beneficiaries)? Provide any comments.   | Y   |    | Budget is proportionate to the scope, including geographic areas, timeline of the project and number of beneficiaries.  |
| 4. Is the percentage of staffing and operational costs by the Receiving UN Agency and by any implementing partners clearly visible and reasonable for the context (i.e. no more than 20% for staffing, reasonable operational costs, including travel and direct operational costs) unless well justified in narrative section? | Y   |    | Staffing costs are around 20%, operational costs are similar as in other projects and directly linked to travel distances.  |
| 5. Are staff costs proportionate to the amount of work required for the activity? And is the project using local rather than international staff/expertise wherever possible? What is the justification for use of international staff, if applicable?  | Y   |    | The successful implementation of project activities is reliant on proper planning and continuous engagement with stakeholders. Sufficient staffing costs have been allocated. Direct project staff are international, whereas some indirect staff are international, ensuring compliance to international donor requirements. |

|   |          |          |  |
|---|----------|----------|--|
| <p>6. Does the project propose purchase of materials, equipment and infrastructure for more than 15% of the budget? If yes, please state what measures are being taken to ensure value for money in the procurement process and their maintenance/ sustainable use for peacebuilding after the project end.</p> | <p>Y</p> |          | <p>For all purchases of material value a competitive procurement process will be followed which could be a national tender, or a decision on the quotations and selection through a committee. For durable equipment (vehicle, motorbikes), maintenance costs are budgeted, and will be following guidelines of Transfer of Ownership.</p> |
| <p>7. Does the project propose purchase of a vehicle(s) for the project? If yes, please provide justification as to why existing vehicles/ hire vehicles cannot be used.</p>  | <p>Y</p> |          | <p>Vehicle will be regularly used for field travel, costs of hiring a vehicle exceeds costs of purchasing. The project is very travel intensive, and neither ZOA or Angie Brooks would be able to cater for this through other vehicles.</p>   |
| <p>8. Do the implementing agencies or the UN Mission bring any additional non-PBF source of funding/ in-kind support to the project? Please explain what is provided. And if not, why not.</p>  |          | <p>N</p> |  |

## **Annex B.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 Programs, 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 cost 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  |
|--|--|
| <b>30 April</b>  | Annual reporting – Report <b>Q4 expenses</b> (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

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>31 July</b>    | Voluntary Q2 expenses (January to June)      |
| <b>31 October</b> | 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 ([www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund](http://www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund)) and the Administrative Agent’s website ([www.mptf.undp.org](http://www.mptf.undp.org)).

**Annex B.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                 | 1 December   | PBF Secretariat on behalf of the PBF Steering Committee, where it exists or  |



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| progress report (for PRF allocations only), which may contain a request for additional PBF allocation if the context requires it |  | Head of UN Country Team where it does not. |
|--|--|--|

#### Financial reports and timeline

| <b>Timeline</b>   | <b>Event</b>   |
|---|--|
| <b>28 February</b>  | Annual reporting – Report <b>Q4 expenses</b> (Jan. to Dec. of previous year) |
| <b>30 April</b>   | Report <b>Q1 expenses</b> (January to March)                                 |
| <b>31 July</b>  | Report <b>Q2 expenses</b> (January to June)                                  |
| <b>31 October</b>   | Report <b>Q3 expenses</b> (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 ([www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund](http://www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund)) and the Administrative Agent website ([www.mptf.undp.org](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 project.<sup>25</sup>
- 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.

---

<sup>25</sup> Annualized PBF project budget is obtained by dividing the PBF project budget by the number of project duration months and multiplying by 12.

### Annex C: Project Results Framework (MUST include sex- and age disaggregated targets)

| Outcomes   | Outputs   | Indicators   | Means of Verification/<br>frequency of collection   | Indicator milestones  |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Outcome 1: Women promote co-existence and peaceful conflict resolution among political actors in the aftermath of the mid-term Senatorial Elections using the Women's Situation Room (WSR) mechanism</p> <p>This outcome contributes to SDG targets: 5.5 and 10.2</p> <p>(Any Universal Periodic Review of Human Rights (UPR) recommendation that this Outcome helps to implement and if so, year of UPR)</p> |   | <p>Outcome Indicator 1a: % of participating women and youth who report an increase in sense of agency<sup>26</sup> and civic responsibility<sup>27</sup> to initiate and own mediation and conflict prevention/mitigation processes in their communities through the WSR mechanism</p> <p>Baseline: TBD<br/>Target: Between 60% and 80% of participating women (all ages) and youth (between 18 – 35, male and female)</p> | <p>MoV: Baseline survey and end of project evaluation reports on women's engagements and interviews</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: Twice during project duration: Baseline survey and final evaluation.</p>   | 40% of participating women and youth after the first 9 months of the project                        |
|  |   | <p>Outcome Indicator 1b: % of political actors, citizens and other relevant stakeholders who acknowledge the key role of women in conflict resolution and peaceful co-existence</p> <p>Baseline: TBD<br/>Target: Between 60 and 80% of political actors, citizens and other relevant stakeholders (including local authorities, traditional leaders, youth) (male and female, all ages)</p>                                | <p>Interviews and surveys / baseline and end evaluation</p> <p>MoV: Baseline survey and end of project evaluation reports on women's engagements and interviews</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: Twice during project duration: Baseline survey and final evaluation.</p> | 40% of political actors, citizens and other relevant actors after the first 9 months of the project |
|  |   | <p>Outcome Indicator 1c: % of citizens in target communities who report co-existence and peaceful conflict resolution in the aftermath of the elections</p> <p>Baseline: TBD<br/>Target: Between 60 and 80% of citizens in target communities (male, female, youth, elderly, diverse religious, ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds)</p>   | <p>MoV: Baseline survey and end of project evaluation reports on co-existence and conflict resolution and interviews</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: Twice during project duration: Baseline survey and final evaluation.</p>  | 40% of citizens in target communities after the first 9 months of the project                       |
|  | <p>Output 1.1 Selected women have knowledge on the WSR mechanism, methodology in delivering Track II mediation and have the skills to convene mediation dialogues to manage</p> | <p>Output Indicator 1.1.1: # of women from local civil society groups and communities who complete the training and are certificated on the WSR mechanism and Track II methodologies.</p> <p>Baseline: 0</p>   | <p>MoV: Training attendance register</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: once during project duration after completion of the training</p>   | 30 women are certified after the first 9 months of the project                                      |

<sup>26</sup> The definition of sense of agency is the degree to which one feels that ordinary people can change things in their community (SCORE 2018)

<sup>27</sup> Civic responsibility refers to the extent to which one feels responsible for the future and wellbeing of their society and country (SCORE 2018)

|  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  | post elections expectations between conflicting political actors | Target: 30 women from local civil society groups and communities are certified as Women Mediators (eminent women – above 40 years old)  | MoV: copies of certificates<br>Frequency of data collection: once during the certification ceremony  |  |
|  |  | Output Indicator 1.1.2: % of Women Mediators who demonstrate acquired skills and knowledge of the WSR mechanism and methodologies of Track II mediation by convening mediation dialogues.<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: Between 60 and 80 % of Women Mediators (above 40 years) | MoV: Track records of mediation dialogues<br>Frequency of data collection: regular after each dialogue<br>MoV: End evaluation survey and interviews with Women Mediators<br>Frequency of data collection: once during the end evaluation | 40% of women mediators the first 9 months of the project   |
|  |  | Output Indicator 1.1.3: # of mediation dialogues with conflicting political actors convened by Women Mediators to mediate issues among conflicting political actors<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: 20 (10 per county)  | MoV; Reports from mediation dialogues and attendance records<br>Data collection frequency: regular after each dialogue   | 10 mediation dialogues implemented after the first 9 months of the project   |
|  |  | Output indicator 1.1.4: % of women-led mediation dialogues among conflicting political actors which result in peaceful conflict resolution and co-existence<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: Between 60 and 80% of mediation dialogues   | MoV: End evaluation survey and interviews with Women mediators and political actors<br>Frequency of data collection: once during the end evaluation  | 40% successful women-led mediation dialogues the first 9 months of the project   |
|  |  | Output 1.2: Local women's groups are capable of advocating for citizens' rights and responsibilities and promote peace in their communities   | Output Indicator 1.2.1: # of women participating in peace marches organized by women's groups in their communities<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: 2,000 women (all ages)  | MoV: monitoring reports and media coverage of women's activities in the counties<br>Frequency of data collection: regular after each women's march |
|  |  | Output Indicator 1.2.2: # of peace statements delivered by political actors and women<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: TBD   | MoV: press statements released by political actors<br>Frequency of data collection: regular after release of each statement  | To be determined   |
|  |  | Output Indicator 1.2.3: % of participating women who report to have the capacity to advocate for citizen's rights and responsibilities<br><br>Baseline: 0   | MoV: End evaluation survey and interviews on women's capacity<br>Frequency of data collection: once during the end evaluation  | 40% of participants after the first 9 months of the project  |
|  |  |   |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |

|  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  | Target: Between 60 and 80% of participating women (all ages)  |   |  |
|  | Output 1.3: Youth groups (male, female) have the knowledge and skills to advocate nonviolence in their communities and support women's groups in conflict resolution and mediation | Output Indicator 1.3.1: # of youth trained in the WSR mechanism and conflict resolution<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: 400 (200 females; 200 males) and 10 peace monitors (5 female, 5 male) (between 18 and 35)   | MoV: Training attendance sheet<br>Frequency of data collection: regular after each training day<br>MoV: copies of certificates<br>Frequency of data collection: once during the certification ceremony  | 400 youth trained after the first 9 months of the project              |
|  |  | Output Indicator 1.3.2: # of peer to peer peace dialogues conducted by peace monitors and # of participants<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: 40 (20 per county) with around 2,000 youth participants (male and female)   | MoV: track record peer to peer dialogues and participants database<br>Frequency of data collection: Regular after each dialogue   | 20 per to peer peace dialogues after the first 9 months of the project |
|  |  | Output Indicator 1.3.3: % of trained youth who report nonviolence and peaceful conflict resolution in their communities in the aftermath of the senatorial elections<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: Between 60% and 80% of youth beneficiaries (male and female)   | MoV: End evaluation survey and interviews on youth capacity<br>Frequency of data collection: once during the end evaluation<br>MoV: Track record of number of cases of violence among youth in counties<br>Frequency of data collection: regular monitoring throughout the project<br>MoV: WSR incidents reports<br>Frequency of data collection: regular monitoring throughout the project | 40% of participants after the first 9 months of the project            |
| Outcome 2: Local authorities and traditional leaders have improved perceptions on and increased commitment to women participation and leadership at local and county level<br><br>This outcome contributes to SDG targets:<br>5.5 to ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all |  | Outcome Indicator 2a: % of participating local authorities / traditional leaders who accept there is a problem of under representation of women in political and civic life<br><br>Baseline: 0<br>Target: between 60 and 80% of participating local authorities / traditional leaders (male and female, all ages) | MoV: Baseline survey and end of project evaluation reports on understanding of women participation and interviews<br>Frequency of data collection: Twice during project duration: Baseline survey and final evaluation.   | 40% of participants after the first 9 months of the project            |
|  |  | Outcome Indicator 2b: % of participating local authorities and traditional leaders who report improved perceptions and increased  | MoV: Baseline survey and end of project evaluation reports on perceptions linked  | 40% of participants after the first 9 months of the project            |



|   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life.<br/>10.2 to empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status<br/>16.7 committed to ensure responsive, inclusive and representative decision-making</p> <p>(Any Universal Periodic Review of Human Rights (UPR) recommendation that this Outcome helps to implement and if so, year of UPR)</p> |   | <p>commitment to women participation and leadership</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: between 60 and 80% of participating local authorities and traditional leaders (male and female)</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: between 60 and 80% of participating local authorities / traditional leaders (male and female, all ages)</p>                                    | <p>to women participation and interviews</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: Twice during project duration: Baseline survey and final evaluation.</p>   |  |
|   |   | <p>Outcome Indicator 2c: # of locally led solutions which are agreed upon by women's groups and actors, gain written commitment and are implemented</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: At least 4 ideas (2 per county) gain written commitments, becoming tangible outcomes for local institutions. It is hoped that more will gain informal consent and action.</p> | <p>MoV: minutes of meetings from 'formal institutions' which propose to take action</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: once during the end evaluation of the project</p>   | <p>0 locally led solutions after the first 9 months of the project</p>                   |
|   | <p>Output 2.1: Local authorities and traditional leaders reflect on and understand the barrier's women face to participate in decision-making</p>   | <p>Output Indicator 2.1.1: # of appreciative inquiry visits with local authorities and traditional leaders</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: 120 visits – 72 with driving actors and 48 with blocking actors</p>  | <p>MoV: activity reports of women-led organizations</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: regular after each AI visit</p>   | <p>60 appreciative inquiry visits conducted after the first 9 months of the project</p>  |
|   |   | <p>Output Indicator 2.1.2: % of participating local authorities and traditional leaders who can mention and elaborate on the key structural barriers for women participation in their community / area</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: between 60 and 80% of participating local authorities / traditional leaders (male and female, all ages)</p>                | <p>MoV: Baseline survey and end of project evaluation reports on understanding of women participation and interviews</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: Twice during project duration: Baseline survey and final evaluation.</p> | <p>40% of participants after the first 9 months of the project</p>                       |
|   | <p>Output 2.2 Local women's groups have the confidence, knowledge and skills to represent women's issues, demands and aspirations at local and county level decision-making processes</p> | <p>Output Indicator 2.2.1: # of appreciative inquiry visits with women's groups</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: 200 visits (100 per county, 10 per women's group) with between 300 and 400 participants (female of all ages)</p>  | <p>MoV: activity reports of women-led organizations</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: regular after each AI visit</p>   | <p>100 appreciative inquiry visits conducted after the first 9 months of the project</p> |

|  |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|
|  |   | <p>Output Indicator 2.2.2: % of participants in the appreciative inquiry visits who report increased confidence, knowledge and skills to represent women's issues, demands and aspirations</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: Between 60% and 80% of participants (female of all ages)</p>  | <p>MoV: Baseline survey and end of project evaluation reports on women's knowledge, confidence and skills and interviews</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: Twice during project duration: Baseline survey and final evaluation.</p> | 40% of participants after the first 9 months of the project        |
|  |   | <p>Output Indicator 2.2.3: # of participating women who takes a leadership position at local or county level withing the project period</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: TBD</p>  | <p>MoV: Interviews with women and track record from local authorities</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: Regular monitoring and at the end of the project during evaluation</p>  | To be determined   |
|  | Output 2.3: Inclusive dialogue with key public actors and representatives of women's groups to discuss contextualized solutions for women's civic and political participation | <p>Output Indicator 2.3.1: # of participants at solution sharing workshops held between women and local authorities and traditional leaders (1 per county)</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: 60 representatives of women's groups (30 per county) (female all ages) and 20 local authorities and/or traditional leaders (at least four female)</p> | <p>MoV: attendance records of workshops</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: once after the workshops</p>  | 0 inclusive dialogues held after the first 9 months of the project |
|  |   | <p>Output indicator 2.3.1: # of contextualized solutions which are considered feasible by representatives of women's groups and key public authorities</p> <p>Baseline: 0<br/>Target: at least four solutions (2 per county)</p>  | <p>MoV: minutes from workshops</p> <p>Frequency of data collection: once after the workshops</p>   | 0 solutions developed after the first 9 months of the project      |