This report includes insights from mapping youth peacebuilding programmes, initiatives and organizations in the Asia-Pacific. The mapping and its insights aim to contribute to the strategic vision of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in the Asia-Pacific and promote the Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) agenda in the Asia-Pacific region.

Young people's role in peace and security has been understudied. Very little is understood and tends to be largely stereotypical, with young men and women considered “victims” or “perpetrators” in a conflict.1 For the first time in history, in December 2015, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted the first resolution (UNSCR 2250) on youth, peace and security (YPS), recognizing the positive contribution of young women and men to peace.2 This landmark resolution identifies five key pillars for action: participation, protection, prevention, partnerships and disengagement and reintegration. Resolution 2250 was followed in 2018 by resolution 24193 and, in 2020, by resolution 2535,4 underlining the vital need to include youth in peacebuilding decision-making and supporting their work in building and sustaining peace.

More than 1.1 billion young people aged 15 to 29 live in the Asia-Pacific, representing more than 25 per cent of the population.5 The Asia-Pacific is home to 60 per cent of the world's young people, making it the most youthful region.6 At the same time, multiple countries in the region are in the midst of multidimensional crises and armed conflict,
and half of the world’s refugee population is located in this region. Thus, the youth in the region are often exposed to the detrimental impacts of violent conflicts, disasters, poverty and inequalities. While the YPS agenda globally represents a significant and well-established thematic agenda, the region lacks progress towards implementing the agenda, even seven years after resolution 2250. No other country in the region, other than the Philippines, is even close to a national strategy, framework or plan to implement the YPS agenda.

Further, acknowledging the socio-political agency of youth, it is crucial to ensure young people and youth-led organizations are meaningfully part of national and regional implementation efforts like coalition-building efforts, policy formulation and monitoring implementation. However, while many young people are contributing to building peace in their communities, significant work remains to increase the meaningful and active engagement of young people and youth organizations in peacebuilding processes and decision-making to strengthen the implementation of the YPS agenda.

This mapping is an effort by UNDP to support the YPS work of the Asia-Pacific Interagency Network on Youth (APINY) Themeic Working Group on YPS (TWG-YPS) members and other youth peacebuilding international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) in the region. Internally, UNDP aims to support the work led by the Governance and Peacebuilding (GP) team in the Bangkok Regional Hub (BRH) in collaboration with various regional teams, including but not limited to the Youth Team and the Gender Team in advancing the YPS agenda in the Country Offices across the Asia-Pacific in their youth and peacebuilding work.

**Methodology**

Over two months, over 500 projects, programmes, initiatives and press releases were accessed through multiple avenues (Appendix) and reviewed with a youth, peace and security perspective. In addition, various UNDP staff were consulted to get more insights about their initiatives. At the same time, there are certain limitations to this mapping and its analysis, such as insufficient details in the reports, the unavailability of quality-level assessments of the initiatives and complex categorization in the mapping.

There are also varying age groups that are considered youth in different States and by different organizations. For instance, UNDP Thailand defines youth as 15 to 30 years old, and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) generally considers individuals aged 15 to 24 as youth. On the other hand, Japan and the Republic of Korea define youth as individuals between 15 and 24 years old. Others, like China and India, extend the upper age limit to 29 or even 35. In this mapping exercise, the objective was not to establish a specific age group for youth but to identify initiatives specifically focused on youth. Whether an initiative is youth-focused was based on the implementation agency’s classification, as stated in their reports.

A key effort in this mapping has been to use a youth, peace and security lens to review each initiative. There are two ways of considering YPS work:

1. **Work on the five pillars of the YPS agenda:** participation, protection, prevention, partnership and disengagement and reintegration. This also includes mainstreamed and integrated interventions in the field of youth peacebuilding. In this mapping, this has been mentioned as youth peacebuilding work.

2. **Efforts to advance national YPS implementation:** developing national frameworks/plans/strategies, lobbying for YPS agenda implementation, building coalitions, training youth on how to implement and advocate for the agenda, ensuring transparency and accountability, researching implementation, etc. In this mapping, this has been mentioned as youth peacebuilding work.

**Mapping Youth Peacebuilding**

This initiative mapped a total of 140 youth peacebuilding programmes and initiatives. These included 18 regional, 28 sub-regional, 15 multi-country and 80 national initiatives implemented by a diverse set of stakeholders (UNDP BRH, UNDP Country Offices, UNDP in partnership with other United Nations agencies and/or governments, United Nations agencies, INGOs, civil society organizations (CSOs), and youth-led peacebuilding organizations). The mapped national initiatives have been implemented in 31 countries from the region: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uzbekistan and Vanuatu.

---

8 APINY (accessible from: <https://asiapacificyouth.net>) primarily serves as an information-sharing network for United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and others working in youth development. The United Nations and youth civil society organizations set up the TWG-YPS under the APINY as a mechanism to enhance coordination in advancing the YPS agenda in the Asia-Pacific region.
9 UNDP focuses on Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan as a part of the Central Asia region, rather the Asia-Pacific region. Still, some initiatives from these States were reviewed in this mapping.
These initiatives have been implemented in the last six years (from 2017 to 2022). About two-thirds of the initiatives (69 per cent) have already been completed, and about one-third (31 per cent) are currently being implemented. The mapped UNDP BRH/CO-led or -supported projects also have similar ratios for past (68 per cent) and current projects (32 per cent).

The mapping includes six initiatives led by UNDP BRH, 70 led by UNDP Country Offices, 12 supported by UNDP, 16 led by United Nations agencies and 36 led by others (INGOs, CSOs and youth-led peacebuilding organizations). In total, about 63 per cent of the mapped projects are UNDP BRH/CO-led or -supported projects. However, the projects implemented by UNDP in collaboration with other United Nations agencies are still categorized as initiatives by UNDP Country Offices. So, United Nations agency projects are only those in which UNDP has not been a lead partner.

Findings

Pillar 1: Participation

1. Nineteen per cent of all the mapped initiatives are youth-led. But among all 88 UNDP BRH/CO-led or -supported projects, only four initiatives (5 per cent) can be said youth-led.10

2. While 62 per cent of Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs) reported supporting youth participation in conflict prevention and peacebuilding initiatives — including dialogue and mediation (as per the 2020 Annual Report: Joint UNDP-DPPA Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention)11 — we still don’t see that much traction around the participation pillar of YPS in the Asia Pacific. Only 11% of the UNDP BRH/CO-led or -supported projects can be categorized as core YPS-focused initiatives. Only a few other projects focused on youth participation in decision-making.

3. Most mapped regional, multi-country and subregional initiatives have limited outreach to engage broadly with youth and reach diverse youth, primarily due to the limitations of social media outreach. In addition, there seems to be almost no evidence of undertaking any comprehensive mapping of youth that considers diversity among the youth population before selecting participants for a programme.

4. Youth leadership for designing, implementing and assessing the national YPS implementation is crucial to advance the YPS agenda. However, such avenues and some more like long-term youth-sensitive mentorship for young leaders, have yet to be explored in depth.

Pillar 2: Protection

1. In the context of shrinking civic spaces, there is a significant need for initiatives to ensure youth protection to achieve their full potential and access agency without fear of multiple security threats, as noted in the If I Disappear Global Report on Protecting Young People in Civic Space.12 Still, there are no examples of legal literacy and youth rights programmes in the core youth peacebuilding space in the region. Further, no programme was found that tried to work for youth wrongly prosecuted by police/forces in peaceful social, climate change or human rights protests.

2. UNDP has designed such initiatives focused on human rights and environment/climate work, which can also be a good model for the youth peacebuilding field. For instance, the United Nations engages with national human rights institutions to enhance human rights processes on and with youth and avail them access to legal aid and the justice system.

3. Sixteen per cent of the mapped initiatives focused on gender but only 1 per cent focused on gender-based violence, although also outside of the context of armed conflicts and violence.

Pillar 3: Prevention

1. The majority (72 per cent) of youth peacebuilding programmes in the Asia-Pacific use a training approach. But there has not been much focus on initiatives such as regional or national Training of Trainers (ToT) on youth and peacebuilding.

2. Unfortunately, not many programmes acknowledge youth’s existing capability and knowledge or define their approaches to evaluating it properly to design a needs-based programme. Instead, the existing initiatives simply assume youth need to be educated, obtain skills or be informed. Or, probably due to limited resources, the initiatives cannot invest sufficiently in needs assessments or define a needs-based programme.

10 In this context, “youth-led” initiatives (in comparison with “youth-centric” or “for youth support”) are those that are fully designed, implemented and managed by young people.


3. Most youth peacemaking programmes in the Asia-Pacific district to the themes of media information literacy, prevention of violent extremism (PVE) or civic engagement. These primarily serve the third pillar of the YPS agenda (prevention). But without peace education and conflict transformation work, these cannot ensure holistic empowerment. Additionally, these initiatives do not promote meaningful youth inclusion/engagement (pillar 1) or their protection (pillar 2).

4. PVE work, even when engaging youth, sometimes conflicts with the core idea of the YPS agenda that most young people are peaceful and key contributors to building and sustaining peace in communities. It is predominantly because most of the mapped youth PVE projects end up working with the average young person without a focused approach to identifying and reaching a specific audience. This approach can easily be perceived as mistrustful of the average young person, who is represented as a potential violent extremist. Further, the lack of an established theory of change was also identified as a key pattern in PVE projects, as mentioned in the UNDP Partnership for a Tolerant, Inclusive Bangladesh (PTIB) Final Evaluation Report.13

The D4P14 brings diverse groups together and supports the strengthening of the diverse identity of Bangladesh. However, some stakeholders are confused by PTIB’s civic engagement work and how it connects with PVE. […] The absence of an established theory of change weakens PTIB’s narrative. It undermines its ability to tell a compelling story about why the project’s components work separately and fit together.15

5. Very few mapped initiatives work on youth engagement in peacebuilding through advocacy (active and direct)16 and youth-led participatory action research.17 In addition, little attention is given to initiatives like national youth forums/coalitions for YPS advocacy.

6. The region does not have many implementation examples through innovative or creative programming for YPS, such as the #Youth4Peace Hackathon.18

7. Primarily, the programmes have used a clubbed language, such as ‘women, youth and other vulnerable populations as a target group under the United Nations leave no one behind (LNOB)19 approach. But in most such programmes, the youth group receives only minor and insufficient attention concerning implementation. For example, as per the UNDP Mid-term Review of Parliament Support Project (PSP) Phase-2, Output 4,20 which is dedicated to this clubbed beneficiary group of women, youth and marginalized groups, there is only one indicator (16.67 per cent) focused on youth out of the total six. This has also been highlighted in some evaluation reports. To quote one from the National Initiative and Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support for Sustainable Development Goals mid-term evaluation report on Pakistan:21

The project document speaks of “greater engagement and inclusive process” as part of the project strategy but does not mention citizens among stakeholders or address citizen engagement directly. The PC-Is for Balochistan, Punjab and Sindh, however, include the activity “awareness raising extending the ‘know your goals’ campaign at the local level, encouraging citizens’ active engagement with SDGs.

The Balochistan and Sindh PC-Is add the words “with particular focus on women, youth and marginalized communities” at the end of the sentence quoted above. However, the revised Punjab PC-I is the only design document in which gender has been systematically addressed through four key activities and the involvement of the Punjab Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW).

---

14 Diversity for peace, a PTIB initiative.
17 One example is Amplifying Leadership of Local Youth (ALLY) research in South Asia by the United Network of Young (UNOY) Peacebuilders. Available from: <https://unoy.org/project/ally/>.
While the MTE TOR\textsuperscript{22} require the evaluation to identify the project’s “contributions ... towards women empowerment, gender mainstreaming, youth and other vulnerable populations”, these terms are not mentioned in the project document. No design document describes youth, the vulnerable, the marginalized, women empowerment and gender mainstreaming in operational terms, in ways that could facilitate developing well-defined interventions for identifiable beneficiary groups.\textsuperscript{23}

8. Millions of youth every year immigrate to other countries from the Asia-Pacific. Yet, among all 140 initiatives we reviewed, no programme focused on engaging immigrant youth for long enough concerning their culture and heritage of origin to promote social cohesion and resilience.

Pillar 4: Partnership

1. Among the reviewed initiatives, there are no examples of regional youth peace advisory councils concerning any United Nations agencies or INGOs in the region.

2. There are no examples of intergenerational dialogues bridging intergenerational gaps to address conflicts in communities.

3. While involving elders as mentors can increase the impact of youth peacebuilding initiatives, there is no structured platform where old office bearers from various fields regularly meet youth representatives to discuss important issues and learn from each other.

4. There are several projects promoting entrepreneurship but no incubator for educating and promoting youth-led peacebuilding NGOs. However, just as for-profit start-ups are important for economic development, peacebuilding NGO start-ups are essential for holistic development, as proven by mapped youth-led NGOs.

5. Furthermore, while young people gain knowledge, skills and confidence to engage deeply in this space, they also need to transition out as they grow older. Still, there are a few good examples of supporting the effective transfer of youth leadership through initiatives such as Training for Youth Mentors.

Pillar 5: Disengagement and Reintegration

1. Only three initiatives (2.1 per cent) are for the disengagement and rehabilitation of radicalized youth, such as gang members, criminals or terrorists.

The Way Forward for the United Nations and Development Partners

Pillar 1: Participation

1. There is a need to design more initiatives focusing on youth participation in decision-making and governance. While working on such initiatives, anticipate the protection need of young people and plan to mitigate the risk of the possible political appropriation of some initiatives.

2. At the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) level, the agency of Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs) can be leveraged further to push youth participation in practice in legal/policy framework development around conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

3. Support countries in the region in developing national strategies, frameworks and plans to implement the YPS agenda. These processes must be supported through active and meaningful youth participation and leadership.

4. Youth should be supported to assess participation and inclusion in peacebuilding decision-making to build accountability and transparency.

5. There seems to be a significant need to undertake a comprehensive mapping of youth that considers diversity among the youth population before selecting participants for participation.

6. Resolutions like UNSCR 2250 and 2419 on YPS have been passed unanimously, and commitments have been made at the international level for youth, but these are not necessarily reflected in national policies, especially not in national youth policy. Support youth in analysing national youth policies with a YPS lens and advocate for its context-specific incorporation. This policy analysis can be conducted by youth peace-builders from the respective countries.

\textsuperscript{22} Mid-term evaluation terms of reference.

1. Create safe, accessible, transparent, accountable, youth-friendly and gender-responsive mechanisms for young people to report experiences of violence, human rights violations and abuse, including all forms of gender-based violence.

2. Organize legal literacy and youth rights programmes to support the protection of young people.

3. Build and sustain safe spaces for young peacebuilders for mental health support, psychosocial well-being and protection in emergencies when needed. These initiatives should be gender-responsive.

4. Youth leadership to design, implement and assess peacebuilding work, including dialogue and mediation efforts, needs to be supported. Long-term youth-sensitive mentorship for young leaders could be a simple starting point.

5. Initiatives around youth-led participatory action research and national youth forums/coalitions for advocacy deserve more attention through direct implementation or supporting other organizations already working on these topics. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) Youth As Researchers (YAR) initiative is a powerful example of youth researching youth issues, especially in the context of YPS.

6. Initiatives and ideas such as #Youth4Peace Hackathon, Training for Youth Mentors and Training of Trainers on Youth & Peacebuilding24 can be scaled up at the regional and/or country levels.

7. Youth PVE initiatives should have an established theory of change and a focused target youth group. In addition, these initiatives should follow the Do-No-Harm approach and not promote the stereotype of youth as perpetrators or victims of violence and violent extremism.

8. There should be a sufficient focus on the United Nations LNOB approach. For that, relevant and sufficient indicators to measure the engagement of and impact on youth groups must be set and defined in the programme’s design phase. Giving minor or insufficient attention to youth groups in implementation fails to advance the YPS agenda.

9. All programmes should conduct a needs assessment, acknowledge youth's capabilities and design interventions accordingly. This will aid in designing initiatives beyond trainings.

Pillar 4: Partnership

1. More examples of effective inter-agency partnerships are needed for national YPS implementation. For instance, UNCTs and United Nations agencies can use the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNSDCFs) to work together in the specific outcome groups at the country level.

2. Build incubators to nurture youth-led peacebuilding NGOs focused on inclusion and resilience initiatives.

3. Organize intergenerational dialogues to bridge the gap between elders and youth in the community. This can also be done by training youth in developing, designing and facilitating community dialogues.

4. To increase the impact of youth peacebuilding initiatives, create platforms to engage old office-bearers from various fields as mentors to youth leaders to discuss important issues and learn from each other.

5. The United Nations can advocate for the meaningful and active inclusion of youth in the decision-making of the NGOs they fund or partner with. Similarly, partner government departments may be asked to form youth-led youth expert/advisory committees.

6. For regular input from young people in programming and policymaking at the national level, UNCT can create a Youth Advisory Committee under the YPS agenda. This advisory committee would analyse and regularly liaise with the UNCT and respective governments to ensure national YPS implementation. Regionally, these young people can be supported further through capacity-building and strategic networking.

7. To obtain more insights about the quality of the mapped initiatives and what can be done more to support YPS programming in a more nuanced manner, the UNCT can invite these organizations for consultations, offering a safe space under the Chatham House Rule to share their experiences designing and implementing their programmes, especially multi-year initiatives.

8. Promote collaboration between and within United Nations agencies and CSOs by commissioning and sharing studies such as this YPS programme mapping, initiatives and organizations in the Asia-Pacific.

---

The last study on a tangentially related topic is over a decade old (Youth Development through Civic Engagement: Mapping Assets in South Asia). The context and assets have changed significantly since the time of publication.

Pillar 5: Disengagement and Reintegration

9. Other than serving the educational, skill and employment requirements of youth engaged in armed conflicts, community reconciliation and trauma healing initiatives are also important for effective reintegration.

To build upon this study, the following aspects can be explored in future research:

- Examining youth political participation (formal/informal, perspective on governance/participation in governance, at the table/around the room/outside the room).
- Reviewing UNDP country programme documents (CPDs) and the UNSDCF/United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) from the countries to evaluate the outcomes and outputs concerning youth-responsive considerations in programme design and reporting.
- Mapping protection-related work by UNDP, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), UN-Women and others, including their work with national human rights institutions, access to legal aid and the justice system and supporting human rights defenders.
- Exploring youth empowerment work around climate-related security and peacebuilding
- Examining how data has been disaggregated around gender in different youth initiatives. Youth are often registered as youth rather than in a gender-disaggregated manner (men, women, LGBTI+, etc.).
- Developing a typology of YPS work in the region (e.g., youth-led conflict recovery, youth engagement in Track One and One-and-a-Half peacebuilding, youth in the digital space, youth in PVE, etc.).

Appendix

1. Data sources

- UNDP Transparency Portal: information, including project strategies, key results and budget and donor information on all the projects implemented by UNDP in the region
- Reports on the UNDP Intranet via this link
- Project and Programme Evaluation Reports from the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre
- Results-oriented Annual Reporting (ROAR), especially youth-results mapping from 2018, 2019 and 2020
- UNDP Strategic Plan 2022–2025
- Regional and Country Programme Documents
- Blogs and reports from UNDP BRH and country office webpages
- BRH PVE Work Bi-monthly Newsletters
- Project and Programme Evaluation Reports from UNDP Artificial Intelligence for Development Analytics (AIDA)
- 2018 UNDP Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Work in Asia-Pacific report
- UNDP global input for United Nations 2020 and 2022 Reports of the Secretary-General on YPS
- Input from Bangladesh and Indonesia for United Nations 2022 Reports of the Secretary-General
- UNDP YPS brief 2022
- Review of UNDP Youth and Parliament work
- 2017 Draft overview of youth and peacebuilding activities in UNDP Country Offices in the Asia-Pacific
- UNDP BRH Youth in Review: Preventing Violent Extremism through Promoting Development, Tolerance and Respect for Diversity
- UNDP Funding Windows Annual Reports
- United Nations Peacebuilding Fund Annual Reports
- Annual Reports of the Joint UNDP-Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA) Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention
- Inputs from and desk review of the YPS work of APINY members and the Thematic Working Group on YPS members (i.e., the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA], DPPA, UNESCO, the Mahatma Gandhi Institute for Education for Peace and Sustainable Development [MGIEP], UNOY, Youth for Peace International [YFPI], AYPN, etc.)


26 Track One diplomacy and peacebuilding or “official” diplomacy and peacebuilding based on the contact between the governments of States through intermediaries mutually recognized by the respective parties.

27 Track One-and-a-Half diplomacy and peacebuilding involves the “unofficial” interactions between official representatives of States facilitated by third parties and unofficial bodies but directly involving official representatives.
## 2. Data Tables

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Initiative Mapped (#)</th>
<th>Past Projects (#)</th>
<th>Current Projects (#)</th>
<th>Youth-led (#)</th>
<th>Youth-led (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-country</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (%)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>YPS</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MIL/Media</th>
<th>Civic/Governance</th>
<th>PVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (%)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Dialogue/Participation</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-country</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (%)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Initiative Mapped (#)</td>
<td>Past Projects (#)</td>
<td>Current Projects (#)</td>
<td>Youth-led (#)</td>
<td>Youth-led (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP BRH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP CO</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP CO-supported</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations agencies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (UNDP)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (%)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>YPS</th>
<th>Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MIL/Media</th>
<th>Civic/Governance</th>
<th>PVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP BRH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP CO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP CO-supported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations agencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (UNDP)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (%)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Dialogue/Participation</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP BRH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP CO</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP CO-supported</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations agencies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (UNDP)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (%)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Credit:** This mapping and analysis report was completed by Mridul Upadhyay. The report has been further reviewed and inputs were provided by Bhasker Kafle, Beniam Gebrezghi, Reidun Gjerstad and Dilrukshi Fonseka