

Global Project 'The Saving Lives Entity (SALIENT)'
Project Appraisal Committee Minutes
27 November 2020

Participants

Chair: George Conway, Crisis Bureau

Participants:

1. Lenni Montiel, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean
2. Noura Hamladji, Regional Bureau for Africa
3. Agi Veres, Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS
4. Christophe Bahuët, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific
5. Khaled Abdel Shafi, Regional Bureau for Arab States
6. Gulden Turkoz-Cosslett, Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy
7. Priya Gajraj, Bureau for Management Services
8. Adriana Dinu, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support

Project Overview

Working on both the demand and supply sides of the illicit trafficking and misuse of small arms, the Saving Lives Entity (SALIENT) will support national initiatives in a holistic and transformative approach, through a gender lens. Leveraging the complementary expertise and operational capacities of UNODA and UNDP, SALIENT will support catalytic activities in operationalizing and mainstreaming small-arms control in development efforts and policies. The total budget amount indicated at the time of PAC was USD 3.068m, with funding secured through the PBF.

Comments and Discussion

On 20 November 2020 the CB Deputy Director invited Deputy Directors/representatives from other Bureaux to participate in a virtual PAC, requesting comments by 27 November 2020. The below matrix reflects comments received from RBA, RBLAC, RBEC, BMS, RBAP and BPPS. RBAS endorsed the document with no specific comments on the document. The attached project document includes revisions made in response to PAC member comments and suggestions.

Decision

The PAC has in principle endorsed the project for approval, with the understanding that the project document will be revised based on the comments received.

Process

After the PAC closing date, additional contributions were received toward the initiative, bringing the total budget for this new project to USD 3.796m; the budget has been revised accordingly. The draft PAC Minutes and revised project document have been circulated to PAC members for final endorsement. As no objection was received by the indicated deadline of 17 December 2020, the PAC Minutes and final project document have been considered endorsed.

The signed PAC Minutes and the signed project document will be uploaded in the Global Projects document library.

George Conway

17 December 2020

George Conway
Deputy Director, Crisis Bureau, UNDP

Date

MATRIX OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES			
Criteria	Bureau/Agency	Comments	Response
Strategic	RBEC	Theory of Change: could benefit from being further elaborated, currently it appears to be a short list of institutional level changes sought only.	Thanks for the astute observation. The ToC will be revisited with partners and may be updated based on the evolving context.
	RBAP	RBAP welcomes this project, which is an important step towards greater integration of small arms control into UNDP's broader work on conflict prevention, and greater system-wide coherence through the partnership between UNODA and UNDP.	Thanks a lot for the endorsement.
Relevant	RBLAC	We find that SALIENT is an excellent and timely initiative and fully endorse it. While we are aware that in the initial pilot only Jamaica will participate, we hope the initiative gets expanded and in a near future other LAC countries can join it. As you might be aware, some years ago we had the CASAC initiative in the northern countries of Central America, which had a big success and impact in actions conducted to reduce the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. No further comments, except that Annex D for Budget details was not shared in the original message.	Thanking for the endorsement and in agreement with the observation. SALIENT is envisioned to significantly scale up its ambition and will explore opportunities in all regions and search synergies with ongoing initiatives in the future.
Effective	RBEC	Once approved, the mechanism could benefit from a clear SOP on application and implementation of the grants, as well as a further description of the roles of the Programme Board and the Project Team, where the former provides strategic guidance, and the latter as the decision-making body for allocation of grants. As the current Board consist of UN entities only, and if the grant mechanism is to expand, may consider how non-UN entities, including key civil society organizations, especially women's organizations, could be further engaged in direction giving and in at country-level implementation.	Thanks for the comment. This is noted. SOPs for allocation will be drafted in the commencement phase and endorsed by the first Programme Board. The potential inclusion of non-UN entities in the board structure will be included in the agenda of the first Board Meeting.

	RBAP	<p>We would appreciate to know more about the mechanism for selecting the priority countries, which will be eligible for small grants under the project. Although the prodoc includes references to every region except Asia-Pacific, in fact the Global Peace Index 2020 noted high levels of access to weapons across South Asia and in some South-East Asian countries, while a 2019 Small Arms Survey report noted a high increase in imports of small weapons to South-East Asia.</p>	<p>The selection mechanism will be shared with the Global Programme for Rule of Law and Human Rights Regional Bureau Focal Points as soon as it is fully operational. As we are conducting pilots in Jamaica and Cameroon, we will also have some lessons learned to include.</p> <p>Thank you for referencing the Global Peace Index 2020. We have included it on Page 8 of the project document.</p> <p>We have also included the reference to the 2019 Small Arms survey as indicated on page 5.</p>
Principled	<p>RBAP</p> <p>BPPS</p>	<p>We especially welcome the strong gender lens throughout the project design, which will strengthen national capacities to address the linkages between armed violence and SGBV. In these respects, and in making available resources for armed violence reduction to COs in non-mission settings, the project aligns well to the priorities in our region as well as the conclusions of the Community of Practice hosted by UNIDIR earlier this year.</p> <p>The proposal is a strong GEN 2 project. It effectively mainstreams gender in its different sections, including context (I.e. differential impact of small arms and armed violence, its underlying causes and normative/institutional framework), project description (I.e. different lines of work for the grants and eligibility criteria -GEN 2 projects, gender analysis and budget-) and results framework.</p> <p>I am attaching the PRODOC, with some very specific suggestions using the "comment format" for the context, eligibility criteria, risks, evaluation and results framework sections.</p> <p>I have no comments regarding the QA. It adequately addresses the issues regarding gender equality and human rights.</p>	<p>Thanks for the comment.</p> <p>Thank you for the great feedback and very useful comments in the prodoc.</p> <p>The comments have been discussed with partners (ODA and PBSO) and included where applicable.</p>

Efficient	RBA RBEC	<p>Minor observation - On the cover page, both UNDP and UNODA are listed as implementing partners. It is however indicated on the same page that the total amount of the funds U\$ 3.068 million will be channelled through UNDP. We assume UNODA is playing only a coordination and oversight role through the project board and not necessarily implementation in the field.</p> <p>Budget – was not attached, and hence not clear how the 3m is sought invested, e.g. in human resources (incl. gender expertise?) and management of the grant mechanism; and whether a portion will be allocated in actual grants to COs/UNCTs to pilot?</p>	<p>In agreement with the observation.</p> <p>Thanks for highlighting. This was an oversight. There is HQ staff cost envisioned but the majority of costs will be allocated to COs. Please find budget attached.</p>
Management & Monitoring	BMS	<p>We have reviewed the project document and would like to share the observation that while the project has a comprehensive risk register, all identified risks must be assessed to determine their likelihood and impact, as well as to assign risk and treatment owners.</p>	<p>Thanks for highlighting this. Please see updated risk matrix attached.</p>