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# **Summary**

This document was prepared within the framework of a mid-term assessment of the impact, and effectiveness of the “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh Province” Programme in 2016-2018. The assessment was conducted in accordance with the UNDP ToR on the basis of collected data, an analysis of the results achieved by the Programme and the identification of the Programme’s strengths and weaknesses and the lessons learned. To assess the Programme, over 25 meetings-interviews were conducted with all stakeholder partners at the local and national level, 19 monitoring visits were made to the Programme’s objects (facilities). The present document gives an interim assessment of the Programme’s effectiveness and the efficiency of its activities, analyzes its main achievements and their correspondence to the current needs of the country.

The “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh Province” Programme aims to assist the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic in creating conditions for the prevention of violent conflicts and ensuring sustainable human development in three pilot districts of Osh province, KR. The Programme helps to create various opportunities for target population groups in order to reduce their vulnerability in the short- and long-term perspective by supporting economic activities, improving access to water, environmental safety, creating new jobs and rehabilitating social and economic infrastructure. The implementation of the Programme started in September 2016 and will end in December 2019. The Programme is being implemented in 30 pilot villages of 17 municipalities of Kara-Kulzha, Nookat, and Uzgen districts in Osh province.

The primary areas of Programme activities fully correspond to the country’s priorities, to national and oblast-level socio-economic and regional development Programmes. The Programme’s components are comprehensive in character, encompass the most important livelihood issues of a person living in a rural area and correspond to the concept of sustainable development. The work of the Programme is designed by taking into consideration achievements, experience and lessons learned from implementing the UNDP Programme in Naryn and Batken provinces.

The Programme interrelates the main approaches in the realization of UNDP activities such as promoting democratic governance, sustainable development and represents a system that covers all spheres of human development.

Basic approaches of Programme implementation

* *Engagement.* The Programme implements mechanisms for the active involvement of communities in order to ensure that they benefit from the capacity building activities and the results of social projects*.*
* *Complexity.* Actions and measures of the Programme cover all spheres of vital activity, interacted with each other to get the final result.
* *Transparency.* The Programme promotes transparent and open participatory approaches. The Programme is committed to a flexible response to changing opportunities and conditions for development.
* *Efficiency.* The implementation of all activities of the Programme is carried out based on cost effectiveness.
* *Sustainability.* All actions of the Programme are aimed at achieving sustainability by securing the developed mechanisms and tools at the normative level. They also ensure capacity building measures for their further use.
* *Partnerships.* The Programme is aimed at strengthening the interaction between the government agencies, local authorities, civil society institutions, business and the general public.

The Programme has applied the most effective UNDP approaches, used in the course of implementing similar Programmes in Naryn and Batken provinces, and also developed new mechanisms, which ensured quality during the processes of selecting pilot municipalities, communities and projects and active involvement of national partners and local consulting companies in identifying priority projects of the Programme, criteria for selecting projects and in ensuring transparency of procedures and fairness during their selection.

173 socio-economic, environmental and political projects were implemented during the period of Programme implementation. Programme beneficiaries include 233 000 people (the number of residents in 29 pilot villages and in the town of Uzgen). All planned activities have, for the most part, been implemented, some projects experience delays in implementation but with objective reasons (administrative procedures of tender bids and procurements, the impact of the seasonal nature of projects, delays in co-funding on the part of the local community, etc.). 29 106 people were trained via the educational activities of the Programme, with women comprising 54.5% of them. Partners from government agencies and international organizations are being involved in planning, implementation, and monitoring of Programme results.

The Programme actively cooperates with other development Programmes in Osh province (GIZ, Aga Khan Foundation, Helvetas, etc.) and partners in the public and non-public sector, which leads to more rational and effective use of the UNDP resources. On the part of the main partners, represented by state and non-state bodies and organizations, one observes respect for and acknowledgment of the authority of the Programme’s employees and its activities, in general.

A series of studies (virtually on every component) was conducted in the first phase of Programme implementation, based on which the Programme’s management identified measures. This approach applied by the Programme not only ensured achievement of set goals but also created conditions for building the capacity of local consulting organizations, as the knowledge and skills that they gained can be further used to serve the interests of the country.

The Programme used new mechanisms, aimed at strengthening cooperation between LSGAs, state bodies, civil society organizations and businesses under the principle of “partnership for development”. The Programme developed and introduced new demo schemes (SDCs, business projects, RES, raising funds from labor migrants for local development and so on), which have proven their effectiveness and can be disseminated to other regions and municipalities. National partners note the professionalism and competence of the Programme team and underline that Programme measures are balanced between institutional support and technical support for building the capacity of development actors.

In the course of assessing the above-mentioned strengths of the Programme, weaknesses that need to be addressed and improved in 2019 were also noted. A weakness impacting the effectiveness of the Programme is its insufficient logic and methodology (results/measures/indicators). A conducted baseline survey that was supposed to structure the Programme, unfortunately, failed to offer a reliable M&E system (tracking the achievement of target indicators), provide necessary measuring tools and give baseline data for evaluating the Programme’s progress in future. For this reason, the introduction of an M&E system is one of the crucial measures and requires close attention on the part of the Programme management in 2019. The current M&E system that functions within the Programme is to a greater extent focused on monitoring planned activities (collection of statistical information and reporting on the implementation of planned activities has been set up) than on monitoring the achievement of the set, impact-related goals and objectives – changing the quality of beneficiaries’ living and assessing whether the sustainability of Programme interventions was achieved. An insufficient interconnection observed between measures under implementation and the achievement of the main Programme goal – reducing the vulnerability of the population and the conflict potential; no sound system has been set up for collecting information about the achievement of target indicators on the basis of reliable data.

The assessment shows that the main actors of the Programme have not formed a common understanding of the integrated approach to development. State bodies and LSG authorities equate integratedness with the geographical coverage of the Programme: a request to expand the Programme’s geography beyond pilot territories was voiced frequently during interviews. For Programme employees, integratedness is seen as the implementation of all coordinated interventions of all UNDP Programmes in one place. At the same time, there is another approach, based on supporting measures that result in the highest synergetic socio-economic effect, ensure close interaction of Programme components and achievement of sustainable development. Using such an approach for selecting projects could allow to find more projects impacting the region’s development.

The work on components by specialists, who are responsible for individual components of the Programme, does not allow the Programme to fully utilize the possibilities of a Programme approach, which is based on a coordination of efforts, a combination of all invested resources, and a common vision of the overall end result of the Programme shared by all participants. For example, the implemented and ongoing projects of various components could be interlinked as part of a single chain that could enhance the effectiveness of their implementation through integrated measures and synergy effect.

The Programme has not clearly defined target (direct) groups of beneficiaries for each component (specific individuals or organizations, households/farms). Considering that the main Programme mechanism for creating favorable conditions and ensuring sustainable human development is the reduction of vulnerability of target groups, identifying and defining their problems becomes a condition of paramount importance. As a rule, vagueness with regard to target groups leads to unnecessary and often unjustified costs.

During the first phase, the Programme actively engaged consulting companies that, to a greater extent, focused on achieving interim results. At present, the pressure is increasing on Programme specialists to bring the projects to their final results. This situation requires involving additional specialists, primarily in business and monitoring & evaluation.

Due to various reasons, some of the projects aimed at improving social infrastructure were unable to fully achieve their final goals. In order to achieve sustainability, these projects require further technical support on the part of the Programme. In connection to this, it is recommended to conduct an analysis of the implemented projects, develop and introduce measures aimed at improving the quality of services and the lives of beneficiaries as well as on the sustainability of their performance after the support from the Programme (standardization of services, approval of fees, regulatory formalization of further funding, registration of equipment, etc.)

To guarantee the effectiveness and sustainability of business projects, the Programme needs to ensure support on the part of mentors, peer instructors, consultants, and coaches. Funding the private sector with grant resources requires developing social responsibility and entrenching social commitments of businesses to the local community and LSG authorities.

*On the whole, the assessment of the Programme shows that it makes a significant contribution to regional development, strengthens interaction between authorities and the population, helps to reduce vulnerability and the conflict potential of target groups, launches new/ innovative mechanisms for managing problems emerging in communities and ensures an increase in welfare and the quality of lives of residents in pilot districts and municipalities of Osh province.*

# **Introduction**

The “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh Province in Kyrgyzstan” Programme is aimed at assisting to the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic in creating conditions for the prevention of violent conflicts and ensuring sustainable human development in three pilot districts of Osh province. The Programme helps to create various opportunities for target population groups in order to decrease their vulnerability in the short- and long-term perspective through different economic activities, improved access to water, environmental safety, creation of new jobs and rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure.

Programme implementation started in September 2016 and will end in December 2019. The Programme is being implemented in 29 pilot villages of Kara-Kuldja, Nookat, and Uzgen districts and in the town of Uzgen of 17 municipalities of Osh province.

The present document gives an interim assessment of the extent to which the Programme is implemented effectively, examines the efficiency of project measures, looks at the main achievements and their alignment with the needs of the country, and also provides a mid-term assessment of the impact that the Programme had on improving living standards and welfare of Programme beneficiaries in three pilot districts of Osh province with the aim of reducing their vulnerability and conflict potential.

The report consists of an introduction and three chapters. The first chapter presents an assessment of the extent to which the overall goals and interim results, reflected in the Programme document, have been achieved. The second chapter presents the main assessment conclusions. The final chapter proposes recommendations and a package of measures, aimed at improving the Programme, based on the assessment as well as lessons learned from Programme implementation.

## **Assessment methodology**

The purpose of the document is to present conclusions, findings, and recommendations of the interim assessment of the Programme, the assessment of its impact on sustainable poverty reduction and improvements in the welfare of Programme beneficiaries. Lessons to be learned were identified and analyzed in the course of the assessment and a set of recommendations was developed, which will help the Programme to improve its work and reach target indicators before its completion.

*Main assessment goals and objectives:*

1. Evaluating the extent to which the overall goals and interim results, reflected in the Programme document, have been achieved.
2. Reviewing the efficiency of Programme activities in achieving the main Programme goal (creating conditions for conflict prevention and sustainable human development in Osh province**)**
3. Evaluating the extent of Programme’s impact on the welfare of target beneficiaries.
4. Evaluating the sustainability of results after the completion of the Programme’s projects.
5. Identifying weaknesses and shortcomings in Programme implementation, developing recommendations for their improvement/sustainability.
6. Identifying and analyzing lessons to be applied in the work of the Programme in the area of socio-economic development and poverty reduction.
7. Developing an additional set of measures/activities for further continuation of the Programme.

*Subject of the assessment:*

* Relevance of Programme objectives. Evaluating correspondence between problems of beneficiaries/villages/region and Programme objectives, including correspondence of Programme objectives to the strategy of the country’s development and the strategy of development of Osh province.
* The extent of achieving indicators of Programme objectives/measures. Evaluating correspondence between planned and actual indicators.
* Effectiveness of Programme objectives/measures. Evaluating logical correspondence between Programme impact/goal and its objectives/measures.
* Sustainability of Programme measures. Evaluating feasibility of continuing objectives/measures launched by the Programme after its completion.

The present report does not include an assessment of efficiency since it is most advisable to carry it out at the end of Programme implementation. In order to evaluate economic benefits, one needs to have all the data on budget expenditures.

*Main products of the assessment:*

* Assessment questionnaire (Annex 1);
* List of interviewed respondents and visited facilities (Annex 2);
* Assessment report.

*Main assessment methods, tools, and stages:*

The first stage was desk research, aimed at analyzing statistical information and internal Programme documents. The following documents were analyzed:

* Programme document;
* Programme work plans for 2016-17-18;
* Annual Programme reports for 2016-17-18;
* Informational publications;
* Baseline survey and studies/ reports of contractors;
* Developed SPSDs of pilot municipalities;
* Statistical information of the NSC KR;
* National and regional development Programmes, etc.

The second stage involved focus groups and in-depth interviews with UNDP and Programme staff as well as relevant state and LSG authorities, primary stakeholders and partners of the Programme. These interviews were mostly structured and partially open (Annex 2).

The third stage included monitoring/ visits to individual projects – Programme objects (facilities) – for direct observation of obtained results and interviews with project implementers and, to the extent that it was possible, with final recipients of benefits. A total of 19 facilities, including 13 projects and 6 business projects, were visited in the course of the assessment.

The fourth stage – preparation of a project report with a special emphasis on relevance, efficiency effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Sustainability was studied thoroughly in order to evaluate whether the perceived positive changes/results will be sustained after the Programme has been completed.

The fifth stage – presentation of main results and conclusions.

Chapter I. Assessing the extent to which overall goals and interim results, reflected in the Programme document, have been achieved

## **1.1. Component 1. Reducing vulnerability through quality governance and sustainable agriculture, tourism, trade, and promotion of green technologies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outputs  | Output 1. Sustainable agriculture, tourism, trade, and promotion of green technologies facilitate the creation of jobs, the socio-economic integration of the poorest population groups and increase in their living standards |
| Output indicator 1.1 At least 100 new jobs were created in agricultural production and processing with a particular focus on women.Output indicator 1.2 At least 150 000 beneficiaries have improved their welfare by increasing their capacity to conduct income- and profit-generating activities. |
| Comments and recommendations:1. The Implemented Programme measures (22 projects in business and RES), aimed at improving the welfare and capacity of beneficiaries to carry out income-generating activities, can be conditionally divided into two levels:

*а) First level – creating a favorable environment for ensuring an improvement in the welfare and capacity of beneficiaries:** Strengthening public-private partnership through the creation of joint development Programmes. Strategic plans for the sustainable development of pilot municipalities identify promising areas entrepreneurship development and measures to support it;
* Promoting dialogue between authorities and the business community on improving the business environment;
* Supporting the creation of a Centre for Entrepreneurship Support (CES) in Osh city in 2017. In total, 166 people, including 84 women, participated in the 12 activities of the Centre on institutional development in 2017;
* Supporting the development of economic infrastructure (greenhouses, cold storage facilities, trade and logistics centers, etc.);
* Supporting festivals, fairs, fora, exchange visits, etc.

*б) Second level – providing direct support to beneficiaries:** Organizing business and vocational training and consultations;
* Providing quality business information;
* Grant-based support for business initiatives to create a new business or develop an existing one.

In total, 201 training seminars/ consultation meetings on business development, trade, tourism, and RES were conducted; 30 638 people were trained, including 13 796 women.Support was provided for 40 business projects. 110 permanent jobs were created. The number of employed women comprises 45%. Main economic sectors: tourism, agricultural production and processing, trade, promotion of green technologies.2) High activity is planned in the first two years of Programme implementation. However, many of the implemented activities require further support for achieving sustainability before the end of Programme implementation. There is a risk that a part of projects may not reach their planned results. * Consulting support, developing a mentorship Programme, organizing monitoring of results (business profits growth, sales volume increase, increase in their profits, a wider range of goods and increased volume of production, as well as sustainability of enterprises) are required. According to statistics, only 5-10% of the newly established enterprises stay in the market. Lack of a business development specialist in the Programme may lead to a significant decrease in the impact of UNDP interventions by the end of the year.
* It is recommended to conduct an analysis of each business project, identify strengths and weaknesses, ensure targeted consulting support for business projects and monitoring over their implementation as well as undertake measures on the part of the Programme aimed at facilitating development/expansion of businesses. CES in Osh are to be actively used in this area.
* Taking into account that women and youth are the most vulnerable groups in local communities, the Programme is recommended to pay attention to promoting special measures, aimed at increasing the capacity and motivation of women and youth through vocational and business training, women and youth leadership development, social entrepreneurship, mentorship and supervision Programmes.
* It is recommended to use the already developed capacities of supported businesses, pilot vocational schools, CES, VS, etc. for carrying out the training. Grant recipients of operating businesses could exchange experience, hold master classes, serve as mentors and coaches.
* It is recommended to strengthen monitoring of grant resources obtained for the businesses of existing entrepreneurs, to sign trilateral agreements between LSGAs, businesses and the Programme, identify and approve social commitments of businesses to the community (procurement of raw materials from residents at stable prices, supplying social infrastructure facilities with the produce of enterprises, provision of jobs, conducting on-job vocational training, etc.)
* The Programme is not recommended to start new business projects and should instead concentrate on the projects that have already been supported in order to achieve their sustainability and create value-added chains. Support only those measures that will have an effect on developing businesses that have already received support.

Overall assessment of the achievement:Indicator 1.1. On the whole, this indicator has been achieved however, it is recommended to bring reporting for this indicator to one numeric value and apply a uniform accounting method.Indicator 1.2. This output indicator needs to be specified and additional interim indicators for measuring welfare (increase in income/profits from income-generating activities) need to be developed, which should be tracked by the Programme as an evidence base for this indicator. |
| Output indicator 1.3. At least 30 local development plans on issues of economic growth, citizens’ welfare improvement, and rational land management, including management of agricultural lands and pastures, are drawn up and implemented in pilot municipalities. |
| Comments and recommendations:1) The approach introduced by the Programme, which aims to broaden participation of the local community in the process of planning strategic plans for sustainable development (SPSDs) and develop a partnership between LSGAs and the population, fully corresponds to national policy on regional development. Over 1200 members of local communities, including 900 women, were able to take part in the process of assessing needs and identifying priorities and to formulate real problems of communities that need to be resolved at the local level. Meetings with the representatives of state bodies at the level of Osh province and in Bishkek have demonstrated satisfaction with the work of the Programme in this field. Respondents noted that the project is operating in full alignment with national and oblast-level goals and objectives on regional and socio-economic development, creates unique models and mechanisms of solving specific problems for their dissemination not just at the level of the province, but the country level in general, e.g., Service Delivery Centers (SDCs). Local officials and LSG authorities are learning to view sustainable development of the region as a set of integrated objectives in economic, social and environmental fields/areas.2) Documents on strategic territorial development were created in 17 pilot municipalities and 3 districts. Population’s awareness, as well as sustainability and feasibility of jointly developed plans of action, were strengthened in the course of SPSD development. Transparency mechanisms were strengthened, including the format of public hearings on SPSD approval; LSGA capacity in developing strategic documents and managerial capacity of the authorities to respond to the needs of citizens were increased. The local community’s knowledge of its rights and responsibilities and the capacity of LSG authorities to use tools for engaging communities in local development affairs, ensure transparency and accountability, respond to the needs of citizens (identify needs, work with their needs and problems, search for opportunities and resources to address them, work with projects, etc.) have been increased. At the same time, respondents noted that the training should be carried out in keeping with the seasonal fieldwork and that the work on communicating the needs and requirements of local communities to government agencies at the regional and national levels is insufficient. Additionally, together with the NB KR and an expert of the Ministry of Finance of the Kyrgyz Republic a training on public procurement rules was held for LGBAs at the level of each pilot municipality. As a result: participants gained an understanding of sustainable development issues and applied SPSD development tools; AD profiles were renewed and updated for the purpose of developing SPSDs; SPSDs were aligned with the methodology of developing strategic documents; focal persons for SPSD implementation and monitoring were appointed; residents became interested in new technologies. However, not all heads of AAs took an active part in the development of SPSDs, referring to the fact that this is a function of formed planning groups. One more reason for this is that the heads of AAs do not know their functions of developing these plans.* It is recommended to organize monitoring over the first year of SPSD implementation with the involvement of civil society organizations at the local level.

3) In June 2018, a new methodology for creating development Programmes was approved by the order of the Ministry of Economy of the KR and SALSGIR, according to which it is necessary to make changes to the SPSDs.  * It is recommended to provide all pilot municipalities with a new regulatory document and carry out awareness-raising work to bring the developed SPSDs into alignment with the newly adopted requirements. This will require conducting activities on monitoring and evaluating the implementation of SPSDs, identifying strengths and weaknesses and including new measures. This objective will not require great efforts on the part of UNDP but will ensure sustainability and feasibility of adopted documents in accordance with the LRA, as well increase the effectiveness of Programme resources that have already been invested. It is also recommended to conduct final reporting activities with regard to the implemented projects and their impact on the local community’s development together with LSGAs and established local development committees at the level of pilot villages.
* It is also recommended that the Programme increase the capacity of state bodies and local self-government authorities in the budgetary process (due to coming into force of a new Budget Code), management of the municipal property, implementation of the Law “On the State Order”, preparation of investment projects.

4) The Programme initiated implementation of a model of delivering of public and municipal services based on the ‘single window’ principle in four (4) pilot municipalities. All centers are located in central halls of municipalities. LSGA prepared facilities and carried out repairs. The Programme helped to equip centers technically, ensure access to the Internet and supply digital software products, conduct training of municipal servants and test business processes on the delivery of services to residents according to the single window principle. At present, CES are providing a full range of municipal services, starting from information services on legal and regulatory acts, land ownership, taxes and ending with the receipt of all necessary certificates. In 2018, 6165 rural residents have used their services, 56% of them were women.According to interviewed respondents, the single window principle simplifies administrative procedures, increases mobility, reduces the time of service delivery as well as increases the effectiveness of local self-government authorities. The UNDP input in the form of technical support to the LSGAs led to an even higher public confidence and interest in LSGAs. “… the project’s value lies not in its cost but in the expansion of opportunities for communities to receive quality services at the local level”[[2]](#footnote-2). * It is recommended to conduct an analysis of services delivered in 4 pilot Centers, organize experience exchange, identify difficulties that need to be addressed (strengthening interaction with remote villages, expanding delivered services, automatizing processes, improving software, developing ICT skills, etc.) and develop a methodological guide with a feasibility study for organizing CES in other non-pilot municipalities with the aim of replicating applied mechanisms. When replicating experience, actively use the capacity of local self-government authorities of pilot municipalities, involved in the work of these centers.

Overall assessment of the achievement:By the decision of the Programme and the Supervisory Council, the number of pilot municipalities was reduced to 17. This indicator has been achieved. However, the focus should be on sustainability and replication. |
| Output Indicator 1.4. At least 100 000 beneficiaries have improved their welfare through effective land management, including management of agricultural lands and pastures at the level of pilot municipalities |
| Comments and recommendations:There are high risks for this indicator in the Programme, as all results will be achieved only in 2020. It will be very difficult to provide an evidence base proving that the abovementioned indicator is achieved.1) The implemented Programme measures on agricultural land and pasture management (17 projects) can be conditionally divided into three levels:1. *First level – creating conditions for partnership and cooperation for efficient land management*

- The Programme has been instrumental in building a dialogue between government agencies, farmers, agricultural entrepreneurs, and various scientific research institutes and leading enterprises of the RF in agriculture, such as “Premix” CJSC (additives-premixes for animal farming industry), “Soyuzkhim”, “Bayer”, “Schelkovo-Agrokhim” companies (plant protection and mineral fertilizer products), the All-Russian Research Institute of Sheep Breeding (for importing rams-producers of fine wool breeds). The project found stakeholder partners in Osh province for cooperation with Russian SRIs, but at the present moment all these activities have been formalized only as protocols of intent since there are certain difficulties with harmonizing several documents with state bodies (State Standard (Gosstandart), permits, issues related to permitting import of seeds, fertilizers to the market of the Kyrgyz Republic, demand and supply, farmers’ opportunities, etc.). In this specific case, there is a risk of not achieving the forecasted results, as the work on coordination is proceeding slowly (since August 2018).* The Programme also encourages horticultural cooperatives to improve varieties of planting material for seed nurseries in Nookat and Uzgen districts (161 hectares and 340 hectares respectively); so far, this activity has been formalized only by a protocol of intent, more active work is planned in March-April, but there is a risk that the negotiations may be delayed and that cooperatives may miss the time of planting.
* Due to this, it is recommended to appoint persons (RKDF) responsible for the end result of measures (since the Programme will complete its activities in 2019 the result may not be achieved). It is also recommended to accelerate the process of harmonizing standards or limit oneself to creating conditions for partnership and cooperation of specific legal/physical entities with the scientific research institutes of the RF so that they could continue their cooperation. It is necessary to focus on measures that are already available and bring them to an effective and sustainable result, without undertaking new measures.
1. *Second level – creating pilot land management schemes*
* The Programme contributed to the process of testing (negotiations, approval, selection of plots, etc.) 25 new high-yielding sorts of winter crops and rice (wheat, barley, triticale – 125 kg) on demonstration fields (Uzgen, Kara-Suu). They were received from the Lukyanenko Federal Grain Research Center (Krasnodar) and the Kalinenko All-Russian Grain Research Institute (Rostov-on-Don) for variety testing and further distribution (if successful). The result will be known in July 2019 and if successful, the first adapted seeds will be received in the fall of 2020. In this case, there is a risk of losing results, if no responsible persons for the final result (RKFR) are formally appointed, since the Programme will complete its activities in 2019 (although the Programme has plans for regulatory formalization during field seminars in 2019). Therefore, the Programme is recommended to make everything legally binding.
* The Programme has supplied four (4) greenhouse farms (2.6 hectares) in Uzgen and Nookat districts with seeds (20 hybrid vegetable crops - cucumbers and tomatoes), provided by the Federal Research Center for Vegetable Farming (Moscow) and “GAVRISH” plant-breeding and seed-production company to improve yields and demonstrate the potential of these seeds. The results will be available in March-April 2019; this project can be evaluated only after harvest. However, this measure is to a greater degree directed at importing hybrid seeds to the market of the Kyrgyz Republic (a new market). In this situation, the Programme is recommended to focus more on setting up permanent and stable channels for the purchase and sale of seeds for farmers.
1. *Third level – adopted/implemented land management schemes*
* The Programme contributed to the establishment of partner relations and a cooperation agreement between “EldanAtalyk” AIC Ltd. (Uzgen), engaged in oilseed processing and grape growing together with the “North Caucasian Federal Scientific Center of Horticulture, Viticulture, and Winemaking” Research Institute (Krasnodar), and the “Federal Rostov Agrarian Scientific Center” Research Institute (Rostov-on-Don). “EldanAtalyk” AIC Ltd. has purchased 5 varieties of oilseeds for 50 hectares of land as well as 302 thousand pieces of grape planting material. In the future, “EldanAtalyk” AIC Ltd. will conduct variety testing and distribution of different varieties of oilseeds and grape planting materials in the Kyrgyz Republic on its own. This shows that local companies are highly interested in and able to improve varieties (legitimize varieties) and work with local farmers independently. However, the Programme needs to have a clear evidence base showing the impact of this measure on increasing farmers' incomes
* It is also recommended to monitor and provide advisory support to “ElDanAtalyk” AIC Ltd. on the mechanisms of engaging farmers in this chain.
* The Programme contributed to creation[[3]](#footnote-3) of a sustainable pasture management system and development of cattle grazing plans by conducting an assessment of the entire AA pasture ecosystem, pasture use and creating infrastructure (cattle-driving bridges, dips, sheep pens, races, etc.), introducing an e-management system (informing 6686 pasture users) and including issues related to adaptation of pastures to climate change in local strategic plans for sustainable development jointly with Pasture Committees in 3 pilot communities. The Programme transferred the results of e-pasture, an e-tool that helps local committees to make more justified decisions for reducing the load on pastures. This approach, to a great extent, depends on the will of local government authorities and the Pasture Committee, therefore, the Programme needs to strengthen monitoring and evaluation of its performance in this area. 686 representatives of municipalities and communities (including 211 women) improved their skills in efficient pasture management. A total of KGS 6 048 065 was spent on pasture management, out of these KGS 100 000 – by LSGAs, KGS 6 156 329 – by local communities, KGS 2 469 718 – by UNDP.
* Eleven (11) pasture infrastructure facilities were rehabilitated with the Programme’s assistance. Dips, bridges, races, etc. were constructed or repaired. Activities on agro-forest-reclamation helped to improve the quality of 22 hectares of pastures. However, in order to secure the obtained interim results, it is necessary to conduct monitoring and evaluation on a constant basis and legally formalize everything.
* The assessment shows that the Programme needs to undertake measures on informing and consulting the community on the role and functions of JC, on how it differs from AD authorities and on the methodologies used for implementing these functions (calculating requirements in fodder, land use planning, livestock grazing plan, plan of veterinary measures, development projects and so on). Active promotion of projects with ‘visible’, ‘visual’ effect (infrastructural projects) is needed to increase community trust in JC and ensure subsequent payments for livestock grazing services.
* It is necessary to analyze the performance of JC in pilot municipalities, identify weak spots and develop a manual for pasture management and planning as well as develop standard documents/ report forms, cattle grazing plan in the form of a regulation or a business process for dissemination to non-pilot municipalities.
* It is recommended to improve the “Electronic Jayit Committee” information system with the subsequent training of JC and participation of non-pilot municipalities.
1. The majority of conflicts take place as a result of limited access of residents to certain resources (especially in the southern region). The Programme conducted a needs assessment among residents of pilot municipalities for the purpose of developing SPSD. In the course of identifying needs, issues of fair distribution of resources (including pastures) came up as well. At present, the impact of measures, implemented in the area of land and water management, on decreasing the level of conflict is not tracked by the Programme in a sufficient manner.
2. A high rate of intensity of Programme activities on land management is expected in 2019 (in addition to pasture management, where planned activities are already actively implemented). However, many of the implemented activities require close attention and further support in order to achieve sustainability by the end of the Programme. There is a great risk that a part of the projects may not reach their planned results due to seasonal works and delays in the process of approving activities of engaged parties.
* With regard to this, it is recommended that the Programme specialist in agriculture develop a detailed plan on dates and end results and focus on its implementation.

Overall assessment of the achievement:This result is in the process of being achieved and requires specifying and developing additional final indicators for measuring welfare (increase in income/profits from rational land management, including management of agricultural lands and pastures, number of pasture users/farmers, who have applied the knowledge gained in practice)[[4]](#footnote-4) that should be tracked by the Programme as an evidence base for these indicators. |
| Output indicator 1.5. At least 4 demo schemes aimed at expanding and diversifying production the field of agriculture have been introduced to manufacturing and processing enterprises using sustainable technologies |
| Comments and recommendations:1) The Programme has developed 4 demo schemes, but some of their aspects have not been fully finalized:*A demo scheme showing how a cold storage facility, a greenhouse, and a trade and logistics center work with farmers* * The Programme applied an approach to selecting project proposals that focused on supporting business projects who contributed 80% of their own input and specialize in storage, processing, and production of agricultural produce. Five (5) projects received support for a total amount of USD 144 710; 25 jobs were created (incl. 12 for women). Over 500 farmers gained access to integrated services on collecting, sorting, storing and selling agricultural produce.
* Funding of business proposals was based on a decision of the Project Selection Committee. Social responsibility was one of the selection criteria.[[5]](#footnote-5) At the same time, all companies (particularly Advantex Ltd.) failed to develop tools and mechanisms of social corporate responsibility; quotas for vulnerable population categories and help to kindergartens were not defined, etc.; one should take into consideration that these projects were supported specifically for improving the welfare of residents.
* The Programme introduces biogas units as one of the chains of integrated farming activities: animal farming – bio-waste processing – greenhouse farming, crop farming, field husbandry – processing-heating. Out of the four biogas units, two are currently working. One of them was included in the “biogas unit – farm – greenhouse” cycle. The second unit was not included in the planned cycle – “biogas unit – greenhouse” and is used for domestic purposes, which is extremely inefficient, given the costs (farmer’s expenditures – KGS 193 651, UNDP expenditures – KGS 2 020 373). This demonstrates that the possibilities of the farmer were not always taken into account, that no constant advisory support was established, no clear plans and deadlines set, and no risks calculated, e.g. that farmers have not yet fully understood the advantages of using biowaste as organic fertilizer and will not purchase it, that cattle waste will not suffice, etc. The intensity of Programme activities on introducing RES was particularly high in 2018. However, projects on biogas units require close attention since there is a great risk that a part of these projects may not reach their planned results.
* It is recommended to carry out a thorough analysis with regard to the possibility of establishing the cycle (at least an abridged one) and implement constant monitoring and coaching for achieving the results, with an emphasis on its possibilities.
* It is recommended to develop a methodological guide on the “Successful Practices” of demo schemes.

Overall assessment of achievement:The assessment confirms that the Programme introduced 4 demo schemes on systemic work with farmers, aimed at expanding and diversifying production in agriculture by using sustainable technologies. All schemes are in the process of implementation (1 cold storage facility, 1 trade and logistics center, 2 greenhouses and RES (solar collectors, biogas units). The riskiest demonstration scheme is connected to biogas units. |
| Output indicator 1.6. At least 3 educational tools aimed at the expansion and diversification of production in agriculture with the use of sustainable technologies.  |
| Comments and recommendations:1) Four (4) educational tools were introduced: 1. *Capacity building through training activities*

The Programme carried out a number of training activities and increased the capacity of 3 584 farmers in agricultural management. All of these training measures were necessary and timely, but no assessment was done to evaluate the effectiveness of capacity building. The impact and effectiveness of this measure can be evaluated only after obtaining the first results, which, for now, are virtually absent in this component.1. *Support and advice to farmers*

Support and advice to farmers have been primarily provided when outsourcing implementing companies and have not been done since, therefore, the Programme is recommended to continue advising target groups after a thorough analysis. The Programme should focus on building links between farmers and consulting organizations.1. *Establishing stable partner relations*

Stable partner relations are primarily established with scientific research institutes (SRIs) and agricultural companies of the RF. At the present moment, links have been established with 8 SRIs and 4 companies of the RF; additionally, fruitful cooperation and partnership is maintained between ElDanAtalyk AIC Ltd. (Uzgen), engaged in processing oil-bearing crops and growing grape with the “North Caucasian Federal Scientific Center of Horticulture, Viticulture, and Winemaking” Scientific Research Institute (Krasnodar), and the “Federal Rostov Agrarian Research Center” Scientific Research Institute (Rostov-on-Don), i.e. with 2 companies.1. *Exchange of experience, products, and results*

Exchange of opinions, know-how, and products, the establishment of horizontal links between all projects of the Programme was done through festivals, fairs, etc.Overall assessment of achievement:This result is in the process of being achieved. Four (4) educational tools were developed and are being implemented (capacity building, establishing stable partner relations, support and advice, experience and product exchange) with the aim of expanding and diversifying production in agriculture, using sustainable technologies. |
| Output indicator 1.7. At least 300 beneficiaries improved their access to energy-saving use of resources |
| Comments and recommendations:* A practical demonstration of the effectiveness of RES units (solar fruit dryer, water heaters, ovens for food preparation, greenhouses, LED street lighting) resulting from their active utilization by 15 business and social infrastructure facilities, supported by the Project in 2017, made a significant contribution to popularizing RES among rural residents. As well as to organizing demo training fields with full information about the most in-demand RES units and contact details of their suppliers.
* Large-scale information work on the successful implementation of the *Jashyl-Aiyl* Initiative, launched by the Project in mass media, resulted in the mass introduction of LED street lighting in villages. LED street lighting had the greatest impact on local communities as a highly sought means of ensuring the safety of villagers. Many non-pilot villages and streets are also initiating installation of street lighting through their own efforts, which signifies that positive experience is already being replicated.
* Another result is the popularity of using solar collectors for heating water, especially in social infrastructure facilities (FMS, schools, kindergartens), and drying fruits and kurut (a dry sour milk product) for income-generating activities. It should be noted that solar collectors are often used together with other RES units, e.g. with a hydraulic ram. In many projects on social infrastructure, the Programme has used an effective cyclic approach, i.e. water supply – purification – solar collector (for heating) – hydraulic ram in places (if the water was supplied from open sources) – septic/sewage.

Overall assessment of achievement:This result has been achieved. At least 300 beneficiaries have improved their access to energy-saving use of resources, mainly to LED lighting, solar collectors, and the hydraulic ram. |
| Output indicator 1.8. At least 50% of trained beneficiaries are using gained skills and knowledge in their income-generating activities in an efficient manner. |
| Comments and recommendations:It is recommended to prepare a questionnaire (a brief one with 3-5 questions) for surveying trained beneficiaries and conduct this survey in the near future, with a sampling frame of up to 10% of trained beneficiaries, aggregated by components.Introduce a post-learning assessment immediately after educational activities (pre- and post-test).Overall assessment of achievement:It is difficult to evaluate this indicator since the Programme has not yet measured the effectiveness of using skills and knowledge gained by beneficiaries. |

## **1.2. Component 2. Reducing vulnerability through the rehabilitation of rural water supply systems (drinking water and irrigation) in target districts, including through the introduction of low-cost and environmentally friendly technologies, and widening access of rural communities to a sustainable water supply.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Output 2. | Rehabilitation of rural water supply systems (drinking water and irrigation) in target districts, including through the introduction of low-cost and environmentally friendly technologies, will widen access of rural communities to sustainable water supply |
| Output indicator 2.1: At least 80% of pilot municipalities have local development plans that include integrated water management issues. |
| Comments and recommendations:The Programme provided assistance in the development of all 17 pilot municipal SPSDs that compulsorily include water supply development projects.The following was done to achieve this indicator:1. Local groups on strategic planning were created;
2. These groups increased their capacity to develop municipal SPSDs and develop/implement conflict- and gender-sensitive project proposals;
3. Needs of local communities were analyzed, priorities and relevant projects, including projects on developing the water supply system (plus working plans for water use in each AA) were developed;
4. The SPSDs themselves were developed and approved.

Problems related to the lack of understanding of their roles by the management of AWUs/RPADWUs, their difference from the LSGA functions, as well as weak analytical and writing skills came to light in the course of developing projects on water supply.Overall assessment of achievement:This indicator has been achieved. All pilot municipalities have SPSDs that include water management issues. |
| Output indicator 2.2: Five (5) demo schemes were implemented in pilot municipalities with the aim of expanding and diversifying the process of drinking and irrigation water supply using sustainable technologies. |
| Comments and recommendations:The 29 developed projects on water supply include approximately 17 projects related to utilization of energy-saving and environmentally friendly technologies in the field of drinking/irrigation water supply (12 - drinking, 5 - irrigation). However, in total, there are about 20 examples of innovative technologies used in these projects. These include: installation of a hydraulic ram to supply river water upstream with its simultaneous filtration (Nookat district), membrane water treatment technology (Nookat district), installation of helio systems (collectors) for heating water in two schools (Nookat and Uzgen district), a FMS (Nookat district) and a kindergarten (Uzgen district). In addition, drip irrigation in 5 AAs and 12 chlorination bactericidal plants for supplying clean drinking water (12 AAs).However, there are problems with the clear identification and accounting of these technologies due to a general formulation that does not allow to conduct a detailed evaluation.It is recommended to make a classification of the implemented projects, define clear criteria, summarize the entire experience gained in this field and develop demo schemes in the form of a separate document to be disseminated to non-pilot municipalities at the district level.Overall assessment of achievement:This indicator has been achieved, given that it is understood as the number of technological facilities that are functioning: for demonstration purposes or for the purpose of addressing residents’ problems related to water supply problems[[6]](#footnote-6). And also given that ‘sustainable technologies’ are understood as energy-saving and environmentally friendly technologies, although this definition also needs a clearer classification. |
| Output indicator 2.3: At least 150 000 beneficiaries have improved their welfare through effective water use at the level of pilot municipalities;Output indicator 2.4: At least 150 000 beneficiaries have improved their welfare through access to water resources with the help of energy-saving and environmentally friendly technologies. |
| Comments and recommendations:To achieve the above-indicated results, the following was implemented:а) training which included a series of study tours[[7]](#footnote-7), seminars on SPSD development with the inclusion of water supply and sanitation issues, training seminars on water quality testing, integrated drinking water and sanitation management, two ToTs on planning awareness-raising work among residents[[8]](#footnote-8).b) Development and budgeting of 29 facilities for repairing and reconstructing drinking and irrigation water network.[[9]](#footnote-9)c) Seventeen (17) information and advocacy campaigns on sanitation and hygiene were held across all three districts in 17 AAs, reaching 42 702 people.d) Organizational measures included support for the institutionalization of AWUs/RPADWUs with regard to issues of staff and organizational renewal[[10]](#footnote-10), service fees[[11]](#footnote-11), accounting and document management[[12]](#footnote-12), transfer of equipment[[13]](#footnote-13), contractual relations with consumers[[14]](#footnote-14) and with District Water Management Departments (DWMD)[[15]](#footnote-15), water quality[[16]](#footnote-16), and appointing AA employees to work on water issues[[17]](#footnote-17).* It is advisable to replace the indicator of reached beneficiaries (the number of people) with the number of households/ farms. In doing so, it is recommended to unite the two indicators into one, using the following formulation: the number of households who gained access to drinking/irrigation water through effective water use at the level of pilot municipalities or by using energy-saving and environmentally friendly technologies;
* Bring the entire attention of the Programme to completing the rehabilitation of all facilities, monitoring the achievement of projects’ effectiveness, creating/developing sustainability mechanisms (capacity building in managing water resources and users of AWUs/ RPADWUs, measures on improving sanitation and hygiene among residents and so on) and introducing urgent systemic water supply problems at the national level (changes in LRAs, delegating functions with the budget, etc.)
* It is recommended to involve specialists (UNISON PF, BIOM, etc.) for supporting and assessing the effectiveness and impact of projects that use RES.

Overall assessment of the achievement:1. Indicator 2.3 is not fully clear. However, if we interpret this indicator as the number of people who gained access to drinking/irrigation water supply services, then, at the present moment, coverage comprises over 100 000 people, among these women comprise over 50% (according to Programme data). According to the data of the NSC KR, the total number of residents in 30 pilot villages comprises 112 323, in Uzgen – 61 049, which shows that the indicator will be achieved only if all facilities are completed in 2019. Then the indicator is almost achieved.
2. Indicator 2.4 is more specific, but its planned target, which is completely identical to Indicator 2.3, is cause for concern. There is a great risk that this indicator may not be achieved due to an overestimation of its target since it is impossible that all 100% of projects apply energy-saving and environmentally friendly technologies. There is no precise information on this indicator as it is not collected within the Programme. Therefore, this indicator requires collecting information.

However, some projects have not been completed; accordingly, the number of beneficiaries may increase. |

# **1.3. Component 3. Rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Output 3. | Rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure has improved rural community welfare in target districts |

|  |
| --- |
| Output Indicator 3.1. 80% of pilot municipalities implemented mechanisms for improving the quality of functional performance in the delivery of public services, budgeting and monitoring one’s own activities. |
| Comments and recommendations:1. The Programme initiated implementation of a model of delivering public and municipal services according to the ‘single window’ principle in four (4) pilot municipalities. At present, CES are providing a full range of municipal services, starting from information services on legal and regulatory acts, land ownership, taxes and ending with the receipt of all necessary certificates. In 2018, 6165 rural residents have used their services, 56% of them were women. 23% of municipalities introduced the ‘Single window’ model.
2. 100% of pilot municipalities developed and approved SPSDs.
3. 100% of pilot municipalities implemented mechanisms for improving water use budgeting, etc. The Programme trained 49 AD specialists on the procedure of state procurements (11 – women) for an effective organization of the procurement process; additionally, UNDP specialists provided consultations on project reporting.
4. The Programme managed to raise funds from migrants (“Congress of the Kyrgyz” PF, Moscow) and, currently, 5 projects that utilize the capital of migrants are being implemented.
5. 100% of pilot municipalities gained experience of working with social projects and strengthening cooperation between local authorities and residents, which led to an increase in public confidence.
6. Skills of 100% of pilot LSGs in implementing state procurements and financial literacy have been improved.
* It is recommended to create a checklist of implemented mechanisms for improving the quality of functional performance in the delivery of public services, budgeting and monitoring one’s own activities for each pilot municipality.
* Develop a methodological guide with a feasibility study for organizing SDCs in other non-pilot municipalities and replicating applied mechanisms. When replicating experience, actively use the capacity of local self-government bodies of pilot municipalities involved in the work of these centers.
* It is recommended to conduct a final event and invite non-pilot municipalities, SALSGIR and state bodies, ME KR, donor organizations, and mass media for presenting effective measures with the aim of disseminating them at the country level.

Overall assessment of the achievement:This indicator is the process of implementation. |
| Output indicator 3.2. 10 000 beneficiaries have improved their welfare by gaining access to information and knowledge on reducing the conflict potentialOutput indicator 3.3. 5 000 beneficiaries have improved their welfare by gaining access to information and knowledge with the aim of expanding employment opportunities and accessing employment markets |
| Comments and recommendations:It is recommended to create a check-list on the number of beneficiaries who have improved their welfare by gaining access to information and knowledge on reducing the conflict potential, expanded employment opportunities and access to employment markets for each component and target groups: LSGAs, business representatives and farmers, youth in VS and rural youth, women, etc.Overall assessment of the achievement:All information and educational activities that were conducted within socio-infrastructural and business projects as well as aimed at increasing the capacity of LSG authorities, CS organizations, and businesses directly or indirectly affect the achievement of this indicator. These indicators require further more precise tracking. |
| Output indicator 3.4. At least 60 measures were taken at the local level to reduce the conflict potential and engage residents in public life through the rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure. |
| Comments and recommendations:The Programme does not identify measures that were used to engage the population in public life, but it does conduct an accounting of the population’s coverage in public life – the Programme has reached residents of 25 villages[[18]](#footnote-18) and funded (via small grants) the rehabilitation of 32 projects on improving local socio-economic infrastructure[[19]](#footnote-19) related to education (schools and kindergartens), medicine, leisure (rehabilitation of sports grounds), increased security (street lighting) in villages, improved road infrastructure (bridge repairs), etc.Additionally, 9 projects were implemented at the district level: to equip medical establishments in pilot districts with electrocardiography equipment sets (with an automatic decoding function) and automated external defibrillators with the management center located in the Osh Urban Hospital. At present, over 3000 people have been examined.* It is recommended to improve the system for evaluating the impact of measures, aimed at reducing the conflict potential and expanding the participation of residents in public life.
* It is recommended to classify social infrastructure facilities, identify weaknesses and strengths of each facility, develop measures on eliminating these weaknesses and achieving project sustainability, focusing all attention on measures aimed at reducing the conflict potential and engaging the population in the social and economic life.
* It is recommended NOT to begin new socio-infrastructural projects, but to concentrate on completing the ongoing projects and increasing their efficiency as well as adding funding for measures leading to sustainability and dissemination of gained experience. Measures should be developed on the basis of a joint analysis with project implementers.
* Analyze and develop a list of measures and approaches, applied by the Programme to reduce the conflict potential and engage residents in the social and economic life, and provide an evidence base confirming these processes.

Overall assessment of the achievement:The Programme has not fully finalized the system for assessing the impact of measures, aimed at reducing conflicts and increasing the participation of residents in public life, therefore, it is quite difficult to assess the achievement of this indicator. |
| Output indicator 3.5. At least 60 jobs created, with a special emphasis on women. |
| Comments and recommendations:* It is recommended to develop a checklist on the number of created jobs with a breakdown into 5 components.

Overall assessment of achievement:This indicator is duplicated in every component, it is necessary to introduce general accounting of the number of created jobs for women with a breakdown by each component. |
| Output indicator 3.6. At least 50% of trained beneficiaries are using gained skills and knowledge in their income-generating activities in an efficient manner. |
| Comments and recommendations:It is recommended to prepare a questionnaire (a brief one, 3-5 questions) for conducting a survey among trained beneficiaries and conduct this survey in the near future, with a sampling frame of up to 10% of trained beneficiaries, aggregated by components.Introduce a post-learning assessment immediately after educational activities (pre- and post-test).It is recommended to combine monitoring of this indicator’s achievement with indicator 1.8.Overall assessment of achievement:It is not possible to measure whether this result has been achieved since the Programme lacks measuring tools. |

1.4. Component 4. Increased employment of the population through an enhanced system of vocational and technical education and training

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outputs | Output 4 Enhanced system of vocational and technical education and training in target districts ensures increased employment in the long-term perspective |

|  |
| --- |
| Output indicator 4.1. At least 1000 young people improved their critical thinking skills and reduced conflict potential |
| Comments and recommendations:1) Programme measures are directed at supporting capacity building of youth from pilot districts and municipalities, in particular, through strengthening the VTET system in 29 target villages and in the town of Uzgen in order to decrease their vulnerability and conflict level.2) The conducted assessment recommends strengthening the evidence base collected by the Programme for this indicator.* To evaluate the effectiveness of this indicator, it is recommended to clearly define target youth groups – students in VS, graduates of VS, rural youth, youth aspiring to migrate, returning migrants –who will be the subject of Programme interventions, ask youth to clarify causes of emerging conflicts, specify what they need, in which area will capacity be built and integrate an assessment of training’s effectiveness right after the training and after 6 months into the monitoring system. It is recommended to develop a monitoring toolkit.
* Capacity building can be done via training seminars, consultations, information events, by disseminating information about employment opportunities, initiating projects proposed by youth, organizing leisure activities for youth directed at reducing their vulnerability in the labor market as well as preventive measures aimed at reducing the level of conflict.
* It is necessary to find data on the number of conflicts that took place among youth in pilot municipalities in 2016 and adopt it as a baseline value. At the end of 2019, the number of conflicts among youth should be compared with the baseline value to prove a reduction in the conflict potential.

Overall assessment of the achievement:Achieved result: 350 young people managed to reduce their conflict potential and improve their welfare. The data on target groups for this indicator need to be specified and additional final indicators for measuring a reduction in the conflict potential that should be tracked by the Programme on the basis of the capacity building need to be developed as the evidence base for this indicator. |
| Output indicator 4.2. At least 200 jobs created with an emphasis on women. |
| Comments and recommendations:Business projects of young people need assistance on the part of mentors, supervisors, and consultants.Overall assessment of achievement:Currently, 126 people, including 52 women (41%), have been provided with employment. 91 people, including 21 women (23%), gained access to temporary work. 22 business projects of VS graduates received support. |
| Output indicator 4.3. At least 1000 young people have improved their welfare by improving vocational skills and gaining access to employment services.Output indicator 4.5. At least 50% of trained beneficiaries among youth are using gained skills and knowledge in their income-generating activities in an efficient manner. |
| Comments and recommendations:Vocational training courses were organized for young entrepreneurs – recent graduates. The total number of young people who completed short-term vocational training courses on confectionary, zoohygiene, and milk processing comprised 242 people, out of them 145 were women (59%), 28 (70%) were Kyrgyz, and 12 (30%) Uzbek. The adult population was also covered by vocational training. To improve coordination and synergy, all short-term courses were conducted together with the GIZ Programme on the Economic Development of Osh Province and the GIZ Programme on Vocational Education and Training. Within the framework of vocational courses on zoohygiene and milk processing, organized at the request of *Alaiku Organics Ltd*. working on milk processing, 4 mobile points for collecting milk from farmers were opened in the Kara-Kuldja district.* It is recommended to develop a checklist on welfare improvement indicators (the number of the employed, those who opened their own enterprises, growth in income, % of those who applied gained knowledge in practice, implemented innovations, increased their income, acquired new professions, etc.).
* It is also recommended to launch information and educational events aimed at vocational guidance of youth, assistance to youth in finding employment, provision of market information, preparation for entering the labor market, using the capacity of VTET, CES, CP, employment centers, etc.

For sustainability purposes, it is recommended to supply these structures with methodological materials about implementing this work.Overall assessment of the achievement:Achieved result: 350 young people were able to improve their welfare by improving their professional skills. The data on target groups for this indicator need to be specified and additional final indicators for measuring an improvement in welfare (number of employed people, number of people who opened their own enterprises, applied acquired knowledge in practice, introduced innovations, increase their income, acquired new professions, etc.) that should be tracked by the Programme on the basis of the capacity building need to be developed as the evidence base for this indicator. |
| Output indicator 4.4. At least 4 educational tools were implemented in the system of vocational education and training, aimed at expanding and diversifying the VTET system. |
| Comments and recommendations:1. The Programme implemented a study of the labor market assessment and the main employment scenarios for residents of Osh province in the context of their vocational education trajectories.On the basis of the study, two vocational schools (VS #58 in Jany-Nookat v. of Nookat district and VS #62 in Kurshab v. of Uzgen district) were selected as pilot institutions and approved with relevant national partners.Training facilities in pilot VS were modernized for three new specializations – Lathe operator, Carpenter, Metalworker in a car repair shop.A list of necessary educational and methodological literature for the three newly opened specializations was approved with the RSMC and the AEVET, and 18 literature titles for a total amount of USD 1 963 were handed over to pilot vocational schools.To improve access of 849 students and instructors, among them 128 women and young women (15%), to information and knowledge, e-libraries were created in pilot schools and equipped with advanced information technologies, with the total amount of support comprising USD 10 902. To hold regular activities on peacebuilding and strengthening youth health, the Project supported the initiative of youth and local authorities to build a sports ground on the territory of VS № 58 in Nookat district, where the KR Government input comprised 21 169 (82% of the total project cost) and the UNDP input – USD 5 665.Implemented mechanisms:1. The Programme provides assistance in the development of income-generating activities of VS and their transformation into service delivery centers for the adult population by strengthening ties with local authorities.
* It is recommended to approve the curriculum in the RSMC and organize enrollment of at least three adult groups in partnership with employment centers and local authorities. Develop a regulation and a work plan of the Center, prepare a billboard, market services to residents.
1. On the basis of a labor market study, new specializations (‘Carpenter’, ‘Auto mechanic’, ‘Lathe and milling machine operator’) were created in pilot vocational schools for the region. The Programme is taking measures to strengthen the material and technical basis for organizing training and production activities in these specializations. Equipment was purchased for a total amount of USD 355872, including KR Government input - USD 83 160 (23%) and UNDP input – USD 272 712 (77%). In 2019, enroll at least one group to be trained in each specialization. Ensure control over the registration of equipment in balance books, inform the Trusteeship Council of schools and local authorities, refine mechanisms of using the equipment with businesses.
* It is recommended to hold a roundtable with the participation of the Ministry of Education, the AEVET, employers, and LSGAs in order to develop a plan of measures for discussing mechanisms of transforming vocational schools into service delivery centers for the adult population by strengthening links with the local authorities, and secure funding for the most urgent measure.
1. To increase the capacity of instructors and students, an e-library was created in 2 VS. However, at present, this is just purchased equipment that needs to be turned into a center for professional development and promotion of innovations among EPP and VS students, with a focus on women. Increase the capacity of the librarian, create a plan of development, organize experience sharing between two VS, inviting VS from all three districts.
* It is recommended to provide assistance in the development of services offered by the library.
* Mechanisms recommended for testing:
* *Improving work on vocational guidance in the region and employment of youth, including VS graduates;*
* *Strengthening cooperation between VS and businesses, developing a mentorship institute on the part of the business community for VS graduates who wish to open their own business (creating business chains).*

2. The assessment shows that the implementation has not been completed. All mechanisms require monitoring and support to prove their effect and sustainability.Overall assessment of the achievement:The process of implementing the three mechanisms is ongoing. To achieve sustainability, it is necessary to set up control, monitoring and coaching support for mechanisms under implementation. |

## **1.5. Component 5. Strengthening the resilience of local communities to natural disasters.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected outputs | Output 5. Strengthening the resilience of local communities in target districts to natural disasters and climate change |

|  |
| --- |
| Output indicator 5.1. A pilot risk assessment was undertaken in the water management sector for forecasting possible damage and losses and a “model” methodology, adapted to local conditions and capacity, developed. |
| Comments and recommendations:1. The Project was instrumental in implementing a quality, detailed analysis of disaster risks together with the district and oblast divisions of the MES KR with specific indicators for identifying natural and man-made hazards, including projects in the area of water management and biological safety, using technical means (drones) of each pilot district. The following were developed: (i) schematic maps showing proliferation of hazardous processes and objects with designated zones of possible impact (for settlements), vulnerability maps, risk maps; (ii) 30 disaster risk profiles for 29 villages and the town of Uzgen; (iii) Emergency Response Plans of district territorial subdivisions of the Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Kyrgyz Republic (in 3 pilot districts) were developed and recommended as an additional annex to the existing Civil Defense Plans of districts in Osh province. The most dangerous zones that require the speediest solution were included in the emergency response plans of MES KR territorial subdivisions in the pilot districts of Osh province, which implies their mandatory implementation. The effectiveness of this study lies in the fact that a joint analysis and risk assessment (according to international standards) with the DMES of three pilot districts has increased their capacity.

2) Thanks to the Project all pilot villages and the town of Uzgen were inspected more thoroughly for potential emergency situations, with the inclusion of all zones in the risk map of the district and the province; risk profiles were developed for each pilot village. All schematic maps, developed jointly with the MES KR, on the proliferation of hazardous processes and objects with a designation of potential impact zones (risks profiles) were handed over to all 30 pilot villages together with the 164 recommended mitigation measures. Meetings were held with representatives of pilot villages (490 people), where emergency-related issues were discussed and emergency risk maps presented. This allowed to once again remind the population of the need to work on improving the resilience of local residents to emergency situations, with a mandatory inclusion of plans on information, mitigation projects and preventive measures in SPSDs. Some of the proposals were included in the strategic development plans of aiyl aimaks, which implies their mandatory execution. The responsibility of MES and AA employees increased in the course of carrying out joint work on monitoring and prevention of emergency situations in pilot districts. The joint work of the DMES with the AA in management is being strengthened, but communications with the population are weak and need to be expanded. It is possible that the ties between the AD population and the DMES will be strengthened when migration projects will enter their active phase.* It is recommended to disseminate the experience of developing risk profiles and risk maps together with the DMES, with the inclusion of mitigation projects at the level of three districts, to non-pilot municipalities.
* It is recommended to prepare a demo model on developing a set of documents aimed at improving ES management at the local level.

Overall assessment of the achievement:This result has been achieved, a risk assessment was conducted in the water management sector, three (3) schematic maps were developed: proliferation of hazardous processes and objects with the indication of possible impact zones (for settlements), vulnerability maps, risk maps; a model of risk profiles in the water management sector and integrated in 30 villages. |
| Output indicator 5.2. Identification of hazards and implementation of small-scale infrastructure projects, including ‘green’ (agricultural and forest land reclamation) measures, to reduce the vulnerability of residents and their sources of income to climate hazards, slope processes and land degradation# of population (of all ages) with reduced vulnerability to climate hazards, slope processes, and land degradation |
| Comments and recommendations:1) The Programme contributed to the partial development of mechanisms and tools to address issues identified as a result of the study in implemented pilot villages[[20]](#footnote-20) and focused more on the implementation of mitigation projects. Through the implementation of 4 mitigation projects the Programme intends to protect over 10 000 households (84 044 villagers, 48% women), 6 social facilities, 264 hectares of irrigated land, 13 hectares of gardens, and 15 km of intra-farm roads from seasonal mudflows. Practice shows that the impact and effectiveness of mitigation projects are high, but it will be possible to assess them only after these projects have been completed2) At the same time, taking into account the primary goal of this component, namely, strengthening the resilience of local communities to natural disasters of local significance,* it is recommended to refine and implement the following tools together with the DMES:

(i) define and assign functional responsibilities of CDC members; (ii) define specific schemes of protection, response, mobilization, notification with full names, telephone numbers, access routes, etc. by one’s own efforts; (iii) local communities must know which disaster poses a hazard for them, therefore, schematic maps should be displayed in all public places, schools, FMS, postal offices, etc. (iv) develop step-by-step instructions on natural disasters for an ordinary villager in the Kyrgyz language (telephone numbers, where and whom to turn to, etc.). The developed scheme should be included in the demonstration model on developing a set of documents aimed at ES management at the local level, indicated in item 5.1, for dissemination to non-pilot municipalities.Overall assessment of the achievement:The final indicator adopted in the Programme document is not an impact indicator, but one of the process indicators, which is not directly connected to changes in the lives of beneficiaries. A baseline survey that had been conducted did not propose indicators for tracking the effectiveness of Programme impact. Implementation of 4 mitigation projects is delayed due to administrative procedural issues and seasonality. Work with the local population on resilience has not been finalized. |
| Output indicator 5.3. Development of relevant tools and creation of a healthcare infrastructure network with the aim of improving the epizootic situation in pilot districts. |
| Comments and recommendations:1) Tools have been developed and are being tested (improving cooperation between district AA and SES on preventive water and soil measures, improving cooperation between the veterinary service in districts and in Osh province and AAs on utilizing biowaste, loss of cattle, etc.) aimed at improving the epizootic situation in pilot districts.2) The Project contributed to improving the epizootic situation in Uzgen district by supporting and installing an incinerator in Jalpak Tash AA[[21]](#footnote-21) for thermal utilization/recycling and disinfection of cattle loss consequences and various biological waste at the initiative of the veterinary service and the MES KR. The epizootic situation in three districts occupies a special place among disaster risks. The high population density in these districts (46 people per 1 sq. km), the proximity of ground waters and open sources that are used by residents for getting drinking water, the absence of *Becker's pits* in many villages, the frequency of mudflows, floods, poor soil stability, forest soil type, loss of cattle, the size and the overcrowded character of cattle markets, climatic and geographical conditions, methods of cattle breeding - all these pose a great threat to the local population. Therefore, ensuring veterinary safety is of paramount importance for preventing potential disaster risks. Installation of modern incinerators (with a capacity of 50-100 kg) is necessary and justified, but there are issues related to regulatory sustainability (who is responsible, how is it controlled, on whose balance should it be, who allocates funds for installation, maintenance, and disinfection, etc.)* In connection to this, it is recommended to thoroughly plan all activities on installing the incinerator together with the MES, the MH KR, the veterinary department and SES. It is recommended to take measures to give incinerators a legal status and increase the capacity of veterinary services in pilot districts to conduct awareness-raising and educational work with the population on public biosafety and reduce risks connected to installation and maintenance of incinerators.

3) The Project contributed to improving the health of local residents by supplying equipment for improving the quality of drinking water analysis. The effectiveness of this measure is very high since virtually 80% of the population drink water from open sources or homemade pits /wells with a depth of 4-10 meters and from ground waters, which poses a great threat to them. The impact of this measure requires baseline data confirming an improvement in the quality of drinking water.Overall assessment of the achievement:This indicator does not have a numeric value and is not result-oriented. The implemented baseline survey did not propose indicators to track the effectiveness of Programme impact. |
| Output indicator 5.4. Consultations and dialogue between state LSG authorities, the private sector, and civil society organizations with the aim of developing response mechanisms for potential large-scale emergency situations and crises. |
| Comments and recommendations:1) A dialogue was established between state LSG authorities, the private sector, and civil society organizations. Emergency response plans (in accordance with several provisions of the international standard) of district territorial divisions of the MES KR (in 3 pilot districts) were developed and recommended as an additional annex to the existing Civil Defense Plans of Osh province. The most dangerous zones requiring the speediest solution were included in the emergency response plans of MES territorial divisions in pilot districts of Osh province, which implies their mandatory execution This component was implemented through outsourcing.Overall assessment of the achievement:This result has been achieved; Emergency Response Plans of district territorial divisions of the MES KR (in 3 pilot districts) were developed and recommended as an additional annex to the existing Civil Defense Plans of districts in Osh province. |
| Output indicator 5.5. Defining cooperation mechanisms between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Emergency Situations on issues of emergency medical aid and obtaining respective materials and supplies for creating one mobile hospital. |
| Comments and recommendations:1) The Programme facilitates the creation of an urgently needed mobile medical aid point for strengthening emergency medicine (which also foresees a scheme with a function of providing aid in case of serious traffic accidents) by providing necessary equipment, ensuring smoothly running cooperation between fire and rescue formations, the Crisis Management Center (CMC), and the 112 Unified Duty and Dispatch Service (UDDS 112) together with the MES KR and the MH KR, with assistance from the All-Russian Research Institute for Civil Defense and Emergencies (ARRICDE) of the EMERCOM of the Russian Federation. However, there is still no established methodology, no cooperation and interaction scheme.* In connection to this, it is recommended to analyze international experience in the field of creating similar mobile points, develop a concept and a methodology for creating such a mobile point, including a scheme of cooperation and interaction of structures. In accordance with the findings, make a decision on the necessity of creating such service or a justified refusal from this idea.
* This issue should be discussed at a session of the Supervisory Council of the Programme.

Overall assessment of the achievement:The assessment shows that the information available in the Programme is not sufficient to evaluate whether the results of this indicator have been achieved. A long-drawn process of approval (LRA) between the two main stakeholder ministries related to deciding which authorized body will be responsible for creating an emergency medical service. In the course of an interview with MES representatives, information was obtained that “… at the present moment, we have disagreements with the MH KR, there are problems of regulatory nature which still have not been addressed.” |

1. Main assessment conclusions
	1. Programme Design
* The Programme document provides a good description of the main components/results and proposes measures for introducing various approaches and mechanisms aimed at improving virtually all areas of human activity at the local level. The Programme’s primary focus was made on achieving synergetic effects via an integrated impact on all objects (pilot municipalities), using different tools in various areas of livelihood, which makes the Programme unique and innovative, increases its effectiveness and contributes to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Concept.
* The primary mechanism of Programme implementation is strengthening cooperation between LSG authorities, state bodies, civil society organizations, and businesses according to the “partnership for development” principle.
* The Programme’s design fully corresponds to expectations, goals, and objectives of national and sectoral socio-economic Programmes; it is directed at achieving the goals adopted by Kyrgyzstan with regard to SDP 2030. Announcing 2018 and 2019 as years of regional development increased the relevance of the Programme and raised motivation of state and local self-government bodies to implement main Programme measures.
* Nevertheless, the inadequately structured methodology of the Programme (a set of results and target indicators), the weakness of logical interlinks between component goals/measures/indicators may become a factor hampering the achievement of Programme results. Unfortunately, the implemented baseline survey that was supposed to ensure a methodology for monitoring results failed to provide the Programme with interim indicators of target achievement, baseline data for measuring progress, tools for their measurement and a methodology for their collection and processing to prove that they have been achieved.
* Moreover, target groups of beneficiaries (specific people or organizations, households/ farms) for each component are not defined clearly. If we take into account that the main mechanism of Programme implementation on creating favorable conditions and sustainable human development is the reduction of vulnerability of target groups, then defining and identifying their problems becomes a condition of paramount importance. Vagueness with regard to target groups, as a rule, leads to excessive and inefficient costs.

## **Relevance**

Assessment of Programme’s relevance evaluates the correspondence of Programme objectives to the problems of beneficiaries/villages/the region, including correspondence of Programme objectives to the country development strategy and the development strategy of Osh province.

* The main areas of the Programme correspond to the country’s priorities and international commitments of the KR on SDG 2030 implementation as well as national and oblast-level Programmes of socio-economic and regional development (NDS KR 2018-40, KR Government Development Programme for 2018-2022 “Unity, trust, creation”, Concept for Regional Development of the KR, etc.) and UNDP Programme documents.
* Goal and Measures of Components also logically correspond to the goals and objectives of the Socio-Economic Development Programme of Osh province for 2018-2022 and sectoral development objectives.

*Overall assessment: corresponds fully*

## **Efficiency and effectiveness**

Assessment of effectiveness evaluates the extent to which the Programme's objectives/measures have been achieved, and the consistency between planned and actual indicators.

* The total Programme budget comprises USD 3 500 000, out of these USD 2 934 458 were allocated for Programme activities (Component 1. USD 1 147 600, Component 2. 631 900, Component 3. 469 700, Component 4. 327 635, Component 5. 357 623).
* Information obtained from the Programme document shows that administrative costs comprise USD 565 542, which makes up 16% of the total project budget.
* Financial implementation of the Programme is consistent with the planned volume of resources but does not always meet the set deadlines. The reasons for delays are rather objective in nature and are caused by bureaucratic procedures of state procurements, UNDP procedures, re-tenders, delays in inputs on the part of local communities, etc. Nevertheless, several projects are in the process of implementation (procurements of necessary equipment were made only in the end of 2018, and a part are awaiting the end of the winter season to start project activities).
* Effectiveness of each Programme component is described in detail in the first chapter.

*Overall assessment: corresponds partially since the project is continuing its activities.*

## **2.4. Impact**

Assessment of impact evaluates the extent to which measures, applied by the Programme, affected a reduction in the vulnerability of target groups, according to the Programme document, on local and regional levels.

* Measures implemented by the Programme are aimed at reducing the vulnerability and expanding access to services for all vulnerable population groups living in pilot municipalities as well as at increasing the capacity of LSG authorities, state bodies, CS organizations, and businesses to manage the reduction of target groups’ vulnerability.
* The impact degree of projects that have already been implemented within the Programme is ambiguous, a part of projects already has evidence of their impact, however, many projects have a delayed impact effect or lack evidence of impact.

The implemented assessment confirms the following impact of the Programme at the current moment:

* LSGAs and state bodies are applying new mechanisms of partnership and raising funds from the private sector – funds of labor migrants, businesses, etc. *Sources – interviews, observations, focus groups with state and LSG authorities, and demo schemes.*
* Beneficiaries are receiving state and municipal services at a higher level via SDCs (the ‘single window’ principle), and public confidence in local authorities is increasing. *Sources – interviews with community members and a book of complaints and suggestions.*
* The state, LSG authorities and the population acknowledge the problems outlined in projects as the ones that need to be addressed and allocate additional funds as co-funding. *Sources – Programme reporting on inputs.*
* Members of the local community have gained access to the decision-making process at the local level, and their problems were included in SPSDs (selection of problems to be addressed by SPSDs). *Sources – Programme reports, participant lists, SPSDs.*
* Programme beneficiaries are receiving a wider range of services (new types of services) through the development of new businesses, improved pasture, land, and water management. *Sources – Programme reports, interviews with business representatives, visits to businesses.*
* Beneficiaries understand the advantages of introducing efficient and innovative technologies and apply these technologies in practice (LED lighting, hydraulic ram); public security is also improving (LED lighting). *Sources – observation, interviews with residents, reports.*
* Beneficiaries have the experience and higher motivation to work with development projects, understand project documentation and requirements. *Sources – interviews with project implementers, representatives of state and LSG authorities.*
* Beneficiaries receive services on the prevention and early diagnostics of cardiovascular diseases in local medical establishments. *Sources – report of the Osh Oblast Hospital on identifying 14 cases in more than 6000 examined patients.*
* The types of impact that should be achieved by the Programme, based on the Programme document, but that currently require compiling a sufficient evidence base or have a delayed effect. Due to this, the Programme is recommended to concentrate its efforts on their achievement.
* Beneficiaries/households of the Programme are increasing their income by increasing yield and expanding the area of crops (seeds, irrigation, innovative processing technologies, new agricultural crops, etc.), improving sales of agricultural produce and increasing employment among Programme beneficiaries.
* Vulnerability of residents to various diseases, resulting from drinking water of poor quality, and infectious diseases from animals is decreasing.
* Population, especially, youth and women have a higher motivation to open their own businesses and obtain vocational education.
* Residents are receiving higher quality services of primary vocational training, acquiring new professions and have expanded employment opportunities.
* Preventive detection of risk zones associated with drinking water from any sources (SES) is increasing.
* Vulnerability of victims to emergency situations is decreasing and the safety of residents from natural disasters is improving.
* Reduced conflict potential in resource use (pasture, land, water)
* Beneficiaries (state bodies, LSGAs, CSOs, and individual population groups) are getting the opportunity to apply gained knowledge, technologies, and information in practice.

*Overall assessment: corresponds partially since the Programme is at the stage of implementation.*

## **2.5. Sustainability**

Assessment of the degree of sustainability of Programme measures evaluates the possibility of continuing measures launched by the Programme after its completion.

* An assessment of the sustainability of Programme mechanisms and results shows that mechanisms, which increase their sustainability, have already been implemented and are continuing to be implemented in the Programme for the current period. There is political will on the part of state bodies, Osh regional administration, LSGAs to ensure sustainability of Programme achievements. Nevertheless, there are factors that can nullify the results achieved (support of state and LSG authorities is of personal nature, which, given the current frequent staff turnover, can lead to a reduction/failure to achieve Programme results). It is, therefore, recommended to use the numerous mechanisms of regulatory registration more actively in order to ensure their sustainability and succession by a new head.

It should also be noted that projects implemented jointly with state agencies and LSG authorities utilize a greater number of sustainability mechanisms: registration in the balance sheet, allocation of financial support from the budget for maintenance, mandatory nature of their provision (SES, SDCs, kindergartens, FMS, schools, VS, etc.). However, they also contain risks that may affect their sustainability (poor capacity of staff, shortage of funds for service and technical maintenance/updates, motivation of the head to guarantee the security of purchased equipment and its operation). Due to these risks, the Programme is recommended to focus its attention on implementing measures aimed at increasing their sustainability (development and implementation of regulatory norms, implementation of plans, introduction of recommendations, etc.)

* The business capacity of several enterprises/ entrepreneurs, who have received grant-based support from the Programme, remains unsustainable and can lead to a decline in production/ closing. This situation requires the presence of a business specialist in the Programme for implementing Programme interventions in the form of coaching and consultations and creating mechanisms for monitoring social commitments undertaken by the business community on the part of the population and LSG authorities.
* Created Local Development Committees (LCD) are quite unstable structures for monitoring since LDC members have low motivation and are not a part of the LSG system, they are viewed by the population as a rather temporary artificial structure, created specifically for project implementation.
* Despite the interventions of the Programme to increase/create the managerial capacity of AWUs/ RPADWUs, RHCs, their work on delivering services to the population remains unsustainable. This situation requires a deeper analysis of causes and a search for new solutions, including the implementation of other mechanisms to increase management effectiveness in the form of preparing an analytical note for state bodies.
* It is not possible to evaluate the sustainability of agricultural and mitigation projects due to delays in their implementation start date. The active phase of these projects will begin in March 2019.

*Overall assessment: corresponds partially since the Programme is at the stage of implementation*.

# **Lessons learned and recommendations**

## **3.1 Lessons learned**

* The correspondence of the main Programme areas to country and regional priorities of socio-economic development and the integratedness of its measures, aimed at reducing the vulnerability of the population, strengthens the participation of state and LSG authorities in the work of the Programme on the creation of favorable conditions and increases partnership and cooperation up to the level of co-funding Programme activities.
* Cooperation with other development Programmes in Osh province and partners from the state and non-state sector leads to a more rational and efficient use of the UNDP resources and strengthens the capacity of local partners (outsourcing consulting services).
* A clearly structured methodology of the Programme (set of results and target indicators) and close logical interrelation between component goals/measures/indicators) are some of the important factors of Programme success. Of great importance is a baseline survey, which offers an M&E system for tracking how results are achieved, provides measurement tools and baseline data for assessing progress and lays down a common Programme approach based on a coordination of efforts and synergy of all inputs.
* Formulation of a common understanding of the integrated approach in partners and in the Programme strengthens the synergetic effect of all projects on achieving sustainable development. A shortage of synergy and links between projects at the local, district and inter-district level does not allow the Programme to achieve its goal in a more effective manner.
* Lack of definition and specificity with regard to direct beneficiaries in each component (specific individuals or organizations, households) reduces the focus and effectiveness of Programme measures.
* Establishment of an effective M&E system within the Programme is a mandatory condition for its effectiveness and helps to justify corrections and changes to Programme design in a timely manner.
* The Programme’s Management, who actively use outsourcing, should have a sufficient expert capacity in project management (in setting goals and objectives, monitoring and evaluating the results obtained, etc.) for specifying terms of reference.
* Funding the private sector with grant resources requires informing the population and entrenching the social responsibility and commitments of businesses to the local community and LSG authorities.
* Creation of new artificial structures (LDCs) results in weakened management functions. It is therefore advisable to build the capacity of existing/operating local management bodies (*aiyl* council commissions, community organizations, and *jaamats*).
* Projects aimed at improving the socio-economic infrastructure should not limit themselves to repairs/updates/ equipment procurement. These projects should mandatorily include measures on improving the quality of services and the quality of living of project beneficiaries.

## **3.2. Recommendations**

Recommendations given below were developed for the Management of the Programme and are of general nature. More detailed recommendations for each component are given in the first chapter.

*The Programme Management is recommended to:*

* Set up an M&E system for tracking the achievement of Programme target results (impact and sustainability indicators). Develop and implement tools necessary for measuring results, increase the capacity of Programme staff in monitoring, evaluation, and identification of interim indicators.
* Strengthen the interaction between measures of the Programme’s components to achieve a synergy of UNDP interventions and create impact chains (e.g. a carpentry shop in VS # 68 manufactures blanks for souvenirs, while a souvenir shop in Uzgen turns them into souvenir products and sells to tourists). This will require changing the existing management system in the Programme. Management should move away from a component-based management approach, directed at achieving results within the component, toward an integrated ‘geographic’ approach oriented at achieving Programme results in a specific area (village, municipality, district). Appoint thematic specialists as coordinators responsible for achieving the results of all components across the district. These specialists will have to conduct a general analysis of all projects in the district and develop ideas with a potential for synergy and multiplicative effect.
* In the final year of the Programme, it is recommended not to start new projects and direct all measures at completing ongoing projects, achieving sustainability of projects that have already been implemented, disseminating gained experience to other non-pilot villages, municipalities and districts of Osh province in the form of demonstration models, assign funding priority to supporting ideas of a cross-cutting, integrated nature and expanding the impact of the results obtained.
* Conduct an analysis of all studies carried out by the Programme, and compile a document summarizing all problems of systemic nature, which have hampered quality delivery of public, market and state/municipal services at the local level and required changes to the regulatory and legal environment in the competence of state bodies at the republican level. Initiate a final event for presenting the results of the report.
* The Programme is recommended to provide a clearer definition of target groups for each component (direct/indirect beneficiaries, including poor population groups) and areas of their livelihood activities, the vulnerability of which will be reduced via implemented measures. For 2019 the primary focus of the Programme should be on reducing the vulnerability of target groups.
* Component 1. Reducing vulnerability through quality governance and sustainable agriculture, tourism, trade, and promotion of green technologies
* Component 2. Reducing vulnerability by improving access of rural communities to a sustainable water supply
* Component 3. Reducing vulnerability through rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure
* Component 4. Reducing vulnerability through increased employment of the population via an enhanced system of vocational and technical education and training
* Component 5. Strengthening the resilience of local communities to natural disasters.
* The Programme needs to define a unified policy on statistical accounting of the number of beneficiaries – recipients of benefits of the Programme. It is necessary to set definition criteria and markers, methods for calculating the number of beneficiaries for each Programme component. For example, a person, who received 3 services from the Programme, cannot be indicated in reporting as 3 beneficiaries. In the same way, the entire population cannot be defined as a beneficiary of activities of one facility. The number of beneficiaries from one village cannot be summed up by different Programme activities since the final figure may exceed the total number of residents in this village. It is also advisable to replace the indicator of reached beneficiaries (number of people) with the number of households/farms (SDC, water, social infrastructure). It is recommended to conduct an accounting of the number of beneficiaries by breaking it down into 5 Programme components (e.g. creation of jobs for women).
* It is recommended to classify projects by goals:

1) social projects

2) projects aimed at improving management quality

3) business projects

and by current status evaluation:

1. Completed, require supervision.
2. Completed, require sustainability measures
3. Not completed, but do not have risks
4. Not completed and have high risks

This classification will allow the Programme to develop special measures, which will make it possible to increase the effectiveness and sustainability of projects as well as focus educational activities based on project needs. Those projects that will be defined as having high risks will require the most attention and interventions on the part of the Programme. Business projects will require hiring an external business consultant, e.g. CES in Osh city, since these projects need business coaching, mentorship, etc.

* To have evidence of the impact of implemented training, it is necessary to create a system for assessing the impact of educational and informational measures in the Programme. For this, it is recommended to prepare a questionnaire (a brief one, 3-5 questions) for conducting a survey among trained beneficiaries and conduct this survey before the completion of the Programme, with the sampling frame comprising up to 10% of trained beneficiaries, aggregated by components.

Introduce a post-learning assessment immediately after educational activities (pre- and post-test).

* With the goal of increasing the capacity of local self-government and state authorities to improve the process of managing territorial development, it is recommended to create and implement a curriculum that includes issues related to budgeting, attracting investments and developing investment projects, effective use of municipal property, the new methodology of developing SEDP (Order of the ME KR), as this will increase the quality of governance at the local level and public confidence in local authorities.
* Take measures to translate activities implemented by the Programme together with various scientific research centers of the RF into a more “practical plane” (for example, these can include projects on the standardization of seeds/fertilizers, projects on establishing trade links between farmers and partners in the RF, etc.)
* Based on the successful results and the implemented demo schemes/models of the Programme, it is recommended to prepare methodological guides/manuals, which will summarize experience and lessons learned and describe all dissemination mechanisms and tools (SDC, RES, the experience of engaging labor migrants, risk profiles, etc.)
* Take measures to entrench the social responsibility of enterprises to the local community (e.g. agreements indicating responsibilities to accept raw materials from vulnerable population groups, to create permanent and seasonal jobs for them and so on).
* Regularly send out a newsletter with information about Programme activities and hold general briefing sessions with all key partners of the Programme.
* Conduct joint monitoring with project implementers on a quarterly basis, analyzing the implementation of their development plans/business plans, registered by protocols (work committees, pasture committees, entrepreneurs, etc.).

3.3. Set of measures/activities for the subsequent continuation of the Programme in 2019.

Component 1. Reducing vulnerability through quality governance and sustainable agriculture, tourism, trade, and promotion of green technologies

Main recommended measures for 2019.

1. Identify a focal person in the Programme, responsible for developing the Programme’s business component (CES or an external consultant/organization), whose functions will include:
2. Conducting an analysis of all business projects, identifying risks and measures for achieving their sustainability. Based on the analysis, developing a plan of action for 2019 for each project and the Programme in general.
3. Organizing consulting support, implementing mentorship by advanced entrepreneurs, CES, VS, etc.
4. Implementing a system for monitoring results (income growth, profit growth, creation of jobs, etc.).
5. Identifying and entrenching the social commitments of businesses to the community.
6. Creating value-added chains.
7. Organize monitoring of implementation and make changes to SPSDs in pilot municipalities.
8. Implement measures to increase the quality of services and disseminate the experience of SDCs. For this purpose, analyze service delivery in 4 pilot centers, organize experience exchange, identify difficulties that should be addressed (strengthening interaction with remote villages, expanding the services provided, automatizing processes, etc.) and develop a methodological guide on organizing CES for other non-pilot municipalities with the aim of replicating the mechanisms applied.
9. Pay special attention to the Programme section on agriculture. Analyze the current status of this subcomponent and define a list of objectives/measures for 2019. When selecting measures take into account the timeframe of the Programme; the main selection criteria should be feasibility and practicability of their implementation.
10. Pay special attention to the project on biogas units. Conduct an analysis, identify all weaknesses and develop a package of measures, possibly by inviting external experts. Organize constant coaching and monitoring on the part of the Programme.
11. Develop a methodological guide on the successful practices of demo schemes and implement measures for its dissemination.
12. Develop and implement a Programme for training LSGAs.

Component 2. Reducing vulnerability through the rehabilitation of rural water supply systems (drinking water and irrigation) in target districts, including through the introduction of low-cost and environmentally friendly technologies, and widening access of rural communities to a sustainable water supply.

Main recommended measures for 2019.

* 1. Analyze the current status of all projects, identify weaknesses and classify them by a degree of potential risks related to failure to achieve target indicators and sustainability.
	2. Based on the analysis, develop a work plan for the projects and the Programme for 2019.
	3. Develop and implement measures for further capacity building of AWUs/RPADWUs in managing water resources and water users.
	4. Develop a methodological guide on the “Successful practices” of demo schemes and take measures to disseminate it.

Component 3. Rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure

Main recommended measures for 2019.

* 1. Analyze the current status of all projects, identify weaknesses and classify them by a degree of potential risks related to failure to achieve target indicators and sustainability.
	2. Based on the analysis, develop a work plan for the projects and the Programme for 2019.
	3. Develop and implement a system for collecting evidence of the social impact of projects on the lives of beneficiaries.
	4. Analyze and form a list of effective measures and approaches applied by the Programme to reduce the conflict potential and engage the population in the social and economic life for their further replication.
	5. Hold a final event for presenting these effective measures and invite non-pilot municipalities, SALSGIR, ME KR, donor organizations, and mass media so that these measures can be disseminated at the country level.

Component 4. Increased employment of the population through an enhanced system of vocational and technical education and training

Main recommended measures for 2019.

1. Define target groups for this component, develop a plan of measures for increasing their capacity and employment, and strengthen vocational guidance among youth, using the capacity of VTET, CES, SDC, employment centers and so on.
2. Set up an accounting system for this component and create a system for monitoring the impact of Programme measures on reducing the number of conflicts among youth.
3. It is recommended to approve the curriculum in the RSMC, organize enrollment of at least three groups of adults in partnership with employment centers and local authorities. Develop a regulation and a work plan of the Center, prepare a billboard market services to the population.
4. Hold a roundtable on developing a plan of measures for transforming pilot VS into centers for training adults and delivering services to the population.
5. Develop a SP for VS with the participation of local authorities and employers.
6. Create and implement a plan for e-library development.
7. Introduce a mentorship institute on behalf of businesses (22 projects funded by the Programme).
8. Analyze projects aimed at creating turning, fitting and carpentry shops in a VS and develop measures on their sustainability and strengthening links with the local economy and community.

Component 5. Strengthening the resilience of local communities to natural disasters.

1. Complete mitigation projects and conduct their assessment.
2. Disseminate the experience of developing hazard profiles, mitigation projects, risk maps, etc. at the level of three districts to non-pilot municipalities.
3. Finalize and implement the following tools jointly with the DMES: (i) functional responsibilities of CDC members; (ii) schemes of protection, response, mobilization, notification; (iii) develop brief step-by-step instructions on disasters for a simple villager in the Kyrgyz language.
4. Take measures to give incinerators a legal status and increase the capacity of veterinary services of pilot districts to conduct awareness-raising and educational work on public biosafety with the population and decrease risks related to installation and maintenance of incinerators.

# **List of annexes**

## **Annex 1. Survey toolkit**

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS:

* The degree of effectiveness of Programme objectives/measures. A logical correspondence between the goal of the Programme and its objectives is assessed.
* What does the success of the Programme mean for you? What is an indicator of success resulting from UNDP assistance? Which specific examples can you give? What has changed in the needs and activities of Programme beneficiaries?
* What are the goal and objectives of this Programme? What is the structure of Programme management? Which main components does the Programme consist of? Why, precisely, were they selected, in your opinion?
* Is there a logical connection between the goal and objectives?
* Do you think that the goal of the Programme is being achieved in full by implementing the indicated objectives of the Programme? Or are there other objectives that were not included in the Programme? Why do you think so?
* What are the main achievements of the Programme as of now (the present period)? Which main results and products were obtained specifically?
* Why precisely these achievements and results do you consider to be the most important in the Programme?
* Which key factors/causes (external and internal) impacted their achievement? Did new factors, risks emerge?
* What limitations were there in achieving the set goals and objectives, were there any difficulties? How (at the expense of what) were these difficulties resolved?
* Who are the main partners of the Programme and which mechanisms/ tools were used to engage them? To what degree did they become genuine partners? What were the limitations?
* What was the role of the Programme’s management in achieving the results? How were Programme indicators and primary activities developed?
* The extent of achieving indicators of Programme objectives/measures. Evaluating correspondence between planned and actual indicators.
* How relevant are developed indicators to the set goals and objectives?
* Are the set indicators achievable and sufficient?
* Who, on the whole, is responsible for internal monitoring of the Programme? How often and how is it conducted? With the help of which methods/tools is the monitoring conducted?
* How does the discussion of monitoring results and making changes to the Programme design proceed?
* Who are the recipients of benefits?
* Relevance of Programme objectives. Evaluating correspondence between problems of beneficiaries/ villages/ region and Programme objectives, including correspondence of Programme objectives to the strategy of the country’s development and the strategy of development of Osh province.
* Who is the beneficiary of the Programme (target group)? To what extent are they included in the process of Programme implementation?
* How were/are problems/needs of Programme beneficiaries identified? How well did this work? Was there anything left out?
* How do you involve beneficiaries in achieving the goals and objectives of the Programme?
* Do you think that Programme measures offered the best solution for the problems/needs of beneficiaries? Which other solutions could there be for addressing their problems, in principle?
* Are these problems/needs not expected to emerge again in the future? Why do you think so?
* Efficiency of Programme measures. Evaluating resources spent on implementing Programme objectives/measures.
* How well do resources that were actually spent on the Programme (at the present stage) correspond to the planned resources?
* If you were to start your project anew, what would you change in funding, where would you direct it?
* During the implementation of which objectives/measures were there discrepancies between planned and actually spent resources?
* What are the causes of this discrepancy?
* How do actual deadlines for implementing Programme measures correlate with the planned ones? What is the cause of delays?
* Sustainability of Programme measures. The feasibility of continuing objectives/measures launched by the Programme after its completion is evaluated.
* What, in your opinion, is working well in the Programme and what is not?
* What was created/improved by this Programme[[22]](#footnote-22) and is sustainable*?*
* Why do you think so?
* On the whole, how is the Programme perceived by different stakeholders: beneficiaries, project staff, state bodies, donors? Is the Programme aligned with their “course” of politics? What do Programme participants dislike?
* In your opinion, are these people (beneficiaries, state bodies, LSGAs, donors) ready to continue to support what has been created by the Programme?
* Which products and achievements of the Programme require replication in other regions? With which resources (administrative, informational, material, financial)?
* Did the Programme manage to launch mechanisms aimed at sustainability? If yes, which ones exactly? If not, why? What new risks have emerged?
* Are there any new possibilities that are not yet used by the Programme?
* To what extent can the experience of this Programme be applicable in other regions, in other communities?
* What are your current and future plans? To what should attention be paid?

## **Annex 2. List of people interviewed during the assessment and facilities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | List of respondents of an interim assessment of the UNDP Programme “Integrated development of Osh province”National partners |
| № | Full name | Organization  | Position |
| Bishkek city |
| 1 | Kadyrov Aibek Askerbekovich | Ministry of Economy | Head of Department |
| 2 | Chokoeva Burul Nasipbekovna | AEVET | Leading specialist of the Department of Policy Analysis and International Cooperation |
| Osh city |
| 31 | Shadyhanov Emil Toktosunovich  | Office of the Plenipotentiary Representative of the GKR in Osh Province | Coordinator on cooperation with projects of international organizations  |
| 4 | Turdubekov Tynysbek Adambaevich | Osh Regional Office of the Interregional Department of the Ministry of Economy of the KR | Head of the Office |
| 5 | Turgunbaev Zarlyk Turginbaevich | SALSGIR KR | Representative for Osh province and Osh city |
| 6 | Momunov Saypidin Esenalievich  | Southern Regional Office of the Department of Drinking Water Supply and Water Discharge Development | Head of the Southern Regional Office |
| 7 | Jusupov Ishen | Osh Interregional United Clinical Hospital | Cardiologist of the Department of Emergency and Interventional Cardiology  |
| 8 | Sulaymanov Asan | Department of the MES KR for Osh Province | Deputy Head of the Department, works on approving mitigation projects |
| Partners, Osh city |
| 9 | Matkadyrova Nazira | GIZ Programme on “Assistance to the sustainable economic development of Osh province” | Programme coordinator |
| 10 | Subankulov Iskander Akparalievich | PF “Center for Entrepreneurship Support” | Executive director |
| 11 | Takeleyev Bektursun | JIA-Osh | Director of JIA OSH, founder of “Center for Entrepreneurship Support” PF |
| 12 | Musaev Tynarbek + 3 employees  | TSAAV PA | Executive director |
| 13 | Mametjanov Askar Mamatturduevich | Regional Council of Entrepreneurs | Chairperson |
| Partners, Bishkek city |
| 14 | PA “Center of Public Technologies” working on creating local development plans of pilot municipalities – Ahmat Madeyuev, Nazira Kaseyeva |
| 15 | Promotak Ltd., services on expanding economic opportunities of rural residents to increase the touristic attractiveness of Osh province – Azamat Akeleyev + 1 employee |
| 16 | PF “Rural Development Fund” services on implementing approaches to sustainable development of pasture resources – Erlan  |

Meetings in Uzgen district

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Meeting with the head of the Office DSA in Uzgen district and the head of the social department of Uzgen town administration | Uzgen town, district administration |
| 2 | Monitoring visit to the “Support of a trade souvenir pavilion” facility. Restroom repair | Uzgen town, Historical and archaeological center |
| 3 | Monitoring visit to the “Construction of a public restroom” facility. | Uzgen town |
| 4 | Monitoring visit to the “Equipping Uzgen District SES Center with equipment for water quality analysis” facility. |  Uzgen town, SES |
| 5 | Monitoring visit to the “Reconstruction of a water supply system of Uzgen town” facility | Uzgen town, MTA #2 in Tort Kocho area and MTA #4 in Tashtak area  |
| 6 | Monitoring visit to the “Installation of LED street lights with lighting sensor (photo element) regulation” facility.  | Uzgen town, MTA #2 in Tort Kocho area |
| 7 | Meeting with the head of Tort-Kol AA: SPSD and PSDC | Tort-Kol AD |
| 8 | Monitoring visit to the “Manufacturing workshop for producing dried fruits: water supply and electrification” facility. “Oimofood” | Tort-Kol AD, Shoro-Bashat village |
| 9. | Monitoring visit to the “Biogas plant for humus collection and household gasification” facility. | Tort-Kol AD, Shoro-Bashat village |
| 10 | Monitoring visit to the “Dip for small ruminants” facility. | Tort-Kol AD, Shoro-Bashat village |
| 11 | Monitoring visit to kindergarten | Tort-Kol AD, Shoro-Bashat village |
| 12 | Monitoring visit to a vocational training classroom, an e-library in VS #62  | Kurshab village |

Meetings in Kara-Kuldja district (monitoring visits to facilities were not possible due to weather conditions)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Meeting with deputy akim of Kara-Kuldja district | Osh city |
|  2 | Meeting with the head of Alaiku Organics Ltd. | Osh city |

Meetings in Nookat district

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Meeting with the deputy akim of Nookat district representative of DSA  | Nookat town, district administration |
| 2 | Meeting with the LSGA representative (implementation of a mitigation project – tender)  | Jany-Nookat АА, LSG |
| 3 | Monitoring visit to a vocational training classroom, an e-library, and a sports ground in VS #58 | Jany-Nookat village  |
| 4 | Monitoring visit to the “Sewing shop” facility | Jany-Nookat village |
| 5 | Meeting with the LSGA representative, SDP, PSDC  | Zulpuyev АА, LSG |
| 6 | Monitoring visit to the “Rehabilitation of a school and a FMS” facility. RES promotion. | Jatan village, Zulpuyev AA  |
| 7 | Monitoring visit to the “Shop for manufacturing plastic windows” facility. | Jatan village, Zulpuyev AA |

UNDP

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Choybaeva Nuriya | Programme analyst of the UNDP Country Office |
| 2 | Subankulova Mira | Programme manager, UNDP Programme on “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh province in the KR” |
| 3 | Tairov Sharabidin | Specialist in cooperation with LSGAs and ES, UNDP Programme on “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh province in the KR” |
| 4 | Mamatova Gulmira | Specialist in VTET development, UNDP Programme on “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh province in the KR” |
| 5 | Amatov Emil | Specialist in water management, UNDP Programme on “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh province in the KR” |
| 6 | Hashtyrov Ibragim | UNV, expert in agricultural development, UNDP Programme on “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh province in the KR” |
| 7 | Hodjaeva Mavlyuda | PR specialist of the UNDP Programme on “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh province in the KR”  |

Annex 3. Table of Programme Results

|  |
| --- |
| INTERIM results of the UNDP Programme on the *Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh Province* in 2017 |
| #  | Components | Number of projects | Project cost, KGS | Indirect beneficiaries, persons | Long-term jobs created, persons | Temporary jobs created during project implementation or for seasonal work |
| Total | UNDP | KR Government | Community |   | gender distribution |   | gender distribution |   | gender distribution |
| in KGS | in USD | in KGS | in USD | in KGS | in USD | in KGS | in USD | Total | men | women | Total | men | women | Total | men | women |
|  1 | Total for RES | 15 | 12 799 600 | 183 531 | 9 515 794 | 135 940 | 778229 | 11278,68 | 2 505 577 | 36 313 | 1944 | 932 | 1012 | 17 | 11 | 6 |   |   |   |
|  2 | Total for TOURISM | 13 | 14 456 586 | 208 605 | 5 382 859 | 78 012,4 | 0 | 0 | 9073727 | 130593 | 35420 | 18494 | 16926 | 46 | 15 | 31 | 54 | 45 | 9 |
|  3 | Total for PASTURES | 7 | 3 656 230 | 52 988,8 | 2 068 518 | 29 978,5 | 1587712 | 23010,3 |   |   | 6686 | 4475 | 2211 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 130 | 72 | 58 |
|  4 | Total for SANITATION | 30 | 15 857 874 | 229 353,2 | 10 371 613 | 149842,1 | 5486261 | 79511,0 | 0 | 0 | 33166 | 15536 | 17630 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  5 | Total for SDCs and CES | 2 | 3 736 934 | 54 158,46 | 1 615 934 | 23419,3 | 2121000 | 30739,13 | 0 | 0 | 111875 | 62016 | 49859 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 15 | 2 |
|  6 | Total for SES | 3 | 4 575 948 | 66 318 | 4 372 986 | 63 377 | 202 962 | 2941,5 | 0 | 0 | 129208 | 63508 | 65700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
|  7 | ECG and AED | 1 | 3 151 119,7 | 45 668,4 | 3 151 120 | 45668 |   |   |   |   | 221000 | 109494 | 111506 |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | TOTAL | 71 | 58 234 292 | 840 624 | 36478824 | 526237 | 10 176 164 | 147481 | 11 579 304 | 166 906 | 539299 | 274455 | 264844 | 88 | 51 | 37 | 209 | 138 | 71 |

|  |
| --- |
| INTERIM results of the UNDP Programme on the *Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh Province* in 2018 |
| #  | Components | Number of projects  | Project cost, KGS | Indirect beneficiaries, persons | Long-term jobs created, persons | Temporary jobs created during project implementation or for seasonal work |
| Total | UNDP | KR Government | Community |   | gender distribution |   | gender distribution |   | gender distribution |
| in KGS | in USD | in KGS | in USD | in KGS | in USD | in KGS | in USD | total | men | women | total | men | women | total | men | women |
|  1 | Component 1: Total for Osh province: agriculture | 5 | 18670651,4 | 270589,2 | 8214970,42 | 119058 | 0 | 0 | 10455682 | 151532 | 17575 | 8272 | 9303 | 25 | 13 | 12 | 81 | 50 | 31 |
|  2 | Component 2 Total for Osh province: drinking water supply | 24 | 27010026 | 389193 | 13181027 | 189928,3 | 10333372 | 148895,9 | 3495627 | 50369,3 | 71335 | 35842 | 35493 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 564 | 411 | 153 |
|  3 | Component 2 Total for Osh province: irrigation water supply | 5 | 4135974 | 59596,17 | 2899828 | 41784,27 | 475162 | 6846,715 | 760984 | 10965,2 | 11678 | 5731 | 5947 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 109 | 28 |
|  4 | Component 3 Total for Osh province: socio-economic infrastructure | 32 | 33144893,1 | 428402 | 14736022,6 | 212334,6 | 12436450 | 179199,6 | 2558646 | 36868,1 | 38128 | 18752 | 19376 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 474 | 356 | 118 |
|  5 | Component 4: Total for Osh province: vocational schools | 8 | 12303032,4 | 177277 | 10346350,4 | 149082,9 | 1956682 | 28194,27 | 0 | 0 | 849 | 721 | 128 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 39 | 31 | 8 |
|  6 | Component 4 Total for Osh province: increased employment among the population | 22 | 16 687 671 | 240 456 | 9 469 472 | 136 448 | 0 | 0 | 7 218 199 | 104 009 | 42115 | 19573 | 22542 | 126 | 74 | 52 | 91 | 70 | 21 |
|  7 | Component 5: Total for Osh province: disaster risks management | 6 | 9483944 | 137448,5 | 5318077 | 77073,58 | 1538930 | 22303,33 | 2626937 | 38071,6 | 10624 | 5515 | 5109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 76 | 17 |
|  | TOTAL  | 102 | 121 436 192 | 1702963 | 64165747 | 925 709 | 26 740 596 | 385439,7 | 27 116 075 | 391 814 | 192304 | 94406 | 97898 | 157 | 93 | 64 | 1479 | 1103 | 376 |

1. For convenience, the “Integrated Area-Based Development of Osh Province in the Kyrgyz Republic” Project will hereinafter be referred to as the ‘Programme’ in order to avoid confusion with the projects implemented to achieve its goals. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. From an interview with the deputy head of Nookat district. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Successful UNDP experience [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Land management is an aggregate of functions of the management system, aimed at rational use of land resources. The subject of management – processes of land use organization, which provides for the entire diverse needs of its residents within a certain territory. Land management ( Rus. “*Управление земельными ресурсами*”), N.V. Gagarinova, M.V. Sidorenko, 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Protocol of a Committee for the Selection of Project Proposals [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Usually, the term “demonstrational” is used for objects aimed at practical training, not service delivery. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Study tours with a demonstration of the best practices, effective organization, water management and utilization of water supply systems. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Number of trained employees in AWUs, RPADWUs and LSGAs for 2017-2018 comprised 44433 people, number of training measures – 39. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Programme interventions reached residents of 3 districts (Kara-Kuldja, Uzgen, and Nookat), 19 rural and 2 urban municipalities (Uzgen, and Nookat), and 30 villages. The following were rehabilitated/built: 1) 24 drinking water supply and water discharge facilities; 2) 5 irrigation network facilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Staff renewal in 3 and renewal of 6 RPADWUs. An AWU was created in 1 AA. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Developing fees on water in 14 RPADWUs [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. in 11 RPADWUs [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. 1) Creation of a commission on water pipeline inventory (8 ААs), 2) approval of an LRA on transferring equipment to RPADWUs (6 ААs) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. 14 contracts were signed with water users. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. 5 contracts on water supply were signed between AWUs and DWMDs [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. 3 contracts for water quality control were signed with the CDP&SSES. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. A land issues specialist of an AA was authorized to address water issues in 1 AA, 4) in 2 AAs village heads were appointed for water management. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Projects covered 24 educational establishments, 5 FMS and 8 RPADWU facilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Medical stations, schools, public toilets, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Gaps identified as a result of the study on ES in villages: (i) absence of regulations on AA CD, lack of a plan of preparedness and response; (ii) functional responsibilities of CDC members were not defined and assigned; (iii) the primary measures for reducing disasters risks were not defined and included in SPSDs; (iv) absence of early warning systems; (v) weak cooperation with district services on ES; (vi) poor capacity of the community in developing structural and non-structural mitigation projects; (vii) lack of practices on estimating damage caused by disasters; (viii) disasters that have previously taken place were not described and there were no statistical data on the consequences, preventive and response measures; (ix) LSGAs lacked experience of forecasting possible damage and losses in the water sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/97771 [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. New LRA, new mechanisms, new procedures, new technologies, new facilities, new relations, new behavior patterns, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)