



FINAL EVALUATION

“Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development project”

PBF/KGZ/B-7 – UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR

Dec 2021 to Jun 2024

SUBMITTED BY:

Lach Fergusson and Shairbek Dzhuraev

25 November 2024



Country	Kyrgyz Republic
PBF project number	PBF/KGZ/B-7
MPTFO project ID	00129739
Full project title	Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development
Project start and end dates	Dec 2021-Jun 2024 (30 months)
Total allocated budget	USD 3,000,000
Funds recipients	UNDP (USD \$1,150,000) UNICEF (\$1,000,000) OHCHR (\$850,000)
Timeframe of the evaluation	Dec 2021-Jun 2024 (30 months)
Date of the evaluation report	25 Nov 2024
Names of evaluators	Lach Fergusson Shairbek Dzhuraev
Organization commissioning the evaluation	UNDP

Acknowledgements

This report was written by the Evaluation Team, comprising Lach Fergusson (Lead Evaluator) and Shairbek Dzhuraev.

The Evaluation Team would like to extend its appreciation to all those individuals within and outside of the United Nations who participated in this exercise and willingly shared their advice, insights and experiences. This particularly includes Project management colleagues who were responsive to coordinating meetings, providing documentation and supporting the organisation of the Evaluation Team’s field missions.

Being an independent Evaluation, the views expressed herein are entirely those of the Evaluation Team and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the United Nations or any other institution involved in this Evaluation.

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	4
Executive Summary.....	6
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	11
2. EVALUATION FINDINGS	16
2.1 Relevance: <i>Did the Project do the right things?</i>	16
2.2 Coherence: <i>How well did the Project fit with other interventions?</i>	23
2.3 Effectiveness: <i>Did the Project achieve its objectives?</i>	24
Effectiveness and Results: Output 1	25
Effectiveness and Results: Output 2	29
Effectiveness and Results: Output 3	32
2.4 Impact and Sustainability: <i>What differences did the Project make? Will the benefits last?</i>	45
2.5 Efficiency: <i>How well were resources used and managed?</i>	58
3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	64
3.1 Evaluation Conclusions	64
3.2 Strategic Recommendations.....	67
4. ANNEXES	72
4.1 ANNEX: Evaluation Approaches and Methods	72
4.2 ANNEX: Evaluation Matrix.....	78
4.3 ANNEX: Stakeholders Interviewed.....	83
4.4 ANNEX: Document Review and Bibliography	88

Acronyms

AA	Aiyi Aimak (Village Municipality)	JSC	Joint Steering Committee
ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development	KII	key informant interview
ADAP	Adolescent Development and Participation	KOICA	Korea International Cooperation Agency
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome	LGBTQ	lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer
C4D	Communication for Development	LNOB	leave no one behind
CBM	community-based monitoring	LSG	Local Self-Government
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women	MHPSS	mental health and psychosocial support
CPA	Conflict and Peace Analysis	MoCISYP	Ministry of Culture, Information, Sport, and Youth Policy
CS/DNH	conflict sensitivity/do-no-harm	MoDD	Ministry of Digital Development
CSO	civil society organization	MoES	Ministry of Education and Science
DPPA	Department for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs	MoF	Ministry of Finance
ECD	Early Childhood Development	MoIA	Ministry of Internal Affairs
EWER	Early Warning Early Response	MoLSSM	Ministry of Labour, Social Services, and Migration
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	MPTFO	Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office
FGD	focus group discussion	NGO	non-governmental organization
FSI	Fragile States Index	NISS	National Institute for Strategic Studies
GBV	gender-based violence	NTI	National Trust Index
GEWE	gender equality and women's empowerment	OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH	OHCHR	United Nations Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights
GPI	Gender Promotion Initiative	OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus	PBF	United Nations Peacebuilding Fund
HoA	Heads of Agency	PBSO	United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office
I4P	infrastructure for peace	PCC	Public Consultative Council
IMCM	Inter-Ministerial Coordination Mechanism	PDT	Peace and Development Team
INGO	international non-governmental organization	PPC	Public Prevention Centre
IRF	Immediate Response Facility	PPP	Peacebuilding Priority Plan
		PRC	Public Reception Centre

PRF	Peacebuilding and Recovery Facility	ToT	training of trainers
ProDoc	Project Document	UN	United Nations
PwD	Persons with Disabilities	UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
RC	Resident Coordinator	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
RCO	United Nations Resident Coordinator's Office	UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
ROI	Roza Otunbaeva Initiative	UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
RTC	Republican Training Centre	UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
RUNO	Recipient UN Organisations	UNSDCF	UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
SACSLSG	State Agency for Civil Service and Local Self-Government Affairs	UNV	United Nations Volunteers
SCRA	State Commission for Religious Affairs	UPSHIFT	UNICEF's Youth Social Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship Programme
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals	USD	United States Dollar
SESP	Social and Environmental Screening Procedure	WPS	women, peace, and security
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound	YCFLG	Youth and Child-Friendly Local Government
SRF	Strategic Results Framework	YP	young people
TCG	Technical Coordination Group	YPI	Youth Promotion Initiative
ToC	Theory of Change	YPS	Youth Peace and Security
ToR	Terms of Reference		

Executive Summary

Introduction and Background

The **‘Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development project’** (the ‘Project’) was implemented by three Recipient UN Organisations (RUNOs): i.) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); and UN Office for the High Commissioner for Human rights (OHCHR). The Project ran from Dec 2021 to Jun 2024 (30 months) and funded through a \$3,000,000 allocation from the UN Peacebuilding Fund. The Project had a significant number and diverse spectrum of stakeholders involved in implementation at the national-level and in seven community-level target locations in the Batken, Chui, Issyk-kul, Jalal-Abad and Osh Oblasts.

The Project was designed to contribute to one overarching Outcome through the delivery of three mutually supportive Outputs:

- **Outcome 1:** A greater sense of shared and inclusive civic identity and trust enhanced through inter-group dialogue, inclusive and accountable governance and stronger capacities for prevention and peacebuilding.
- **Output 1:** Policy frameworks and institutional mechanisms strengthened for inclusive and accountable governance at national and local levels to increase social dialogue and trust.
- **Output 2:** Comprehensive early warning and early response [EWER] system established for risk-informed development and conflict prevention.
- **Output 3:** Communities and local self-governments are capacitated to strengthen cooperation and trust among different groups and community members.

The Evaluation was conducted in accordance with UN Evaluation Group, UNDP and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-Development Assistance Committee standards and guidelines by a team of two independent consultants. Through field-based and virtual individual/group interviews, the Evaluation spoke to a total of 145 individuals. The Evaluation undertook a holistic review of overall Project performance for the period of implementation between Dec 2021 and Jun 2024, utilising standard evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability. The Evaluation is not a ‘catalogue’ of Project results and does not present elaborated case studies or examples. There are obvious limitations in the nature and the methodologies of the Evaluation; therefore, its findings are presented with modesty and humility.

Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

Overall, the Project was an important continuing contribution to building capacities for sustaining peace in the Kyrgyz Republic. The Project succeeded in launching essential activities and achieving important results while showing notable strengths in many of its strategies and approaches. The Project set ambitious aims to introduce new systems, processes, and capacities that would foster a greater sense of shared and inclusive civic identity, enhance trust and strengthen social cohesion within a short two-year timeframe. While some Project components and results were not entirely achieved as expected, key challenges experienced by the Project—ambitious objectives and scope for such a short timeline, reconciling diverging stakeholder expectations and challenges with oversight/management arrangements—highlight opportunities for refinement and growth for future interventions.

The Project was highly relevant in contributing to national priorities for building peace and stability. In the context of the Kyrgyz Republic, the Project's focus on inclusive governance, shared civic identity and social cohesion addressed some of the country's most pressing needs as related the challenges of rebuilding inter-group trust and restoring confidence in public institutions after previous large-scale violence, such as the events of 2010. National stakeholders and policies increasingly understand that multi-faceted socio-economic, inclusion, governance and other dynamics are also contributing to tensions and conflicts.

The Project was clearly aligned with a wide array of national and international strategies and policies, including important cross-cutting human rights, gender and youth agendas. The project's relevance and ownership were strengthened by leveraging existing partnerships and adapting from prior initiatives. Local self-governments (LSGs), civil society, and community stakeholders in target areas demonstrated strong ownership and appreciation for project priorities. Although aligning diverse stakeholder expectations—particularly on social cohesion and Kyrgyz Jarany objectives—posed challenges and caused some delays, the project successfully fostered collaboration between national stakeholders and RUNOs.

Despite existing gaps in wider 'conflict prevention/peacebuilding sector' coordination, the Project coordinated as required to ensure effective implementation. There was some especially valuable collaboration and coordination with other international partners, including on development of the Ministry of Internal Affairs' (MoIA's) new Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion curricula for law enforcement, enhancing national EWER capacities and the deployment of new Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity and multi-lingual education pre-school curricula at Early Childhood Development Centres.

The Project achieved good results and demonstrated effectiveness across many components, through both vertical and horizontal modes of implementation. While the wide scope of the Project makes it difficult to generalise about its effectiveness, impacts and sustainability, national capacities for conflict prevention and social cohesion are now better placed because of the Project. In summary:

- **Output 1 – Policy frameworks and institutional mechanisms:** The Project successfully developed policy frameworks and built institutional capacity. Key initiatives included: amending the Charter of Local Communities template, allowing LSGs to enshrine conflict prevention/peacebuilding into core local government priorities; supporting the trial launch of the Youth and Child Friendly Local Government (YCFLG) policy that integrated youth priorities for social cohesion and inclusivity into local government planning; passage of the Law on Youth; and the development of new Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion curricula for law enforcement at the MoIA. Importantly, the Project facilitated a Draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion that could provide the basis for a more coherent and longer-term policy approach to conflict prevention and sustaining peace. However, some activities were incomplete, such as: fully operationalising an Interdepartmental Commission for the Coordination of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept and a wider national 'infrastructure for peace' (I4P) system; new and amended legislation regarding LSGs, rights of people with disabilities and anti-discrimination; and public service internships for young professionals from minority communities.
- **Output 2 – Early warning/early response:** Significant investments went into building national EWER capacities, tools and systems, resulting in: re-developed Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy (MoCISYP) EWER monitoring regulations and tools; extensive consultations, trainings and mentoring of MoCISYP staff and local EWER monitors; trainings for MoCISYP Monitoring Centre personnel on: research, analytical and data; developing State Commission for Religious Affairs abilities for monitoring indicators of social tension in the religious sphere; and development and testing of a

digital data collection tool on the KoboToolbox platform so a broader spectrum of local actors can provide situational monitoring data in real-time. Certain components of Output 2—such as integrating youth ‘U-Report’ polling into national EWER approaches and mechanisms for mainstreaming EWER data into national, sectorial and local development planning/programmes—were not completed.

- **Output 3 – Communities and local self-governments are capacitated:** The Project strengthened community engagement for conflict prevention and peacebuilding by building local capacities and strengthening public participation in local government decision-making, particularly among youth and women. The Project implemented a wide spectrum of activities, ranging from a national Kyrgyz Jarany Concept public awareness campaign, various LSG-public engagement and planning dialogues, youth-led UPSHIFT engagement and community action initiatives, anti-hate speech awareness events and training modules, awareness and successful legal activism for the rights of youth with disabilities and the development and trialing of new pre-school, primary and intermediate/secondary curricula for Kyrgyz Jarany, inclusion and social cohesion. Project components to develop, approve and then fund the implement of social cohesion development plans with LSGs were not implemented.

The Project made significant contributions to making the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept of civic identity more accessible and understood. Attributing the Project’s contribution to measurable increases in the “sense of shared and inclusive civic identity and trust” has proved challenging. While surveying among people already familiar with the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept in Project target locations indicates a threefold increase in those who share its goals and objectives, metrics selected by the Project to assess its contribution to its stated Outcome were not ideally suited for measuring impact. Changes in these should be interpreted cautiously and do not constitute robust findings for determining Project ‘success’ or ‘failure’.

The Project strengthened foundations for social cohesion, inclusive governance and conflict prevention. The Project established strong foundations for local dialogue and cooperation, directly supporting the broader goal of enhancing trust among different groups. Key achievements included advancing inclusive and accountable local governance through new Local Community Charters, strengthening YCFLG implementation and empowering youth to lead local initiatives in partnership with LSGs. Additionally, the project improved national EWER systems, although a fully institutionalised EWER/I4P system is still a work in progress. By building the capacities of governmental and civil society actors, the Project notably increased active participation of women, youth and marginalised groups in local government decision-making. Potentially over 18,000 stakeholders were mobilised and equipped with skills, tools and values for fostering social cohesion, inclusivity and conflict prevention.

Some of the most immediately tangible impacts of the Project have stemmed from its support of youth. Strategic litigation efforts for youth with disabilities have led to compensation, accessibility improvements and increased awareness of disability rights, empowering these youth as future leaders for inclusion. The project's YCFLG dialogues and UPSHIFT youth-led community initiatives fostered essential skills among youth, enhancing their self-organization, collaboration and influence in local governance. Additionally, the new pre-school curricula focusing on Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity, and social cohesion have begun to instill values of non-discrimination, tolerance, and cooperation in thousands of children and parents, positively shaping community dynamics.

The most valuable results of the Project are likely the prospective and potentially transformational impacts of the new awareness, mindsets, skills, practices, tools, networks and other capacities that it leaves behind. The most significant might be grouped into three categories:

- i.) New educational capacities, tools and systems ready for nationwide application;

- ii.) New institutional capacities, tools and systems ready for nationwide application;
- iii.) New personal/social capacities and networks available at the local level.

Most stakeholders accepted that the higher-level outcomes intended by the Project required much longer-term interventions and approaches than were possible within the two-year timeframe.

Attributing Project causality for significant and complex societal change, such as a more cohesive society, more inclusive governance or stronger civic identity, was not reasonable. Rather, stakeholders viewed the Project as an essential 'next step' that effectively built on prior efforts and laid critical groundwork toward these higher-level changes. Overall, the Project has left national stakeholders better prepared to promote social cohesion and peace over the coming years.

Along with Project successes, the Evaluation has identified some aspects of design and/or implementation that would have benefited from adjustments or reconsiderations. In particular:

- Additional measures during the design phase would likely have enhanced Project performance, including: conducting a Project-specific context analysis; developing a clearer Project theory of change; and greater participation of Project stakeholders at all levels;
- The Project would have benefitted from designing more specific and feasible results and narrower scope of interventions given the time and resources available;
- Prospective sustainability could have been strengthened by more clearly defining how certain new capacities would be applied/institutionalised in the future;
- The Project could have benefitted from more proactively coordinating and seeking synergies with wider actors in the field of conflict prevention/peacebuilding;
- Measures for context awareness and conflict sensitivity/do-no-harm should have been more comprehensive and ongoing;
- The Project faced difficulties implementing some activities in a timely and efficient manner; and
- Greater synergy between RUNOs, partners and Project components could have enhanced overall Project relevance, efficiency and impact.

Strategic Recommendations

To help stakeholders design and implement more effective peace-related initiatives in the future, the Evaluation presents a set of strategic-level recommendations for four key categories of stakeholders:

United Nations Peacebuilding Fund:

1. Continue supporting national and local actors to build inclusive, effective and transparent I4P in the Kyrgyz Republic;
2. Consider longer timeframes for multifaceted and ambitious joint projects;
3. Encourage projects to create space and mechanisms for learning and adaptation; and
4. Invest in dedicated capacities for integrated management and monitoring to enhance the effectiveness of joint projects.

Recipient United Nations Organisations:

1. Continue supporting sustainable and transparent national EWER/I4P systems and enhancing local peacebuilding capacities.
2. Establish clear benchmarks and guardrails for continued UN support to national frameworks like the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, EWER and I4P;
3. Establish substantive partnership and coordination mechanisms with government stakeholders from the outset and regularly maintain these;
4. Enhance local relevance and sensitivity to the context by adopting reflective learning, applying conflict sensitivity measures and integrating indigenous knowledge;
5. Commission and update project-specific context analysis regularly; and
6. Ensure projects employ clearer change strategies and match resources to expected impacts.

National Partners:

1. Elaborate the EWER/I4P regulatory framework to institutionalise and resource joined-up national systems, with a greater emphasis on early prevention;
2. Increase the transparency of government's EWER capacities and put in place safeguards to ensure these capacities are not misused;
3. Focus on enhancing and integrating existing local-level EWER/I4P capacities, particularly in known hot spots;
4. Consider Public Reception Centre (PRC) Executive Secretaries and Public Prevention Centres (PPCs) as priorities for further I4P capacity development, as well as LSG instruments for implementing longer-term peacebuilding strategies;
5. Avoid over-burdening and/or 'co-opting' local I4P actors in national EWER systems to protect their integrity and credibility; and
6. Provide lead government entities the authority required to lead and coordinate other 'peer' entities in joint initiatives.

Actors implementing peacebuilding interventions at the local-level:

1. Prioritise a bottom-up approach that places local stakeholders at the heart of project design and implementation;
2. Maximise local languages and use approachable terminology appropriate to the context;
3. Prioritise practical, hands-on training that respects the daily realities of rural participants; and
4. Be mindful of the unintended effects of research/surveying at the community level.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. The ‘Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development project’ (the ‘Inclusive Governance and Shared Identity Project’ and/or just the ‘Project’) was implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and UN Office for the High Commissioner for Human rights (OHCHR) from Dec 2021 to Jun 2024 (30 months). The Project was originally approved in Dec 2021 for a 24-month duration (Dec 2021-Dec 2023); however, the Project applied for and was approved a six-month no-cost extension for a 30 month duration (Dec 2021-Jun 2024). Collectively, UNDP, UNICEF and OHCHR were designated as Recipient UN Organizations (RUNOs) by the UN Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) that has provided USD 3,000,000 to the Project.

2. The Project fitted within a longer framework of PBF engagement with the Kyrgyz Republic. Following violent events in Apr and Jun 2010, the PBF has allocated a total of USD 56,926,864.08 towards peace-related interventions in the Kyrgyz Republic. Total allocation to projects in the Kyrgyz Republic under the current fourth cycle of PBF funding (2021-2026) and the PBF’s current Gender and Youth Promotion Initiatives instrument totals USD 12,541,122.43. Including the Inclusive Governance and Shared Identity Project, a total of five projects have been approved under the current PBF cycle.

Project budget and expenditure

3. The total Approved Budget for the Project was USD 3,000,000. As of 24 Jul 2024, estimated cumulative Project expenditure totaled USD 2,910,216.74 (97% of the total budget).

Table 1: Overview of estimated Project Expenditure (2021-2024) ¹						
	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total Exp	Approved Budget
UNDP	\$0.00	\$177,689.43	\$394,386.18	\$488,141.13	\$1,060,216.74	\$1,150,000.00
<i>Delivery %</i>	0.0%	15.5%	34.3%	42.4%	92.2%	100.0%
UNICEF	\$0.00	\$520,421.03	\$455,302.95	\$24,276.02	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
<i>Delivery %</i>	0.0%	52.0%	45.5%	2.4%	100.0%	100.0%
OHCHR	\$0.00	\$198,385.97	\$340,260.04	\$311,353.99	\$850,000.00	\$850,000.00
<i>Delivery %</i>	0.0%	23.3%	40.0%	36.6%	100.0%	100.0%
TOTAL	\$0.00	\$896,497.10	\$1,189,949.97	\$823,771.14	\$2,910,216.74	\$3,000,000.00
<i>Delivery %</i>	0.0%	29.9%	39.7%	27.5%	97.0%	100.0%

Project locations

4. Components of the Project were implemented at the national-level in Bishkek, as well as in seven target locations at the community-level:

Table 2: Overview of Project Community-level Locations

¹ As per data of estimated expenditure supplied by RUNOs on 24 Jul 2024. Expenditure data presented in the Evaluation derives from working figures provided by the Project; they are indicative and not intended as representing an ‘auditable’ financial statement for the Project.

Province (Oblast)	Local Self Government (LSG)
Batken	Aidarken Town
Chui	Tokmok Town
Issyk-kul	Balykchy Town
Jalal-Abad	Suzak Village Municipality
Osh	Osh City Nookat Town Uzgen Town

Key project stakeholders

5. At the global level, the Project was funded and fell under the accountability mechanisms of the PBF as managed by the UN Peacebuilding Support office (PBSO) within the Department for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA). Funds for the Project were allocated under the PBF's PRF Mechanism. A PBF Secretariat located in the Bishkek UN Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) provides local oversight and coordination of all PBF projects in the Kyrgyz Republic.

6. The Project was supervised by the PBF Joint Steering Committee (JSC) for the Kyrgyz Republic, co-chaired by the Head of the Department for Political and Economic Studies at the Presidential Administration and the UN Resident Coordinator. UNDP was the Project's 'Lead Agency' responsible for coordinating implementation through the provision of a Project Coordinator and management of the Project's Technical Coordination Group (TCG). The TCG comprised UNDP, UNICEF and OHCHR as designated RUNOs, as did the Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)/Communications Group. There were periodic coordination meetings between RUNOs and the Ministry of Culture, Information, Sport and Youth Policy (MoCISYP), which served as the Project's principal governmental counterpart. UN Heads of Agency Meetings with the UN RC also periodically reviewed and coordinated Project implementation. Each RUNO implemented their respective Project components directly and/or with an array of different governmental and non-governmental implementing partners at the national and community-level.

7. Overall, the Project had a significant and diverse spectrum of stakeholders directly involved in implementation, as mapped in **Table 3**:

Table 3: Overview of Key Project Stakeholders	
Stakeholder Types	Stakeholders
Contributing Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PBF, Peacebuilding Support Office (DPPA, UN Headquarters) - Kyrgyzstan PBF Secretariat, RCO (Kyrgyzstan)
Project Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kyrgyzstan PBF Joint Steering Committee (JSC)—Co-chairs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Head of the Department for Political and Economic Studies, Presidential Administration o UN Resident Coordinator
Project Supervision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project-MoCISYP Coordinating Meetings - 'All Stakeholder' Project Coordination Meetings - UN Heads of Agency (HoA) PBF Project Coordination Meetings

<p>and Coordination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Coordinator (UNDP) - Project Technical Coordination Group (TCG): UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR - Project M&E/Communications Group: UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR 	
<p>Recipient UN Organisations (RUNOs)</p>	<p><u>UNDP (Lead Agency)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governance and Social Cohesion Cluster <p><u>UNICEF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adolescent Development and Participation (ADAP) - Program Officer U-Report and UNICEF volunteer officer - Early Childhood Development officer <p><u>OHCHR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kyrgyzstan Programme implementation team - Osh office based UNV - Human Rights Officer on Youth - Human Rights Officer, Indigenous Peoples and Minorities Section 	
<p>National-level stakeholders and beneficiaries</p>	<p><u>Governmental Actors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jogorku Kenesh (Parliament) and Members of Parliament - Deputy Chairperson of the Cabinet of Ministers, Chair of the Interdepartmental Commission for Coordination of the Action Plan for the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept - Political Unit, Department for Political and Economic Studies, Presidential Administration - Situation Centre, Presidential Administration - Deputy Minister, MoCISYP (principal government focal point) - Inter-Ethnic Relations Department, MoCISYP (principal government focal point) - Information Policy Department, MoCISYP - Youth Policy Department, MoCISYP - Monitoring Centre, MoCISYP - State Agency on Civil Service and LSGs - MoIA Academy, MoIA - Republican Training Centre, MoIA - ECD Centres/Libraries Focal Point, MoCISYP - ECD Department, MoES - Republican Teacher Training Institute, MoES - Kyrgyz Academy of Education, MoES - Ministry of Labour, Social Services and Migration (MoLSSM) - Center for the Study of Religious Situation, State Commission for Religious Affairs (SCRA) - Office of the Akyikatchy (Ombudsperson) of the Kyrgyz Republic - National Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of the Kyrgyz Republic (NISS) 	<p><u>Non-Governmental Actors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Association of Legal Clinics of Kyrgyzstan - Build Up - Central Asian Research Center, Kyrgyz-Turk Manas University - Centre for Strategic Litigation - Child’s Rights Defenders League - Coalition for Equality - Eurasia Foundation of Central Asia - IDEA Central Asia - Media Content Distribution - Nash Golos (Our Voice) - Prevention Media - Ravenstvo (Equality): The Union of People with Disabilities - Smile KG - Youth of Osh - Youth Parliament - Contracted experts/consultants (various)
<p>Community-level stakeholders</p>	<p><u>Governmental Actors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LSG representatives, offices and personnel (e.g. Mayors, Vice-Mayors, Mayor’s Offices, Social- 	<p><u>Non-Governmental Actors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - U-Reporter participants and youth volunteers - Women's Peace Bank

<p>and beneficiaries</p>	<p>Development Officers, Heads of Village Municipality, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - City/Village Councils - Youth Centres - Executive Secretaries, Public Reception Centres (PRCs) for Interethnic Issues, MoCISYP - SCRA Regional Representatives - UPSHIFT associated teachers and school staff - Participants of Early Childhood Development (ECD) Centre Kyrgyz Jarany and multi-lingual pre-school curriculum (librarians) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Osh Regional Museum of Fine Arts - Media/journalists trained on Kyrgyz Jarany public communications - Osh State University - International University of Central Asia, Tokmok - Faculty of Law, Kyrgyz-Uzbek University, Osh - Participants of public hearings on Charters of Local Communities - Participants in community-based dialogues on socially significant issues causing conflict - Participants from Youth Committees and Women’s Councils in human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany trainings - Participants of Human Rights and Advocacy Schools for Young People with Disabilities - Participants of Hate Speech training-of-trainers - Participants of ‘Danaker’ (insider mediation) - UPSHIFT youth participants, youth mentors and associated parents - Participants of Early Childhood Development (ECD) Centre Kyrgyz Jarany and multi-lingual pre-school curriculum (children, parents) <p><i>Indirectly</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of local councils - Assembly of the People of Kyrgyzstan/national cultural centers - Youth Committees/Councils/Centres - Women’s Councils - Elders Councils/Courts - Religious organizations - Councils on Inter-Faith Affairs
<p>Indirect Project stakeholders</p>	<p><u><i>Other International actors working in the conflict prevention/peacebuilding sector</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OSCE Office of the High Commissioner for National Minorities, Bishkek - OSCE Programme Office in Bishkek - UNDP Crisis Bureau - Embassy of Japan, GIZ, UNDP-Russia Trust Fund for Development - Peace Nexus Foundation - International Alert - Saferworld - Search for Common Ground 	

Project theory of change and expected outcome/outputs²

8. The Project articulated a Theory of Change in its Project Document (ProDoc) and intended to contribute to one overarching Outcome through the delivery of three mutually supportive Outputs:

<p>Table 4: Overview of Project’s Theory of Change, Outcome and Outputs</p>	
<p>Theory of Change</p>	<p>Supporting an inclusive and tolerant civic identity and respect for the rights and interests of Kyrgyzstan’s different identity groups, when pursued through</p>

² As per the Project’s latest available [project document](#). A more detailed examination of Project Outcomes, Outputs and Activities is presented in sections 2.3 Effectiveness and 2.4 Impact.

	enhanced and inclusive governance and a sustainable peace infrastructure that includes accessible and transparent dialogue platforms can help overcome identified challenges to sustaining peace while fostering greater state-society and inter-group trust.
<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>A greater sense of shared and inclusive civic identity and trust enhanced through inter-group dialogue, inclusive and accountable governance and stronger capacities for prevention and peacebuilding.</p>	<p>Output 1: Policy frameworks and institutional mechanisms strengthened for inclusive and accountable governance at national and local levels to increase social dialogue and trust.</p>
	<p>Output 2: Comprehensive early warning and early response [EWER] system established for risk-informed development and conflict prevention.</p>
	<p>Output 3: Communities and local self-governments are capacitated to strengthen cooperation and trust among different groups and community members.</p>

Purposes, scope and methodology of the Final Evaluation

9. The Evaluation was conducted for the purposes of: i.) accountability—supporting Project accountability to management, partners and stakeholders by providing independent and objective information regarding Project performance; and ii.) learning and adaptation—providing insights to inform and refine the future design, implementation and management of similar strategies, policies and interventions by documenting lessons learned during Project implementation.

10. The Evaluation was conducted in accordance with UN Evaluation Group, UNDP and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-Development Assistance Committee standards and guidelines by a team of two independent consultants. The Evaluation was conducted in an impartial, gender-informed, transparent and participatory manner with informed consent being requested of all participants. Mixed methods were employed, using qualitative and quantitative research methods and the triangulation of information from different sources to demonstrate how the Project has performed in relation to its goals, targets and other performance expectations. A total of 145 individuals were interviewed. An overview of the Evaluation’s approaches and methods is presented in **Annex 4.1**.

11. The Evaluation undertook a holistic review of overall Project performance for the period of implementation between Dec 2021 and Jun 2024, utilising standard evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability. The Evaluation took a results-based evaluation approach to assess performance across the range of expectations outlined in the Project Document and other strategic Project decisions/documentation. It also took a holistic view of Project performance from a lens of processes evaluation (i.e. the way in which interventions worked, not just results per se), including the impact of Project implementation modalities on delivery. As possible, the Evaluation included summative ‘impact evaluation’ elements apparent as of Jun 2024, while also interpreting feedback what ‘prospective’ impacts might be expected in the medium- to long-term. Based on findings, the Evaluation formulated key conclusions, lessons and recommendations.

12. Given constraints and purposes, this Report does not present a catalogue of all Project results or elaborated case studies. Its conclusions and recommendations are based on evidence acquired from an examination of *overall* Project performance. There are limitations in the nature and the methodologies of the Evaluation, and it may inadvertently exclude certain voices or not satisfactorily cover all issues of importance to all stakeholders. Therefore, its findings are presented with modesty and humility.

2. EVALUATION FINDINGS

13. The Project involves a wide-ranging agenda of Outputs, Activities and Sub-Activities at multiple levels with a varied spectrum of stakeholders to be accomplished within a very short period of time and with a modest scale of resources. The Evaluation estimates that the Project involved at least 40 ‘unique’ implementation entities with which the three RUNOs had to coordinate (i.e. state entities, legislators, independent experts, academic entities, non-state entities and an INGO), not including actual ‘beneficiaries’. In some ways, the Project could be better described as a ‘programme portfolio’ with some Project Outputs, Activities and Sub-Activities being more accurately considered as stand-alone projects.

14. The scope of the Evaluation is also very wide. The original ToRs included 45 evaluation questions across 14 ‘criteria’ for assessment, which is a significant expansion of standard OECD-DAC programme evaluation assessment criteria. The Evaluation integrated and streamlined these into ‘key lines of enquiry’ under the standard six evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency. The Evaluation has performed its best to respond to the originally proposed evaluation questions, though not all could be fully answered due to constraints of time and access to/availability of documentation and stakeholders.

2.1 Relevance: *Did the Project do the right things?*

15. Section 2.1 examines and presents findings regarding the extent to which Project design and intentions were aligned with the needs of stakeholders and the dynamics of the context based on the Evaluation’s key lines of enquiry and questions. Higher-level conclusions and recommendations based on these findings are presented in Section 3.

2.1.1 *To what extent was the Project designed and implemented according to the priorities and needs of national stakeholders?*

16. **The Project was largely relevant to and aligned with a wide range of national strategies and development policies.** National consultations with various government, civil society and international development actors occurred throughout the processes of developing the Kyrgyz Republic’s application for PBF Re-Eligibility (signed by the President) and in the design phases of the Project. The Project was designed to support numerous national instruments in the areas of peacebuilding, gender, youth empowerment, governance and human rights, including:

- National Development Strategy for 2018-2040;
- National Development Programme for 2021-2026;
- Concept of Development of Civil Identity - Kyrgyz Jarany in the Kyrgyz Republic (2021-2026);
- Programme for the development of local self-government in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2018-2023;
- Concept of Youth Policy for 2020-2030;
- Youth and Child Friendly Local Government (YCFLG);
- National Action Plan on UN Resolution 1325 (Women, Peace and Security) for 2022-2024;

- National Strategy on Achieving Gender Equality by 2030;
- Program on Countering Extremism and Terrorism in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2023-2027;
- Concept of Spiritual and Moral Development and Physical Education of the Person for 2021-26;
- Concept of State Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic in the Religious Sphere for 2022-2026;
- National Program for the Preservation of National Traditions for 2022-2027; and
- Various national human rights policies/legislation/instruments including, inter alia: the Constitution, Law on Freedom of Religion and Religious Organizations, Code of the Kyrgyz Republic on Children, Law on the Rights and Guarantees of Persons with Disabilities, Law on State Guarantees of Equal Rights and Equal Opportunities for Men and Women and Law on Akyikatchy (Ombudsperson) of the Kyrgyz Republic.

17. The Project was designed in especially close alignment with the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept. In development since 2018 and adopted by presidential decree on 13 Nov 2020, the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept³ succeeded the preceding “Inter-Ethnic Harmony Concept” with a broader scope to address the civic identity, tolerance and diversity aspects of conflict prevention and peacebuilding. Implementation of the Concept is supervised by an Interagency Committee headed by the Deputy Chairperson of the Cabinet of Ministers under which the MoCISYP is the focal point responsible for implementation (the State Agency for Local Self-Government and Interethnic Relations was originally responsible, but structural changes in government transferred responsibility for Inter-Ethnic Relations to a new department within MoCISYP). The Project was specifically designed to support three of the Concept’s strategic objectives: strengthening civic consciousness and effective promotion of Kyrgyz Jarany; strengthening unity, increasing tolerance and understanding of the diversity value; and reducing barriers to equal participation and making decision-making more inclusive. Illustrating the Project’s alignment with the Concept, many stakeholders simply referred to it as the ‘Kyrgyz Jarany Project.’

18. However, the Project had to manage several challenges in order to maintain its ongoing relevancy to national priorities and needs during implementation:

- **Many stakeholders suggested that the Project faced political resistance.** The Kyrgyz Jarany Concept originated in the previous administration; therefore, the Project was conceived in a different political context than its implementation. Political dynamics during implementation of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept (i.e. concerns over closing civic space and free participation in public life, including the marginalisation of civil society actors⁴) were suggested by some stakeholders as indicators that political commitment to promoting the Concept’s values of inclusive governance, tolerance and the protection of minorities and/or advancing the peacebuilding objectives of the Project had diminished.
- **Different Project stakeholders were characterised as having some diverging expectations and levels of commitment to all aspects of the Project.** There were indications of some diverging formal and informal agendas, priorities and requirements across a wide array of governmental stakeholders (at the senior and working levels) that had to be managed and reconciled for the Project to maintain relevance throughout implementation. This was further complicated and amplified by government structural changes that resulted in certain Project-related policies moving to new bodies, as well as by frequent turn-over of government representatives and personnel at the national and local levels.

³ [Concept on Development of Civic Identity - Kyrgyz Jarany in the Kyrgyz Republic for the Period 2021-2026](#), 39 Decree of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2020.

⁴ UN RC, “[UN Resident Coordinator Raises Alarming Concerns: Proposed Laws Risk to Jeopardize Kyrgyzstan's Human Rights Gains and Achievement of Sustainable Development Goals](#),” Welcoming remarks by UN Resident Coordinator at Roundtable on ‘Freedom of Speech and Human Rights in Kyrgyzstan: Threats of Legislative Initiatives’ (13 Jun 2023).

Some UN stakeholders were also characterised as demonstrating only partial or qualified support for implementation of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept. Some UN stakeholders were perceived as distancing the UN from the Concept over perceived risks of inadvertently supporting a potentially ethno-nationalist agenda that undermined the human rights, inclusion, diversity and social cohesion values present in the text of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept.

- **Agreement on significant implementation details occurred mainly after Project commencement.** Project design and approval processes were primarily managed by the Presidential Administration, which then delegated responsibility for primary governmental oversight of implementation to the MoCISYP. An indicator that alignment of implementation details with MoCISYP priorities was not as deep as needed at the time of Project approval was the ‘inception period’ over the first 6-12 months of the Project that involved repeated efforts to develop internal coordination systems and improve inter-partner coherence. This included developing the Aligned Kyrgyz Jarany Concept/Project Work Plan (agreed May 2022) and sharing information about funding allocations for implementing the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept to avoid duplications and ensure complementarities. Time required for extensive consultations and coordination during this ‘inception period’ to ensure the ‘operational relevance’ of the Project led to delays in subsequent implementation.
- **Some stakeholders viewed the government-UN relationship as ‘transactional.’** In some instances, governmental stakeholders expected to directly implement activities with Project funding rather than such activities being ‘outsourced’ by RUNOs to implementing partners/consultants. There were also unexpected requests from government stakeholders for the Project to fund Sub-Activities that were not originally envisioned in the Project. Such frictions during implementation likely led to some diverging perceptions about the relevance of certain Project modalities, methods and activities.
- **Expectations regarding alignment between the Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion concepts were not entirely reconciled.** Many governmental and UN stakeholders arrived at the Project with two ‘adjacent’ rather than wholly aligned concepts and expectations. In very simplified terms: i.) government (especially MoCISYP) sought a UN Project that would serve as a vehicle for government implementation of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept *per se*; ii.) UN stakeholders sought more encompassing social cohesion, human rights and peacebuilding agendas that went beyond the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept but nevertheless aligned the Project to the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept because the Concept presented the ‘best available’ national policy vehicle. The Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion concepts intersect in many ways. They also encompass more comprehensive approaches to address the multi-dimensional sources of conflict *and* capacities for peace needed in the Kyrgyz Republic (i.e. going beyond the ‘inter-ethnic’ conflict prevention paradigm). However, the two concepts do not entirely overlap. Consequently, not all stakeholders from all sides and levels were fully convinced or reconciled that all Project components were suitably aligned with their expectations and priorities.

19. Despite the above challenges, national stakeholders, on-the-whole, appreciated the alignment and adjustment of the Project to national needs and expectations. The Project expanded consultation and coordination with national stakeholders as it progressed and sought to stay flexible and responsive. When needed, the Project demonstrated a capacity to adjust and respond to government requests and needs over time. While some of these requests were unexpected, required extended negotiations and were not always agreed, the Project demonstrated the intentions and capacities to remain relevant as government priorities and needs evolved.

20. Feedback suggests an especially high degree of Project alignment with the priorities of involved LSG and local-level civil society stakeholders. Project activities and interventions were largely welcomed

and appreciated, including the introduction of some innovative processes, methods and knowledge. Buy-in and ownership of Project priorities by LSG, civil society and community stakeholders in target locations was partly demonstrated by: significant voluntary participation of local authorities in organising and participating project activities, such as public consultative processes and follow-up activities; instances of LSG funding youth UPSHIFT initiatives; willingness of LSGs, local police and schools to allow staff participation in trainings, consultations and local initiatives; and large voluntary contributions of free-time by youth and community members in numerous trainings, dialogues, consultations and local initiatives. Overall, some local stakeholders invested a great deal of personal time and effort either on a voluntary basis or on very minimal stipends/reimbursements. For the most part, Project activities at the LSG level were not a case of local authorities being ‘bystanders’ to some project ‘imposed from above’. Project activities seemed to excite and challenge local-level stakeholders and generate genuine ownership and momentum. Many stakeholders highlighted the relevancy of Project activities in relation to local histories of tension and conflict: “The situation is stable now but [...] the need for such projects is high.”⁵

2.1.2 To what extent was Project design and implementation consistent with UN development policies and priorities?

21. The Project was very relevant to and aligned with key global- and country-level UN development policies and priorities, including:

- **Global 2030 Agenda SDG 16:** Project design promoted peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, access to justice for all and effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels, especially to make local contributions to SDG 16 Targets:
 - 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere;
 - 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels;
 - 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels;
 - 16.b: Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development;
- **Global 2030 Agenda Principles:** Project design promoted the achievement of all the Global 2030 Agenda Principles: i.) [Principle One—Human Rights-Based Approach](#); ii.) [Principle Two—Leave No One Behind \(LNOB\)](#); iii.) [Principle Three—Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment \(GEWE\)](#).
- **UN Secretary-General’s Call to Action for Human Rights:** Project design promoted at least three Thematic Areas for Action: 1. Rights at the core of sustainable development; 3. Gender equality and equal rights for women; and 4. Public participation and civic space. The Project was developed and implemented with components for promoting aspects of the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#), [Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women](#), [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#), [Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#) and other international human rights instruments.
- **UN GEWE agendas:** Project design promoted key objectives enshrined in the [Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women \(CEDAW\)](#) and action on four critical areas of concern within the [Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action](#)⁶.
- **Secretary-General’s “Our Common Agenda” and “A new Agenda for Peace”:** The Project largely falls under Agenda Two of renewing the social contract between governments and their people so as to rebuild trust and embrace a comprehensive vision of human rights and promotes: Action 3: Shift the

⁵ KII K-KDIC.

⁶ D. Violence against women; E. Women and armed conflict; G. Women in power and decision-making; and I. Human rights of women.

prevention and sustaining peace paradigm within countries; Action 4: Accelerate implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development to address the underlying drivers of violence and insecurity; and Action 5: Transform gendered power dynamics in peace and security.

- **Youth Peace and Security (YPS) Agenda (UN Security Council Resolutions 2250 and 2419)**: Project design promoted achievement of four of the five YPS pillars for action: 1. Participation of youth in decision-making; 2. Protection and respect of human rights, including for youth; 3. Prevention of violence and promotion of peace involving youth; and 4. Partnerships that increase the political, financial, technical and logistical support of youth in peace efforts.
- **Women, Peace and Security (WPS) Agenda (UN Security Council Resolutions — 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889, 1960, 2106, 2122, 2242, 2467, 2493)**: The Project explicitly promoted women’s participation/leadership and WPS priorities in all aspects of its implementation.
- **Kyrgyz Republic-UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (2023-2027)**: The Project works directly in support of UNSDCF Strategic Priority Area 4: Just, accountable, and inclusive institutions and a civil society for peace, cohesion, and human rights. Under this priority, the UN took commitment to “strengthen social cohesion around valuing the concept of citizenship”, which is explicitly aligned with the Project’s overarching goal.

2.1.3 To what extent was the Project designed and implemented consistent to key cross-cutting priorities?

22. Promoting gender equality was a significant objective, which was designed as a Gender Marker 2 project. The Project reported that it spent USD 1,340,631.42 (46.1% of total expenditure) as of Jun 2024 on efforts contributing to gender equality and/or women's empowerment (GEWE)⁷ just shy of its original target of 50.67% of the budget. The ProDoc contains gender-specific analysis throughout, including on gender inequality, GBV and women’s participation. The Project design specifically identified women and girls as priority stakeholders, especially in Outputs 1 and 3. The ProDoc, Strategic Results Framework, work plans and M&E indicators specified progressive gender equality and women’s participation targets.

23. While not designed specifically as a YPS project, the Project significantly integrated youth participation and YPS elements. The ProDoc contains some youth-specific analysis and design specifically identifies youth as priority stakeholders across all three Outputs. A large range of project activities and deliverables specifically involved and empowered youth and children, including participatory youth peacebuilding activities, youth engagement in governance decision-making and the development of new inclusive, human rights and Kyrgyz Jarany focused curricula for deployment at the pre-school, primary and secondary school levels. It was suggested that ongoing youth unemployment, exclusion from economic growth, lack of access to contribute to community life and decision making and vulnerability to various non-peaceful influences make young people a key determining factor for social cohesion and peace.

24. Human rights were not only integrated throughout Project design but comprised several key components. These included efforts for legislation (on equality/anti-discrimination and rights for people with disabilities), public human rights education/awareness, specific awareness and rights litigation support for youth with disabilities, the production of rights monitoring analysis and the development of new inclusive, human rights and Kyrgyz Jarany focused curricula at the pre-school, primary and secondary school levels. The Project was designed to promote a culture of inclusion and institutionalise practices

⁷ Project Semi-Annual Report Jun 2024, p.18.

and processes for the protection of rights. The “respect for the rights and interests of Kyrgyzstan’s different identity groups” as a precursor for sustaining peace was built into the Project’s ToC.⁸

2.1.4 To what extent was the Project sensitive to the context, including over time?

25. The Project took some measures for contextual awareness and conflict sensitivity/do-no-harm (CS/DNH) during design and implementation. The relevance of Project design and implementation to the context was partly reasoned to be adequately validated by its alignment to already ‘grounded’ government policy priorities, especially the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept. To further demonstrate its contextual relevance, the Project integrated:

- **Pre-existing context, risk, CS/DNH and conflict/peace analysis into Project design:** The Project concept and design were partly informed by the findings/priorities of the: PBF Summary ‘Conflict and Peace Analysis’ (CPA) (Mar 2020)⁹; PBF portfolio review and strategic workshop (Mar 2020); and a Regional Consultation on UN Peacebuilding Architecture in Central Asia (Mar 2020)¹⁰.
- **Some context, risk, CS/DNH or conflict/peace analysis components into the ProDoc:** This included: i.) ‘Peacebuilding Context and Rationale for PBF support’ and a ‘Brief summary of conflict analysis findings’ (pp.4-6); ii.) Risk Management table (pp.19-20); iii.) Project level Theory of Change Assumptions (pp.11-12) outlining key risks and “challenges associated with support to the implementation” of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept; and iv.) conducting a standard UNDP Project Social and Environmental Screening (SESP) (Jan 2022).
- **Ad hoc internal UN context analysis:** Some informal ‘background’ analysis and consultations occurred on an ad hoc basis amongst UN stakeholders during Project design and implementation. The RCO Peace and Development Team (PDT) provided ongoing written/verbal context analysis inputs during the design and inception phases of the Project (at least up until Aug 2022). Contextual/operational risks and challenges were also discussed and mitigation strategies agreed during occasional UN HoA PBF Project Coordination Meetings.¹¹
- **CS/DNH trainings:** The Project conducted two rounds of internal conflict sensitivity trainings. Firstly, an introductory half-day seminar in Apr 2022 for RUNO staff (more than 15 months into implementation) and then a pair of two-day training workshops in Jun 2024 (as the Project was concluding), one for UN/RUNOs staff and the other for Project partner CSOs.

26. Project relevance would have benefitted from taking more explicit and comprehensive approaches to ensure awareness of and relevance to contextual dynamics during design and throughout implementation.¹² The Project was broadly relevant in addressing some of the key conflict drivers, factors for peace and peacebuilding gaps based on the analysis it used to inform design; however, that analysis was very generalised in nature. Conducting a Project-specific context, risk, CS/DNH and/or conflict/peace analysis would have provided a more robust foundation for the Project’s design and implementation relevance to the context by, *inter alia*: interrogating, informing and enhancing the relevance,

⁸ Project ProDoc, p.9.

⁹ This 11-page Summary CPA, prepared for the Kyrgyz Republic PBF Re-Eligibility request and to guide the 2021-26 PBF funding cycle, was itself derived from an Apr 2019 CPA carried by the [PeaceNexus Foundation](#) in consultation with UN, government and civil societies representatives.

¹⁰ This multi-stakeholder consultation highlighted the most salient and systematic challenges to peace in Central Asia and provided Kyrgyz stakeholders some background on issues relating to the eventual development of the Project (national ‘infrastructures for peace’ were not specifically mentioned).

¹¹ Three UN HoA PBF Project Coordination Meetings were held during Project implementation: 30 Aug 2022; 12 Jun 2023; and 27 Nov 2023.

¹² For latest UN CS/DNH best practice, see Molesworth, Timothy. “[Good Practice Note: Conflict Sensitivity, Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace](#),” UN Sustainable Development Group, 2022.

effectiveness and sustainability of the Project’s ‘theory of change’ (ToC) and intervention strategies; providing a basis for developing more relevant and measurable result indicators; and identifying Project-specific CS/DNH, political, operational and other risks, as well as a basis for monitoring and responding to these throughout implementation. Carrying out a collaborative Project-specific context analysis could especially have been utilised to harmonise stakeholder expectations and priorities, potentially diminishing some of the diverging expectation challenges experienced by the Project. While the ProDoc and SESP identified potential risks and risk mitigation strategies, the Project did not develop or utilise formal guidelines, analysis, checklists, tracking/monitoring logs, strategies or mitigation plans that attempted to anticipate potential contextual dynamics, CS/DNH risks, unintended harm/negative impacts, etc. or otherwise enable ongoing context monitoring and analysis during implementation. The Project would have benefitted from conducting CS/DNH training during design, at the start of the Project and periodically throughout implementation.

2.1.5 To what extent was the Project based on a valid and relevant Theory of Change?

27. The Project’s theory of change demonstrated the UN’s commitment to fostering an inclusive and tolerant civic identity in Kyrgyzstan. It emphasises respect for the diverse rights and interests of all identity groups and builds on best practices in peacebuilding, aiming to bridge gaps between state and society through inclusive governance and open dialogue platforms. The ToC highlights the importance of inclusive, transparent engagement as essential to addressing challenges to peace, acknowledging the complex dynamics within Kyrgyzstan. The Project’s design reflected the UN’s added value/comparative advantages of: impartiality; commitment to rights-based approaches; access to and existing relationships with a diversity of stakeholders at all levels; capacities for convening and consensus-building; related technical expertise, especially as RUNOs in combination; and proven experience and relationships in the Kyrgyz Republic for institutional capacity building and policy formulation—all of which are key attributes when working on sensitive areas of conflict prevention/peacebuilding.

28. The relevance of Project design would have benefitted from a change logic that more systematically elaborated how the Project’s *specific* actions were connected with each other and *how* they were assumed to contribute to *specific* desired changes and results. Overall, the language and formulation of the ToC is very generalised. While it outlines a goal of promoting inclusive civic identity and respect for rights through improved governance and peacebuilding, it does not specify the “identified challenges” to peace that these interventions aim to address, how they will do so and what changes would result. Therefore, the relationship between the proposed interventions and their impact on sustaining peace is difficult to understand and evaluate. Clarity of the Project’s change logic was also undermined by the ProDoc containing several sections—an overarching goal, the implementation strategy and the ToC itself—each proposing only partly corresponding objectives and change logics. Explanations of how specific actions created or contributed to desired changes/results (*change logic: how will X actions result in, create or contribute to Y changes/results*) are mainly general rather than Project specific and are dispersed across different parts of the ProDoc narrative. This not only disrupts the ability to understand the change logic and result chains in the Project’s ‘theory’ but also the ability to track and attribute causality of the Project’s actual inputs, activities and outputs to actual changes/results.

29. Drawbacks in the clarity of ToC design likely resulted from a number of challenges. The need for additional clarity in the ToC design may have been intentional in order to accommodate the already highlighted challenges of having to align diverging stakeholder expectations and concepts. Additionally, this also allowed RUNOs to bring together a very diverse portfolio of activities under the ‘umbrella’ of the Project. Interviews suggested that some Project components were a continuation or evolution from

preceding projects—many were not ‘first of their kind’. Positively, this meant that some aspects of the Project could build upon pre-existing partnerships and lessons to refine approaches and effectiveness. However, whether they were adequately modified and enhanced to contribute to the Project’s objectives was not always apparent because the Project’s change logic and strategies were not entirely clear.

2.2 Coherence: *How well did the Project fit with other interventions?*

30. Section 2.2 examines and presents findings regarding the extent to which the Project coordinated with and ensured coherence with other stakeholders working in the conflict prevention/peacebuilding sector based on the Evaluation’s key lines of enquiry and questions. Higher-level conclusions and recommendations based on these findings are presented in Section 3.

2.2.1 *To what extent was Project design and implementation compatible, coordinated and complimentary to other key stakeholders and interventions in the peacebuilding sector?*

31. **There is limited organised conflict prevention/peacebuilding ‘sectoral coordination’ with which the Project could engage.** While the PBF JSC is “the highest authority to provide policy guidance on the implementation of peacebuilding interventions in the country”¹³ it met only twice during Project implementation and in all practical purposes is too high-level and policy-focused a mechanism for detailed operational coordination among projects and stakeholders. An informal ‘Peacebuilding Hub’ is convened from time to time as a means for coordination and collaboration among ‘like-minded’ INGOs and international development partners. However, this is a largely informal mechanism. The RCO PDT occasionally participates in the Peacebuilding Hib on behalf of the UN.

32. **Interviews indicated that the Project coordinated with other stakeholders in the conflict prevention/peacebuilding sector primarily on a bilateral basis as needed for implementation.** The Project ProDoc included a basic mapping of other complementary international projects related to social cohesion and some documentation in the early phases of implementation indicated that the Project benefitted from a MoCISYP and PeaceNexus mapping exercise of international development partner initiatives and plans for implementing the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept in order to identify activity and funding gaps. There was excellent synergy between the Project and the OSCE Office of the High Commissioner for National Minorities in the joint development of new MoIA Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion curricula for law enforcement. The Project and OSCE Programme Office in Bishkek liaised occasionally regarding their mutual support to different aspects of national EWER systems. The impact of Project support to and investments in ECD Centres was maximised by dovetailing with the complementary investments of other development actors in the education sector. Many stakeholders suggested that an ad hoc and bilateral approach to coordination was largely sufficient where formal operational ‘sectoral coordination’ is limited and the number of international stakeholders involved is small. However, there were some reasonable arguments that the Project, as one of the largest peacebuilding interventions in the country, missed opportunities for greater partnerships, synergies and results by not promoting wider coordination and collaboration in the conflict prevention/peacebuilding sector. Some LSG level stakeholders also noted that

¹³ Kyrgyz Republic PBF Re-eligibility Request – Programme , p.7.

coordination between the Project and other actors working on participatory local governance (UN Women, ACTED, etc.) could have resulted in more efficiency.

33. An important achievement of the Project in terms of strengthening coherence in the wider conflict prevention/peacebuilding sector was the Project supporting development of a draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion. The Action Plan seeks to coordinate and integrate the priorities and efforts of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept and six other national policies/concepts¹⁴ as a means for avoiding duplication and improving synergies.¹⁵ At the time of writing, it was under review by the Cabinet of Ministers. It was suggested by some stakeholders that adoption of an integrated Action Plan for Social Cohesion would represent a major step forward in coherence efforts for conflict prevention/peacebuilding in the Kyrgyz Republic, where a multitude of inter-related government policies, concepts and initiatives have been issued largely in isolation from one another.

2.3 Effectiveness: *Did the Project achieve its objectives?*

34. In Section 2.3, the Evaluation assesses to what extent did the Project demonstrate effectiveness in its delivery of results under: i.) Output 1; ii.) Output 2; and iii.) Output 3. The Project's higher Outcome Indicators and associated results are principally examined under section 2.4 Impact. Higher-level conclusions and recommendations based on these findings are presented in Section 3.

35. The Evaluation encountered significant challenges compiling and assessing the information necessary to determine the extent of the Project's effectiveness. Firstly, the Strategic Results Framework is problematic as an evaluation tool. Output Indicators do not cover or provide benchmarks for assessing expected deliverables and results across many Activities and Sub-Activities; therefore, the Evaluation had to interpret or extrapolate what might be reasonably assumed to be intended results under these. Some Output Indicators for important institution-building results are 'binary' (no/yes) without benchmarks for objectively determining either the baseline or the end-state. Six out of the ten Output Indicators rely upon 'means of verification' that were not accessible to the Project or Evaluation. Secondly, the Project did not have overarching M&E tracking systems or central data repository for activities, outputs and results. RUNOs individually conducted M&E according to their agency requirements and compiled information on an ad hoc basis (e.g. for annual reporting).

36. Consequently, the Evaluation had to extract results data from external/internal Project reporting and interviews to capture a reasonably systematic compilation of overall Project activities, outputs and results, the most pertinent elements of which are presented below. Due to the complexity of a Project that is effectively a portfolio of multiple smaller projects, the Evaluation has had to be brief and cannot provide detailed effectiveness analysis of every component. This is regrettable and somewhat of a disservice to the many interesting and complex initiatives undertaken. Conducting multiple smaller

¹⁴ These include the: Concept of Youth Policy for 2020-2030; Concept of Spiritual and Moral Development and Physical Education of the Person for 2021-2026; Concept of State Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic in the Religious Sphere for 2022-2026; National Action Plan on UN Resolution 1325 (Women, Peace and Security) for 2022-2024; Program on Countering Extremism and Terrorism in the Kyrgyz Republic for 2023-2027; and National Program for the Preservation of National Traditions for 2022-2027.

¹⁵ An inter-ministerial working group was formed through a protocol of the Presidential Administration "On optimization and stocktaking of certain adopted national programs and strategies of the Kyrgyz Republic." (UNDP, BTOR 24-29 Dec 2023).

assessments of each component rather than a single omnibus evaluation would have enabled the Project to capture a richer and more nuanced picture of its effectiveness, as well as lessons for future work.

2.3.1 To what extent did the Project realise its objectives and expected results (i.e. activities and outputs)?

Effectiveness and Results: Output 1

37. Output 1 implementation was predominantly focused on supporting ambitious national-level policy, legislative and institutional capacity building activities, outputs and results. **Table 5** provides a quick reference summary of Output 1 Indicators and results.

38. **Output Indicator 1.3** for youth participation in YCFLG can be reasonably measured for progress and shows that the Project exceeded expectations for this specific component. However, **Output Indicators 1.1 and 1.2** do not provide benchmarks for assessing effectiveness. **Output Indicator 1.4** is no longer valid because it was not possible to implement the youth internships component (see Activity 1.6).

Table 5: Output 1 Indicators		
Output 1: Policy frameworks and institutional mechanisms strengthened for inclusive and accountable governance at national and local levels to increase social dialogue and trust		
OUTPUT INDICATOR	PROJECT END (as of Jun 2024)	
	ACTUAL RESULT	TARGET
Output Indicator 1.1: Inter-Ministerial Coordination Mechanism (IMCM) for greater inclusion at all levels established and operational	Interdepartmental commission for the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept was established, but its ‘operational’ functionality is undetermined.	2022: IMCM established 2023: IMCM operationalized
Output Indicator 1.2: Necessary institutional (legal, operational, financial) framework for I4P (IMCM, preventive centers, youth centers etc.) developed and adopted	Unknown—no appropriate criteria or data available.	2022: No 2024: Yes
Output Indicator 1.3: Number of adolescent and young people and women applying new skills to influence decision making at local level	328 youth trained and implemented solutions Male: 80 (24%) / Female: 248 (76%) aged 14-19 years: 252 (77%) aged 20-24 years 76 (23%) <i>(Exceeded expectations)</i>	Baseline: ado/YP = 80 Target: ado/YP = 280 (80 / 29% male, 200 / 71% female; 200 / 71% aged 14-19 and 80 / 29% aged 20-24)
Output Indicator 1.4: % increase of ethnic minorities’ representatives enrolled into the trainings of State Personnel Service in target communities	Component not implemented.	2022: 50 2024: 50

39. Output 1 Sub-Activities successfully implemented included:

- **1.1.2 IMCM—Kyrgyz Jarany, social cohesion and I4P policy analysis:** Various Kyrgyz Jarany, social cohesion and I4P policy analysis and advice were developed and submitted to government.
- **1.2.1 Policy Frameworks—Charter of Local Communities template amended with peacebuilding components:** Re-developed through a series of local consultative workshops, the Charter of Local

Communities template was amended and adopted on Dec 2022.¹⁶ This template allowed LSGs to now tailor and enshrine core social priorities of local government to specific local circumstances, especially integrating the prioritisation of conflict prevention/peacebuilding. Having these priorities enshrined as a ‘local constitution’ enables LSGs to allocate resources from local budgets to implement activities in support of priorities and activities that strengthen the local ‘social contract’ as a means for preventing conflict. They also enshrine requirements for diverse and inclusive public participation in LSG decision-making. Trial application of the new Charters was then implemented in the Project’s 7 target LSGs under Sub-Activities 3.2.1-2.

- **1.2.2 Policy Frameworks—Kyrgyz Jarany, social cohesion and I4P policy analysis:** Various Kyrgyz Jarany, social cohesion and I4P policy analysis and advice were successfully developed and submitted to inform government thinking and Project capacity development support to national I4P/EWER.
- **1.2.3 Policy Frameworks—Development and passage of a new Law on Youth:** The Project provided expert technical advice and supported public hearings involving youth activists and organisations to input into drafting of the Law on Youth, which was passed by parliament on 21 Jun 2023 and entered into force on 8 Feb 2024. The legislation sought to: ensure full respect for the rights and human dignity of young people; promote conditions for the active participation/representation of young people in democratic processes; prioritise developing youth intercultural dialogue, solidarity and skills of coexistence, mutual understanding and socio-cultural diversity; and prioritise strengthening the social integration of youth.¹⁷
- **1.3.1 Regular Dialogues—Draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion:** The Project was requested by the Presidential Administration to facilitate consultative dialogues involving 281 representatives (41% male and 59% female) of LSGs, state bodies and CSOs from seven provinces to reflect and advise on a national approach to social cohesion that integrates Kyrgyz Jarany and other related government policies/concepts. Consultations recommended a shift to more efficient integrated framework of social cohesion policies that also embedded human-rights and gender in order to avoid potentially overwhelming local government actors with having to implement multiple interrelated national concepts and policies. Based on consultations, the Project facilitated development of a draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion that was submitted to the Presidential Administration for review in Oct 2023.¹⁸ This draft amalgamated related policies/concepts so that I4P stakeholders and processes could work more effectively and sustainably beyond 2025 towards a unified set of social cohesion objectives.
- **1.3.2 Regular Dialogues—Capacity building activities for IMCM members:** The Project successfully provided technical assistance and ongoing policy support to relevant governmental counterparts involved in managing the Interdepartmental Commission for Coordination of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept (see 1.1.1 below).
- **1.4.1 Women’s Councils and Youth Committees trained in human rights, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, diversity, tolerance and right-to-participate:** 247 local youth and women representatives across the Project’s target 7 LSGs were trained in human rights, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, diversity, tolerance and right-to-participate. Some local stakeholders believed awareness of these issues was especially urgent in the face of local tensions related to ethnicity and religion and ‘pressures’ on women, girls and vulnerable groups. However, it is not clear *how* participants then applied these new skills or what was

¹⁶ By Decree of the Director of the GAGSMSUMO from 12 Dec 2022 (#279).

¹⁷ There were some dissenting views that the processes of consulting with youth on the law was not very participatory; that it was more akin to a ‘performative’ exercise and ‘presentation’ than a genuine reflection and discussion that sought substantive inputs from youth.

¹⁸ The joint Interdepartmental Commissions for the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept and State Policy in the Religious Sphere met in Feb 2024 to consider the Draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion.

the follow-up. Some stakeholders noted that participants voluntarily organised further trainings with local community members on their own time. However, this varied according to location and was not formally part of the Project. It does not appear as though participants of these trainings were systematically integrated into other local Project activities or systematically linked-up with the EWER/I4P mechanisms supported by the Project, though some did also participate in Sub-Activities 3.2.4 ‘Right-to-participate’ LSG-public dialogues and 3.4.1 Community Dialogue – Danaker (insider mediator) trainings.

- **1.4.2-4 Facilitating implementation of Youth and Child Friendly Local Governance (YCFLG) Guidelines:** These activities involved a significant number of participants across the Project’s 7 target LSGs, including 155 LSG representatives and 328 youth representatives. Two manuals were developed and deployed to support capacities for implementing the YCFLG: a “Manual for LSGs on working with youth” and a “Manual for Youth on working with LSGs”. Supported trainings and LSG-youth consultations are believed to have contributed to more effective drafting of LSG social-economic development plans in at least some Project locations, bringing LSG departments closer together through integrated planning and inclusion of youth priorities for social cohesion, inclusivity, etc.
- **1.5.1 Kyrgyz Jarany education for law enforcement:** The Project supported the development of curricula and manuals on “Features of law enforcement activities to strengthen interethnic relations and form social cohesion” (in Kyrgyz and Russian) for the MoIA Academy and MoIA Republican Training Centre (RTC), which were expected to be approved by Sep 2024 and then put into use by the MoIA.¹⁹ The Academy course will be integrated into the second-year university undergraduate curriculum, while the more simplified and practical RTC manual will be the basis for providing in-service and staff training, especially for police but also for all MoIA staff. The curricula were developed by a joint working group of 18 staff²⁰ from the MoIA Academy and RTC through significant participatory processes involving additional awareness and capacity building on key issues (i.e. Kyrgyz Jarany, human rights, inclusion, conflict prevention/peacebuilding, etc.)²¹ and close methodical mentoring. The curricula involve important innovative, interactive and practical teaching methods, such as simulations and role playing. The curricula promote law enforcement officers adopted ‘change’ oriented conflict prevention and peacebuilding approaches ‘adapted’ to whatever context they find themselves in, as well as promoting collective action with other government actors, local authorities and local actors.

40. Output 1 Sub-Activities that were incomplete or ‘still in progress’ by the end of Project included:

- **1.1.1 IMCM—Technical expertise to operationalise IMCM:** An “Interdepartmental Commission for Coordination of activities of state bodies and organizations for implementation of the Action Plan for the Concept for development of civil identity of Kyrgyz Jarany in the Kyrgyz Republic for the period 2021-2026” was established by Cabinet of Ministers order on 24 Dec 2021, to be chaired by the Deputy Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic and deputy-chaired by the Minister of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy. However, very little information was available about the frequency of the Interdepartmental Commission’s meetings, its agendas or decisions; its ‘operational’ functionality is undetermined. Documents shared by the Project indicate

¹⁹ The Office of the OSCE High Commission for National Minorities collaborated closely with the Project to develop the MoIA curricula, contributing technical advice and trainings such as on inter-ethnic relations and conflict prevention.

²⁰ The joint working group started with 25 members, but only 18 were able to participate throughout the entirety of the process. (KII K-ASXH).

²¹ This Project component also benefitted from a coherent synergy with technical expert inputs from the OSCE Office of the High Commissioner for National Minorities.

that the first meeting of the Interdepartmental Commission was held on 31 Jan 2023²² (more than a year after it was established) and that the Cabinet of Ministers conducted a first-ever joint session of Interdepartmental Commissions, for the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept and the State Policy on Religious Affairs (on 31 Mar 2023).²³ The Project encountered challenges, including a longer than expected time to develop and agree on inter-agency governance of I4P and the reshuffling/reduction in the staffing of key government counterparts that reduced the Project's ability to meaningfully engage with relevant national counterparts. In response, the Project adjusted and supported a government request to develop of an Integrated National Action Plan for Social Cohesion (see 1.3.1 above).

- **1.2.1 Policy Frameworks—Amendments to the LSG Law:** The Project provided technical inputs and supported a wide range of consultations at the regional level between the public and a group of 15 parliamentarians. At the time of writing, the Bill to amend the LSG Law was expected to be tabled for a joint second and third reading by the Jogorku Kenesh (parliament) by Dec 2024. The Bill proposes two amendments to the Law: Article 27 to include the prevention inter-ethnic conflicts to the list of responsibilities of LSGs, and Article 29 to remove the prevention inter-ethnic conflicts from the list of responsibilities of local state administration that could be delegated to LSGs.
- **1.2.3 Policy Frameworks—Draft Law on Rights of People with Disabilities:** The Project provided technical expert inputs to promote international standards for the rights of people with disabilities and supported a wide range of consultations among key stakeholders, including the MoLSSM, National Council for Persons with Disabilities, parliamentarians and a group of NGOs (Equality, Legal Aid for Persons with Disabilities, ARDI and others). However, during inter-ministerial consultations at the beginning of 2024, the MoF declined the draft bill on the grounds that it would not be financially possible to implement the proposed law. The Project since supported interested parliamentarians to maintain momentum with plans to eventually re-introduce a draft bill.
- **1.2.4 Policy Frameworks—Draft Law on Ensuring the Right to Equality and Protection from Discrimination²⁴:** The Project provided technical expert inputs to promote international anti-discrimination standards and supported a wide range of consultations on the draft bill in partnership with MoLSSM and the civil society Equality Coalition. The draft bill received a great deal of attention but was withdrawn after first-reading in parliament. The Project continued advocacy and support to a group of parliamentarians to maintain momentum with plans to eventually re-introduce a draft bill.

41. The only Output 1 Sub-Activity not implemented in the end was:

- **1.6.1 SACSLSG internships for young professionals from minority communities:** Legislative, structural and focal point changes impacted the recruitment processes for state and municipal services and did not permit creation of the originally envisioned internship initiative to bring young professionals (including from minority ethnic groups, women and disabled people) into the state and municipal services. Two attempts to initiate internships were unsuccessful, as well as consultations with government to adapt activities to support applications from minority communities and persons with disabilities in replenishing the pool of personnel for state and municipal services.

²² United Nations CERD/C/KGZ/11-12, "[Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Combined eleventh and twelfth periodic reports submitted by Kyrgyzstan under article 9 of the Convention, due in 2022](#)," 15 Jun 2023, para. 17, p. 3.

²³ Project Annual Report, Jun 2023, p.5.

²⁴ It is important to note that this work is a continuation of OHCHR support and efforts beginning in 2017. (KII K-IOZA)

Effectiveness and Results: Output 2

42. Output 2 implementation was focused on supporting activities, outputs and results to ‘establish’ a comprehensive EWER system both at the national-level and at the community-level in the Project’s 7 target LSGs. **Table 6** provides a quick reference summary of Output 2 Indicators and results.

43. Project components for **Output Indicator 2.1** were significantly changed: the Project did not establish a central EWER Data Processing Centre but instead provided material assistance (i.e. IT equipment and furniture) to establish 6 additional Public Reception Centers (PRCs) for Interethnic Issues. The Evaluation cannot determine effectiveness under **Output Indicator 2.2** because the Evaluation and Project do not have access to internal government information on the number of policy decisions and local development plans based on EWER data and analysis during the course of the Project.

44. Overall, the Project should be more accurately described as intending to add to and enhance the scope and capacities of an existing EWER system rather than to ‘establish’ a comprehensive EWER system. EWER system components already existed, supported by past/ongoing efforts of the OSCE Programme Office in Bishkek and also by previous UNDP efforts from 2014-19 (specifically the establishment of PRCs in 23 multi-ethnic districts/cities). The Project’s own commissioned analysis highlighted that: “The existing monitoring model in Kyrgyzstan is relatively effective, but needs adjustment and improvement”.²⁵

Table 6: Quick reference summary of Output 2 implementation

Output 2: Comprehensive early warning and early response [EWER] system established for risk-informed development and conflict prevention

OUTPUT INDICATOR	PROJECT END (as of Jun 2024)	
	ACTUAL	TARGET
Output Indicator 2.1: A Data Processing Center for early warning and early response established and operational	Component adapted: material assistance provided to establish 6 additional Public Reception Centres (PRCs) for Interethnic Issues.	Baseline: No Target: Yes
Output Indicator 2.2: # of policy decisions and local development plans adopted based on gender and age sensitive analytical data and findings produced by EWER	Unknown – data unavailable.	Baseline: No Target: 7

45. Output 2 Sub-Activities successfully implemented included:

- **2.1.1-3/2.2.1-2 Establish EWER/Capacities for EWER—Analysis on I4P, EWER legal framework and redeveloped EWER monitoring/analytical methods and capacities:** Re-developing and institutionalising the different components of national EWER systems was a core objective and significant area of work of the Project, many aspects of which were effectively delivered. Both the MoCISYP and SCRA were supported to reconceptualise, redevelop and redeploy their monitoring and analysis methods/capacities with a shifted focus from specifically monitoring for inter-ethnic tensions to now include a broader range of broader social tensions. Key support to enhance methods, systems and capacities included:

²⁵ EFCA, “Review of existing system of monitoring and data management in peacebuilding and social cohesion,” p.6 (English translation from original Russian-language report).

- **Commissioning and supporting a series of analysis to better understand and expand the scope of EWER approaches in the Kyrgyz Republic**, including: overarching analysis of and recommendations for redevelopment of I4P at the national and local levels; analysis of the sources of social tensions in the religious sphere in nine locations (including most Project locations); and development of a multidimensional ‘Social Cohesion Barometer’ concept and roadmap for EWER;
- **Development and implementation of a MoCISYP EWER monitoring system and data management improvement Action Plan** to redevelop EWER system policies, methods, tools and capacities for monitoring and analyzing conflict/social cohesion at the district-city-village levels taking into account the administrative-territorial reform. This included redeveloping the MoCISYP Reporting ‘Form 1’ (i.e. ad hoc rapid information report) and ‘Form 2’ (i.e. regular weekly report) and preparing methodology guides for using the reporting forms, which are the principal EWER monitoring tools used by the 23 PRC Executive Secretaries supported by the Project;
- **Development and testing of a ‘Kobotoolbox’ digital EWER monitoring tool on KoboToolbox platform** (sometimes referred to as Reporting ‘Form 3’) so that a broader spectrum of local actors (PRC Executive Secretaries, Public Prevention Centre (PPC) members, etc.) can provide situational monitoring data in real-time through an online portal to the MoCISYP’s Monitoring Centre (awaiting to be adopted);
- **Further institutionalising a regulatory framework for a national EWER system** by supporting the development of the MoCISYP “Regulation/Manual on the procedure for conducting joint monitoring to prevent conflicts (ethnic, religious, social, etc.) and establish peace in the districts, cities, and rural areas of the Kyrgyz Republic.”²⁶ This Regulation/Manual was developed and approved after development and testing of the EWER monitoring guides and reporting forms, representing an important step forward for institutionalising a national EWER system;
- **Extensive consultations, trainings and capacity development support to the MoCISYP**, including: training on modernising monitoring and data management for peacebuilding and social cohesion at the national/local levels for 8 PRC Executive Secretaries (8 male) from 7 PRCs and 5 MoCISYP personnel (1 male, 4 female)²⁷; consultations on local conflict prevention issues, challenges and stakeholders in each of the 7 Project target LSGs involving a total of 179 participants (93 male, 82 female), including deputy mayors, chairs of neighborhood committees, public advisory council members, civil society activists and representatives of the Aksakal Courts, women’s councils and youth committees²⁸; supplementary support from 4 mentors to PRC Executive Secretaries in the 7 Project target LSGs during rollout of the new methodologies²⁹; 2-day seminars in each of the 7 Project target LSGs involving a total of 106 participants (66 male, 40 female) to create awareness of, test and gather feedback on EWER methodologies/issues of concern across a spectrum of local stakeholders (including civil society)³⁰; Bishkek roundtable with 41 (30 male, 11 female) participants to present and discuss the design of a new community monitoring system as a basic component within an overall management and reporting system for civic cohesion³¹;
- **Capacity development trainings for MoCISYP Monitoring Centre personnel**, including on: research and analytical skills (including conducting qualitative research and modern humanitarian research); content analysis of mass media and social networks (including ways to ensure a conflict sensitive approach and early warning of conflicts in the religious sphere based on data analysis);

²⁶ Which was approved by Order No. 55 of the MoCISYP on 30 Jan 2024.

²⁷ EFCA, “Program report for tranche 2” (03/01/2023 to 04/15/2023), p.1.

²⁸ EFCA, “Report on meetings with local councils” (2-5 May 2023), p.2.

²⁹ EFCA, “Program report for tranche 4” (07/17/2023 to 09/30/2023), p.1.

³⁰ EFCA, “Program report for tranche 4” (07/17/2023 to 09/30/2023), p.1.

³¹ EFCA, “Program report for tranche 5” (10/01/2023 to 11/20/2023), p.1.

processing information and learning forecasting methods for assessing risks based on monitoring data of indicators of social tension skills in the religious sphere;

- **Collecting, synthesizing and developing recommendations to further improve EWER methods, capacities and coordination/collaboration** among actors at the local and national levels;
 - **Supporting the SCRA to analyse, develop and test the monitoring of indicators for social tensions in the religious sphere.** After challenges experienced during testing phases, these were redeveloped and integrated into the MoCISYP's EWER monitoring system (i.e. Form 2 – formal approval pending), the SCRA's weekly monitoring of social media and the SCRA's monthly and quarterly situational monitoring reports, which are then shared with key government bodies (e.g. Presidential Administration Situation Centre, MoCISYP Monitoring Center, law enforcement, etc.);
 - **Supporting the SCRA to develop an interactive digital map of religious organizations and indicators for assessing tensions in the religious sphere.** This has 'mapped' more than 4,500 religious organisations/actors and is being developed to enable the identification of potential 'hot spots' based on where inter-denominational tensions exist, where previous such conflict occurred and changes in monitored indicators for social tensions in the religious sphere.
- **2.1.6-9 Establish EWER—U-Reporter implementation:** 4,050 U-Reporters (39% male, 57% female) conducted three polls (on school bullying, digital skills, and career guidance) during Project implementation intended to inform LSG policy discussion and planning for youth.
 - **2.2.3 Capacities for EWER (independent monitoring)—Office of the Akyikatchy (Ombudsperson) report on rights of Kairylmans:** Ombudsperson's Office conducted and submitted the independent research report "Monitoring rights and freedoms of migrants of Kyrgyz origin [Kairylmans]". Recommendations from the report to the Cabinet of Ministers, SACSLSG, MoLSSM, Ministry of Digital Development (MoDD), Armed Forces and regional/district administration were submitted to the Executive via the Ombudsperson's annual report to Parliament; government is legally required to respond to the Ombudsperson's recommendations.

46. Output 2 Sub-Activities that were incomplete or significantly changed by Project end included:

- **Sub-Activity 2.1.4—Material assistance to MoCISYP's EWER data processing centre:** This Project component was adapted based on internal analysis that increasing hardware/software capacities for EWER data processing was, in fact, not a top priority or best use of resources.³² Instead, the Project adapted this component to support a MoCISYP request to establish 6 additional PRCs by providing material assistance to each (i.e. laptop, printer and some basic office furniture).
- **2.1.10 Establish EWER—Data-analysis of U-Reporter Platform:** While three U-Reporter polls were conducted during the Project as a means to channel the voice of youth into national level youth policy discussions, the data was ultimately not integrated into or used by the national EWER system.
- **2.2.3 Capacities for EWER (independent monitoring)—NISS report on access of citizens to decision-making:** Research experts from the National Institute for Strategic Studies (NISS) conducted and submitted the independent research report "Monitoring access of citizens of the Kyrgyz Republic to decision-making processes at the local and national levels" resulting from a survey of 3,329 people (55% male, 45% female) carried out from Apr-May 2024 in 10 locations (including the Project's 7 target LSGs). The findings include recommended courses of action for the government especially for improving accessibility for persons with disabilities and electronic/digital access to information,

³² Helena Puig Larrauri, "Towards a Social Cohesion Barometer for the Kyrgyz Republic: Concept Note," Build Up (28 Mar 2024).

services and processes. While the draft report was submitted to OHCHR, it had not yet been finalised or submitted to government (MoCISYP and Presidential Administration) by the end of Project.

47. Output 2 Sub-Activities not implemented in the end included:

- **2.1.5 Establish EWER—Integrate U-Reporter into EWER system:** Internal cross-RUNO liaison challenges and different methodology development timetables resulted in the U-Reporter polling method not being integrated into new MoCISYP EWER monitoring systems. Instead, the U-Reporter effectively ran ‘in parallel’ with the Project’s other EWER components; it was not clear to the Evaluation how U-Reporter polls were applied in support of the Project’s EWER Output objectives.
- **2.3.1-2 Development plans by EWER—EWER monitoring data mainstreamed into national, sectorial and local development planning/programmes:** Much of the planned EWER support Sub-Activities of the Project did not commence until 2023. Because of this delay, originally planned follow-on Sub-Activities 2.3.1-2 to developed means for mainstreaming EWER data/analysis into socio-economic development planning at the national and local levels could not commence before end of Project.

Effectiveness and Results: Output 3

48. Output 3 was predominantly focused on supporting ambitious ‘local-level’ capacities and initiatives for conflict prevention and peacebuilding. **Table 7** provides a quick reference summary of Output 3 implementation effectiveness and results.

49. Formulation of **Output Indicator 3.1** does not present a clear expected result. Additionally, a direct causal link between Project activities and increased public awareness of Kyrgyz Jarany Concept cannot be proven. The Project’s result under Indicator 3.3 might be assessed from different perspectives:

- As measured by the National Kyrgyz Jarany Concept Public Awareness Campaign (2022-23)³³:*** The Project estimates that the national public awareness campaign reached a total of 2.35 million people to-date via videos broadcast on 12 TV channels and various social media platforms.
- As measured by the Baseline/Endline Surveys in Project target locations³⁴:*** The Surveys show that the mean average percentage of people familiar with the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept increased from 29.5% to 29.7% (an increase of 0.2%) in Project target locations. Awareness of the Concept increased in only four Project target locations and decreased in the remaining three (notably by more than by half in Nookat from 49.1% to 19.8%). However, awareness of the Concept increased dramatically in the control location by 20.2%.
- As measured by composite Project beneficiary estimation:*** The Project did not provide any composite M&E beneficiary data. Therefore, the Evaluation scanned interview and Project reporting documents to estimate that there were at least 11,318 direct participants³⁵ in Project trainings and initiatives across all Outputs related to awareness of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept. However, the number of ‘unique’ beneficiaries will likely be lower as some participated in multiple Project activities and will have effectively been ‘double counted’.

³³ As per information provided by the MoCISYP to the Project.

³⁴ The Project commissioned a Baseline Survey (Nov-Dec 2022) and an Endline Survey (Apr-May 2024) in the 7 Project target locations and 1 control location (Kara-Suu).

³⁵ Evaluation based this composite figure based on a total of all reported direct participants in Project training/awareness on the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept across all Outputs. The Evaluation cannot provide gender disaggregation because not all data used in the composite provided gender disaggregation.

50. The Project clearly exceeded expectations regarding **Output Indicators 3.2-3.5**. The Project exceeded its original target of 400 people under **Output Indicator 3.2** with the Evaluation estimating that 18,109 direct participants had some level of capacity development on issues related to conflict prevention, the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, democratic governance, inclusion, multi-cultural education, human rights, gender, freedom of religion and belief (some beneficiaries participated across different Project activities so the number of ‘unique’ individual beneficiaries is likely lower) with potential additional secondary/indirect beneficiaries cascading from these. The UPSHIFT component of the project supported the identification and implementation of 27 youth initiatives under **Output Indicator 3.3**, with an additional 15 initiatives financed by other partners, surpassing the target of 20 such initiatives. Under **Output Indicators 3.4 and 3.5**, many more youth UPSHIFT (192) and ECD Centre stakeholders (i.e. 194 librarians, 3,553 children, more than 5,000 parents) directly engaged in and benefitted from Project conflict prevention, peacebuilding, social cohesion, diversity and Kyrgyz Jarany associated initiatives than originally planned.

Table 7: Quick reference summary of Output 3 implementation

Output 3: Communities and local self-governments are capacitated to strengthen cooperation and trust among different groups and community members

OUTPUT INDICATOR	PROJECT END (as of Jun 2024)	
	ACTUAL	TARGET
Output Indicator 3.1: # of people who are aware of Kyrgyz Jarany Concept.	<p>i.) 2.35m people nationwide (nearly 33% of the total population) were directly exposed to the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept through a national public awareness campaign.</p> <p>ii.) The percentage of people familiar with the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept in the Project’s target LSGs increased from 29.5% to 29.7% (increase of 0.2%).</p> <p>iii.) Approximately 11,398 direct participants³⁶ in Project trainings and initiatives related to the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept across all Outputs.</p>	<p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: At least 10,000 (50% female) direct beneficiaries</p>
Output Indicator 3.2: # people capacitated in target locations on conflict prevention, Civic Identity Kyrgyz Jarany, democratic governance, multi-cultural education, human rights, gender, freedom of religion and belief.	<p>Estimated 18,109 direct Project beneficiaries³⁷ capacitated across all Outputs. (Exceeded expectations)</p>	<p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: 400 people (30% female)</p>
Output Indicator 3.3: # of local initiatives developed and supported for implementation.	<p>27 of 42 UPSHIFT youth-identified and proposed peacebuilding initiatives implemented (6,000+ youth beneficiaries) with financial support for</p>	<p>Baseline: 0</p> <p>Target: At least 20 initiatives</p>

³⁶ Evaluation arrived at this composite figure based on a total of all reported direct participants in Project training/awareness on the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept across all Outputs. The Evaluation cannot provide gender disaggregation because not all data from the Project used in the composite provided gender disaggregation.

³⁷ Evaluation arrived at this composite figure based on a total of all reported direct participants in Project training/awareness on conflict prevention, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, democratic governance, multi-cultural education, human rights, gender, freedom of religion and belief across all Outputs. The Evaluation cannot provide gender disaggregation because not all data used in the composite provided gender disaggregation.

	the remaining 15 solutions provided by LSGs and KOICA. <i>(Exceeded expectations)</i>	
Output Indicator 3.4: # adolescents and young people with increased skills to enable them to address their own and communities' concerns.	192 youth UPSHIFT participants (58 / 30% male, 134 / 70% female; 128 / 67% aged 14-19 years and 64 / 33% aged 19-24 years) trained and starting to implement solutions <i>(Exceeded expectations)</i>	Baseline: 80 Target: 160 (60 / 38% male, 100 / 62% female; 100 / 63% aged 14-19 years and 60 / 37% aged 19-24 years)
Output Indicator 3.5: # of pre-school age children, librarians and parents benefiting from quality integrated peace and social cohesion in ECD at Child Development Centers.	Additional 95 ECD Centres/libraries implementing curricula. Additional 194 librarians trained and implementing curricula. Additional 3,553 pre-school children benefited (2,076 / 58% female, 1,477 / 42% male, 80 / 2% children with disabilities). Additional 5000 parents of pre-schoolers benefitted. <i>(Exceeded expectations)</i>	Baseline: 3000 children and their parents, 100 librarians Target: [additional] 2000 children (aged 0 -3) + parents (18 and above); [additional] 70 librarians

51. Output 3 Sub-Activities successfully implemented included:

- 3.1.1-3 Public Awareness—National Kyrgyz Jarany Public Awareness Campaign components:** The National Campaign was conducted from 2022-23 to raise public awareness on the values of Kyrgyz Jarany, inclusion and tolerance. It included production of 12 public service announcement videos which the MoCISYP broadcast on 12 TV channels, as well as across various social media platforms. The MoCISYP estimates that a total of 2.35 million people were reached (1.5 million during the 2022-23 campaign itself and an additional 850,000 to date during 2024).³⁸ This included four video public service announcements produced by OHCHR for the MoCISYP's broadcast on social media. In preparation, the Project conducted a Kyrgyz Jarany Media Awareness Training for 80 national/regional journalists and government press secretaries to better enable them to develop narratives, media products and dissemination for the Kyrgyz Jarany concept and value. In parallel, the Project commissioned the development of a "Kyrgyz Jarany" Board Game. The Board Game for Kyrgyz Jarany and constitutional awareness game was developed, tested and submitted for production in Kyrgyz, Russian and English languages (500 units were in production for eventual distribution to universities, schools and libraries, it was also made [available online to educators and the public](#)).
- 3.2.1-2 Capacities of LSGs—Local Community Charters:** Using the redeveloped template for the Charter of Local Communities (see Sub-Activity 1.2.1), the Project conducted intensive public engagements (i.e. participatory rural appraisals, roadshows, public hearings, etc.) to facilitate the development and adoption of LSG-specific Charters that enabled local authorities to plan peacebuilding/social cohesion activities within socio-economic development plans across all 7 Project LSGs: "The process set a precedent and an atmosphere of trust. It involved local community CSOs as participants for the first time in decision making."³⁹ For example, the new Charter for Osh City adopted in Oct 2023 by the local parliament defines the role of the LSG to help resolve various disagreements and conflicts among members of the local community. The public hearings also acted

³⁸ MoCISYP reported that the public awareness campaign videos had over 1,746,000 Instagram and 346,000 Facebook views.

³⁹ KII K-XPXH.

as a platform for intergroup dialogue and promoted peacebuilding as integral to the ‘social contract’ at the community level.

- **3.2.4 Capacities of LSGs—‘Right-to-participate’ LSG-public dialogues:** In an indirect follow-up to Sub-Activity 1.4.1, the Project trained 176 representatives of LSGs to improve awareness and processes for the ‘right-to-participate’ (public participation in local governance decision-making) and supported the convening of 14 Community-based dialogues (2 in each LSG) involving 845 (27% male, 73% female) community members. The dialogues explored and then focused on a significant community issue contributing to conflict, which included: domestic violence (Osh, Uzgen, Suzak, Balykchy); land relations and management (Nookat); social cohesion through tolerant and equal civic identity, inclusive and accountable governance (Aidarken); and unregulated migration and combating human trafficking (Tokmok).
- **3.4.1 Community Dialogue—Danaker (insider mediator) trainings:** The Project trained 138 local community leaders (40% male, 60% female) as ‘Danaker’ (local mediators) through 2-day ‘inside mediation’ trainings in each of the Project’s 7 target locations. The intention was to ensure that the Project developed the conflict prevention/peacebuilding capacities of local government staff *and* community members. Developing a cadre of community-level ‘insider mediators’ contextualised within a traditional ‘Danaker’ (‘peace maker’) model was felt to be especially important in communities where more formal dispute resolution mechanisms did not appear to exist at the local level. It is not clear if and how this cadre was subsequently linked-up with other local I4P elements, though some anecdotes were given of how Danaker trainees have since contributed to mediating and prevention neighborhood-level disputes and conflicts.
- **3.4.2 Community Dialogue—Rights of youth with disabilities:** The Project supported the NGO Equality to organise a series of three ‘Human Rights and Advocacy Schools for Young People with Disabilities’ involving 20 youth with disabilities. As part of the process, participating youth conducted local discrimination case studies, which were then used as the basis for launching 15 litigation cases (carried out by the Centre for Strategic Litigation) and additional governmental awareness initiatives that resolved numerous local PwD discrimination and accessibility violations. The objective was to begin developing a cohort of youth as potential future leaders of PwD rights movements.
- **3.4.3-4 Community Dialogue—UPSHIFT youth participation and peacebuilding:** The youth-focused UPSHIFT methodology (locally referred to as “Jaratman Jashtar”, meaning ‘Creative Youth’) was implemented in all 7 Project target LSGs, engaging and training 192 youth (30% male, 70% female) on human-centred design to identify issues related to tolerance, diversity, conflict prevention and peacebuilding. Participating youth identified and developed 42 community initiatives to address conflict and social cohesion issues, 27 of which were funded and implemented through the Project (including with an additional USD 5,000 in financial and material support from LSGs) and reportedly involved more than 6,000 youth. Projects addressed issues such as: decreasing school bullying and student conflicts; creating an interactive ‘Antikafé’ and other debate clubs/competitions to develop critical thinking skills; establishing a sewing room and lessons for students; expanding first aid and disaster preparedness among students and schools; creating young journalists cabinets/clubs and conducting trainings for media literacy/fact-checking; taking action on various ecological/environmental issues; training for teachers in digital skills and adolescent psychology awareness to foster more innovative and effective learning environments; etc. Financial support for implementing the remaining 15 solutions was provided by LSGs and KOICA. In addition, UPSHIFT identified the need for implemented additional capacity development activities. This included training 290 youth in peacebuilding skills and training 294 parents in better supporting adolescent mental health, both as a means to change behaviour at a community-level to foster social cohesion. The

implementing partner suggested that perhaps up to 70% of UPSHIFT youth participants came from vulnerable backgrounds (i.e. youth with disabilities, children of migrants, families with socio-economically difficult situations, etc.).⁴⁰

- **3.5.1 Promote Tolerance (training modules for local peace mechanisms)—Anti-Hate Speech E-Manual:** The Project funded the development, testing and publication of the E-manual “[From Hate Speech to Nonviolent Communication](#)”, which describes manifestations of hate speech, analyses the ethical aspects of using forms of hate speech in the media space and recommends how to transform hate speech into non-violent communication.
- **3.5.1 Promote Tolerance (training modules for local peace mechanisms)—Anti-Hate Speech online training, ToT, hackathon:** The Project funded the “Sozdun kuchu” project for combating hate speech to create a safe and inclusive information ecosystem (particularly focused on online sexism, misogyny and cyber violence). This included: i.) the development, testing and publishing of the online training course “[From Hate Speech to Nonviolent Communication. How?](#)”; ii.) a 3-day training-of-trainers for 52 youth participants (27% male, 73% female) in Naryn and Osh to teach non-violent communication tools to their peers; and iii.) a hackathon for technological solutions to hate speech involving 55 participants who developed 11 project concepts.
- **3.5.1 Promote Tolerance (training modules for local peace mechanisms)—ARTurduuluk (art diversity):** The Project funded the Osh Regional Museum of Fine Arts to develop and implement the creative laboratory “ARTurduuluk” (art diversity), 64 participants (61% male, 39% female) undertaking multi-cultural art-focused study-visits and producing an Exhibition Catalogue to promote Kyrgyz Jarany Concept goals and objectives through fine art.
- **3.5.2 Promote Tolerance—School curricula ‘formation of Kyrgyz Jarany’:** The Project supported the development of new school curricula (“Formation of Kyrgyz Jarany”) teaching the values of civic identity, human rights, diversity and tolerance. Two teacher Manuals were developed, tested and approved by the Kyrgyz Academy of Education. The Manuals are now awaiting official adoption and integration into the country’s school curriculum by the government (expected Sep 2024). The Manuals comprise 12 primary-school lessons and 30 intermediate/secondary-school lessons and have been published in Kyrgyz, Russian and Uzbek. Developed by 12 authors, the Manuals were trialed by schools in five target locations and two teacher trainings were conducted (one in the South and one in the North) on the new curricula involving 50 teachers.
- **3.5.3, 3.6.1-3 Promote Tolerance—Pre-school curricula ‘Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity and multi-lingual education’:** The Project supported the development, testing and publication of two pre-school level curricula promoting Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity and multi-lingual education: i.) “Multilingual education in childhood”; ii.) “Peace and Social Cohesion in Early Childhood Development”. The curricula were tested and deployed by 194 early childhood workers (i.e. librarians) trained in the new curricula at 95 Early Child Development (ECD) Centers (based in MoCISYP or locally funded community libraries) in the Project’s 7 target LSGs. The curricula promote inclusive ECD services and non-discrimination of children by gender, ethnicity, language, special needs and other criteria, with ECD Centres providing pre-school services for 4 to 6 hours per week (2-3 hour sessions, offered 2 to 3 times per week). A total of 3,553 children (42% male, 58% female, 2% children with disabilities) and over 5000 parents in the Project’s 7 target LSGs are estimated to have participated in and benefited from the new curricula aiming to transform behavior and foster social cohesion.

⁴⁰ KII K-RVMG.

- **3.6.4 Promote Tolerance—Early childhood development—communication and C4D materials:** In addition to the new pre-school curricula and training of ECD Centre librarians, the Project developed and provided ECD Centres with communications support materials for implementing the curricula, including: three video clips on diversity (gender, disability and ethnicity); dolls of different genders and nationalities to demonstrate lessons; the digital application ‘Bebbo’ enabling parents to access early childhood development materials online; and educational/visual materials and aids for multilingual learning (e.g. bilingual talking wall, baby books, cards, etc.).
- **3.6.5 Promote Tolerance—Early childhood development—ECD material and equipment:** The Project also equipped all participating ECD Centres with air conditioning and carpets so the Centres could stay open during the winter, as well as provided age-appropriate toys, games and books to create a favorable and welcoming learning environment.

52. Output 3 Sub-Activities not implemented in the end were:

- **3.2.3, 3.3.1-2 Capacities of LSGs/Local Plans—Develop, approve, fund and implement LSG social cohesion action plans:** Due to delays during the inception phases of the Project, processes to develop, approve and then fund and implement social cohesion development plans with LSGs were not fully completed by Project end. UNDP communicated to the Evaluation that it intends to use funds from its other ongoing PBF Project⁴¹ to follow through with these Project commitments in the coming year.
- **3.4.5 Community Dialogue—Youth visioning exercise to promote dialogue (i.e. “peacebuilding digital diary”):** The Project did not implement this component in the end.

2.3.2 To what extent did the Project strengthen the capacities of i.) governmental stakeholders (duty bearers) and ii.) civil society and local communities (rights-holders)?

53. The Project focused on interventions that strengthened the capacities of both governmental and civil society/community actors, especially for enhancing interactions between these two groups of stakeholders. The Project had several ongoing and impending policy/institutional capacity successes, such as the: passage of new laws (i.e. Law on Youth, amended LSG Law); adoption and application of new LSG instruments (i.e. Local Community Charters, YCFLG); development of innovative new curricula (i.e. at MoIA and for national pre-school, primary and intermediate/secondary schools); new and enhanced MoCISYP and SCRA EWER monitoring tools and systems, etc.

54. The Project invested heavily in ‘software’ capacities—exposure, training and enhancement of key skills and technical knowledge—for both governmental and civil society/community stakeholders, including: innovative new EWER monitoring/analysis methods and approaches; new methods and approaches for participatory local governance, dialogue and problem/solution identification; new skills and methods for local conflict prevention, peacebuilding, mediation, diversity/tolerance; leadership and self-reflection skills; various new skills for research, data collection and surveying; etc. The Project especially promoted new uses of innovative curricula development and pedagogical approaches, emphasising learning strategies, participatory and interactive methods and values-based approaches as opposed to traditional ‘lecture’, ‘rote’ and ‘Soviet’ style approaches.

⁴¹ PBF/KGZ/B-8: Strengthening national capacities for conflict prevention and peacebuilding: Meaningful civil society engagement for trust-building and social cohesion—UNDP, UNESCO (Jan 2023-Jan 2026).

55. Importantly, the Project involved a very wide cross-section of governmental and civil society/community actors at both the national and local levels in capacity development. Leveraging the three RUNOs' existing relationships, the Project had quite good penetration across multiple parts of government. The Project engaged and supported the capacities of parliamentarians and multiple national ministries and agencies, such as the Presidential Administration, MoCISYP, MoIA, MoES, MoLSSM, SACLSG, SCRA, and the Ombudsperson's Office. At the local level, the Project engaged with Mayors, Deputy Mayors, LSG social development offices, teachers, school principals, social pedagogues, PRCs, police, local libraries and librarians, etc. The Project involved a wide range of academic bodies (including NISS, Osh State University, International University of Central Asia, Kyrgyz-Uzbek University, Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University), experts and NGOs in developing new advocacy, policy advice, research and capacity development materials, often pushing these partners into new issues and new methods. For the most part, the Evaluation observed a strong sense of ownership and leadership among national stakeholders over Project implementation and capacity development.

56. The Project developed capacities for a broad a range of local civil society and community members in target locations, though establishing a balance between 'official' and 'non-official' civil society is challenging in the local context of the Kyrgyz Republic. At the local level, it appears as though many civil society/community stakeholders involved in the Project came from 'official' state-recognised bodies, such as Women's Councils, Youth Committees, Elders' Courts, neighborhood committees, etc. (and were frequently former civil servants). The Project also involved many CSO representatives, 'non-official' community stakeholders, parents, etc., the expansion of which should be a priority for any future interventions—including the need to more greatly involve and develop the capacities of marginal and vulnerable stakeholders (i.e. the 'invisible', 'marginalised' and 'stigmatised'). Youth outreach and capacity development were central objectives well achieved by the Project but which also experienced two big challenges—it was suggested that new and greater efforts are needed to better involve 'disorganised' youth and to better ensure greater retention of youth participants throughout the whole cycle. As youth participants aged, many 'grew out' of the Project as they 'got on' with their lives, such as going away to university, getting married, moving away for work, etc.

57. At the macro-level, the Project provided a step forward towards institutionalising a comprehensive national EWER/I4P system. From what can be observed, the Interdepartmental Commission for the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept has not yet fully 'operationalised' the joining-up of existing multifarious I4P strands into one 'system'. While significant new technical capacities were developed for EWER monitoring and analysis, the Evaluation cannot determine the difference this has substantively made to central governmental prevention capacities. Impacts of the MoCISYP's and SCRA's monitoring on the rest of the executive (especially the Presidential Administration) are opaque from the outside apart from some unconfirmed anecdotes. Multiple interviewed stakeholders also noted that just because new instruments (i.e. law, policy, etc.) are 'approved' does not mean that they will be meaningfully implemented. While such instruments provide the necessary regulatory framework for action, many stakeholders suggested that such instruments are frequently implemented as 'tick box' exercises. In other cases, the improvement of instruments was not followed by investment in the capacity development of relevant staff to actually implement the instrument.

58. The Project would have benefitted from systematically capturing and assessing the degree to which its training and other capacity development activities concretely resulted in new and strengthened capacities, and how these capacities were then applied. With a few exceptions⁴², the

⁴² Such as Youth of Osh implementing UPSHIFT and IDEA Central Asia implementing anti-hate speech training-of trainers.

Project did not conduct pre-/post-assessments to measure the impact of capacity development activities (i.e. trainings, workshops, etc.). Many were ‘one-off’ events, aimed either at informing and discussing certain topics or gaining new knowledge and skills. For example, the Danaker (insider mediation) trainings (Sub-Activity 3.4.1) were seen as novel and greatly beneficial by participants; however, after the trainings, the Project was generally unaware of how that new knowledge was then applied and converted into actual local conflict prevention in target locations. As another example, it was not clear how training Women’s Councils and Youth Committees in human rights, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, diversity, tolerance and the right-to-participate (Sub-Activity 1.4.1) translated into a specific applications or results (though some participants were later involved in ‘right-to-participate’ LSG-public dialogues for Sub-Activity 3.2.4).

2.3.3 To what extent did national- and local-level stakeholders perceive the Project’s support as beneficial/useful?

59. The Evaluation consistently heard from national stakeholders that the Project’s support was beneficial and useful. While the Project had its share of challenges and frustrations with some aspects of implementation were expressed by some national stakeholders, interviews suggest that Project activities were much appreciated by stakeholders. The capacity building components of the project received largely positive feedback: participants highlighted the novelty of many subjects, concepts and approaches, but also the relevance and importance of them. For example, Kyrgyz Jarany as *civic* identity was not something self-explanatory, and the discussion of the concept was a discovery for many. Similarly, UPSHIFT youth participants were nearly unanimous on how strong a boost they received in terms of personal development, new perspectives and exposure to civic activism. Government stakeholders appreciated the innovative training methodologies, the importance of the subjects/issue areas and the alignment of Project objectives/activities with government priorities. Some government stakeholders especially appreciated the Project’s support to closer dialogue between LSGs and local communities. However, there were some critical perspectives that the Project could have produced more ‘concrete’ benefits: “The UN is over focused on quasi-technical assistance [...] They need to reboot their thinking and paradigm.”⁴³ Civil society and local community stakeholders stressed immense impact of the activities on personal and professional development, from boosting self-confidence and public speaking skills to gaining new competences such as public participation, conflict resolution, analysis and insider mediation.

2.3.4 Were there any unintended/indirect positive and/or negative results of the Project?

60. The Evaluation did not detect any specific instances in which the Project was the cause of unintended negative impacts, such as contributing to conflict, violence or human rights violations. While some stakeholders were concerned that enhanced governmental EWER monitoring/analysis capacities could be potentially used by security services to surveil and/or suppress identifiable groups, no stakeholders could point to any such situations occurring. Some stakeholders highlighted that an over-reliance on Russian language experts, trainers and material created some discomfort and frustration by non-Russian speaking participants in the Project’s activities, especially in rural areas. Some LSG officials expressed concerns that project activities, such as public dialogue platforms or baseline/endline surveys, had raised ‘unsolvable’ and ‘potentially conflict-inducing’ issues; however, there was no evidence that Project public dialogue and surveying activities caused any such issues.

61. Clarity on and acceptance of the Kyrgyz Jarany ‘civic identity’ Concept among direct Project participants was sometimes initially a source of tension but was generally resolved and strengthened

⁴³ KII K-DJDH.

during Project activities. One inherent challenge of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept is its outward ambiguity in distinguishing between *civic* and *ethnic* identity. The document emphasises that "Kyrgyz" in Kyrgyz Jarany refers to *citizens* of the country, the Kyrgyz Republic. However, "Kyrgyz" is also the name of the majority *ethnic* group in the country. The Evaluation heard of multiple instances where the dual understanding of "Kyrgyz" initially caused disagreements among participants. The Project's focus on highlighting the *civic* identity and the *diversity* aspects of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, along with knowledgeable expert inputs about the differences between civic and ethnic identities, helped alleviate tensions. This approach contributed to alleviating misconceptions about the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept at least among direct Project participants, though wider public understandings of the Concept cannot be determined by the Evaluation.

2.3.5 To what extent did Project results contribute to gender equality?

62. The Project clearly promoted gender equality values and approaches in all of its work. The integration of gender equality in Project activities was not only a desired element but central to the spirit and goals of the Project. Women and girls have long been a marginalized/vulnerable group when it comes to inclusive governance. In aspects where the Project was able to select implementing partners and participants, the Project generally achieved or exceeded targets for female participation as a means for 'overcompensating' for societal norms that generally prioritise the participation of men. The Project purposefully sought over-representation of women and girls in most activities as a means for 'evening up' investments in women's and girls' capacities and priorities. The Project also actively promoted women and girls to assume leadership roles in trainings, consultations, dialogues, problem identification, local projects/initiatives, etc., allowing them to engage directly with local leaders and community members. A few standout examples included:

- **Sub-Activity 1.4.1:** 122 representatives from Women's Councils were specifically trained in human rights, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, diversity, tolerance and right-to-participate;
- **Sub-Activities 2.1.6-9:** 57% of the 4,050 'U-Reporters' collecting youth polling data were female;
- **Sub-Activity 3.2.4:** 73% of the 845 public participants in the 14 'Right-to-participate' LSG-public dialogues were female;
- **Sub-Activity 3.4.1:** 60% of the 138 participants in the Danaker (insider mediator) trainings were female;
- **Sub-Activity 3.4.3:** 70% of the 192 youth UPSHIFT participants were female;
- **Sub-Activity 3.5.1:** 73% of the 52 youth participants in the anti-hate speech ToT were female;
- **Sub-Activity 3.6.3:** 58% of the 3,553 child participants in the pre-school curricula on Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity and multi-lingual education were female.

There are components of the Project where stakeholders are clearly male-dominated; however, these are generally government stakeholders where participant selection is beyond the Project's control. For example, all MoCISYP PRC Executive Secretaries and all high-ranking LSG representatives (i.e. Deputy Mayors) that the Evaluation team met were men. Despite such circumstances, the Project still made efforts to broaden women's participation. For example, while the Project did not have a choice over the selection of all-male PRC Executive Secretaries, 38% of participants in the Project's LSG-level EWER seminars were female.

2.3.6 What factors influenced the achievement or non-achievement of Project results?

63. Certain dynamics increased effective Project implementation and made the achievement of results more likely. Though not exhaustive list, these included:

- **Positioning the Project in support of a high-level policy priority of the Government.** Some diverging expectations between the Project and the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept contributed to some challenges. However, positioning the Project in support of the priority Concept created opportunities for greater responsiveness and proactive engagement of government partners with Project activities, both at the national and LSG levels.
- **A relatively high quality of local implementing partners.** The Project engaged a large range of national and local implementing partners, from non-profits operating in niche areas such as PwDs, youth and LSG development to research organizations to individual consultants. The Evaluation found this broad array of stakeholders to be competent and respected by primary beneficiaries. There were instances when some implementing partners or trainers did not meet the expectations of some participants or had to adapt significantly in their approaches. But the overall picture suggests that the Project’s implementing partners were up to the challenges and possessed a high level of integrity and motivation in support of the Project’s goals.
- **International attention to and engagement with local-level stakeholders.** Many stakeholders at the local-level highlighted the significant ‘boost’ they felt having been acknowledged and supported by international partners (i.e. the UN). The introduction of new perspective, skills, ways of working were very welcomed. Perhaps most importantly, international engagement and solidarity increased the personal motivation and investment of many local-level participants, adding to greater implementation effectiveness: “CSOs working under the name of the [UN] creates trust and credibility. It helps build them up.”⁴⁴ Many stakeholders remarked how they remain keen in taking up new knowledge, new projects and a new sense of activism because of the Project’s ‘international attention’ to their local situation.

64. Certain dynamics strained effective implementation, including:

- **Challenges in balancing logistical convenience with the need for inclusive engagement:** Though not widespread, the Evaluation heard examples where the Project prioritised more convenient approaches (i.e. involving ‘usual suspects’ repeatedly in project events, selecting logistically ‘easier’ locations, facilitating ‘rushed’ and ‘performative’ consultations, etc.) ahead of taking the extra time, doing the extra ‘homework’ and making the extra efforts needed to achieve more substantive results. This was usually a consequence of responding to delays and ‘rushing to catch-up’ and meet tight project timelines. However, it meant that certain aspects of the Project were unable to maximise engaging the most marginalised stakeholders, impacting all ‘invisible’ challenges contributing to societal tensions and deepening stakeholder consultation on certain legislation, policies and processes. It also led to certain levels of ‘project fatigue’ among some stakeholders in some locations.
- **Use of Russian during trainings and other activities involving non-Russian speaking participants.** It was highlighted to the Evaluation that relying on the Russian language during the implementation of trainings and other activities (especially in the South) was inconvenient for non-Russian speakers, many of whom felt uncomfortable to speak-up and draw attention to the problem. However, it was also an issue of misalignment between ‘what you say and what you do’, since the Kyrgyz Jarany prioritises promoting Kyrgyz as the state language and the policy of multilingualism: “How can we speak about Kyrgyz Jarany [...] but then not use Kyrgyz in this event?”⁴⁵ This is a persistent issue for ‘Bishkek-centric’ development organisations that primarily use Russian in their everyday work.

⁴⁴ KII K-XPUM.

⁴⁵ KII K-MOOW.

- **Challenging two-year timeframe to achieve activities, outputs and results further compounded by delays caused by an extended ‘inception’ phase at the start of the Project.** The Project's planned two-year duration was already very short for an intervention of its intended scope and results. Challenges of this short timeframe were significantly compounded by the delayed start of most activities. As some key project activities did not fully begin until 2023 (especially under Outputs 1 and 2), this put substantial strain on the planning and pace of implementation.
- **Significant unanticipated changes in government structures and staff:** During Project design and implementation, some Project-related government structures changed and responsibilities transferred to different bodies. During these processes, some key points of contact were lost and focal points changed (multiple times in some cases), challenging the ability to maintain consensus and progress on planned activities. One RUNO had to engage with four different ministers for the MOLSSM since the beginning of Project design.⁴⁶ At the local-level, stakeholders also repeatedly highlighted the impacts that high rates of turn-over of LSG staff and representatives had on effective implementation, continuity and impact. For example, one target LSG had three mayors over the course of the Project.
- **Shrinking civic spaces and progress on rights.** Many stakeholders observed a changing political landscape, and the greater prominence of populist rhetoric juxtaposed to the priorities of civil society and the international development community. National commitments to rights, including freedom of expression and views opposed to government policies, were described as diminishing. As an illustration, it has been suggested that resistance to the draft bill on equality and non-discrimination was related to strong association of non-discrimination as a proxy for ‘Western’ support for equal LGBTQ+ rights.⁴⁷ Many stakeholders told the Evaluation that the adoption of the so-called ‘foreign agent’ law in 2024 has already made civil society actors and human rights activists hesitant to freely express themselves.⁴⁸ Many stakeholders felt that this general political context made headway on some of the Project’s objectives (particularly its rights-based and inclusion agendas) more difficult and potentially diminished the levels of interest and participation in project activities by civil society.

2.3.7 To what extent were Project strategies and approaches innovative in achieving results?

65. The Project employed some innovative methods for awareness raising, learning and curricula development. The development of a table-top game on Kyrgyz Jarany and the ARTurduuluk (art diversity) initiatives were small but ‘out-of-the-box’ efforts to engage different types of stakeholders in novel and distinct ways. The emphasis on personal development, practical and interactive exercises, simulations, games and local initiatives to test new skills were useful innovations relative to more traditional lecture-styles of training and education. Much of the curricula developed through the Project utilised collaborative cross-organisational, multi-disciplinary and gender-balanced processes. Bringing together diverse expertise and perspectives increased opportunities for common understanding, innovation and unexpected solutions.

66. At the level of project design, the Project’s expansive scope and synergies between ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ modes of intervention were innovative. As indicated by its title, the Project had an

⁴⁶ New MolSSM ministers were appointed in Jun 2024, Sep 2023 and Oct 2021.

⁴⁷ KII K-YRQV. Also see: 24.kg. "Protection Against Discrimination: A Deputy Believes That the Law May Be Used by LGBT" [[Zaschita ot diskriminatsii: Deputat schitaet, chto zakonom mogut vospol'zovat'sya LGBT](#)]. 25 Dec 2023.

⁴⁸ Media.kg. "The Soros Foundation Is Leaving Kyrgyzstan: What Will Happen to Other NGOs?" [[Fond Sorosa ukhodit iz Kyrgyzstana: Chto budet s drugimi NKO?](#)]. 24 Apr 2024. For background, see DW. "An Analogue of the Foreign Agents Law: What Threatens NGOs in Kyrgyzstan" [[Analog zakona ob inoagentakh: Chto grozit NKO v Kyrgyzstane](#)]. 6 Oct 2023.

extremely broad scope, ranging from curriculum development for ECD Centres to creating teaching manuals for schools and universities, and promoting EWER instruments for senior decision-makers. It also combined upstream and downstream modes of implementation simultaneously. For example, the Project effectively combined policy and legislative work at the national level with implementation of policy instruments, capacity building and/or multistakeholder participation at the local level. New national-level curricula were grounded in testing and consultation with teachers and ECD Centre librarians before being readied for national adoption and rollout. The application of newly developed Local Community Charters and YCFLG requirements were trialed through new inclusive public-LSG participation capacities and methods. Fifty UPSHIFT and YCFLG participants elevated local priorities to the national stage by participating in the government's "Kyialymdagy Kyrgyzstan" youth forum held on 28 Nov 2023 in Bishkek and delivering messages on key youth issues directly to the President. With an expanded toolkit and skills, EWER monitors promoted vertical I4P responses while also often acting as a horizontal bridge among local I4P responders. Such breadth of scope and modes, coupled with limited resources and time, meant that the Project faced considerable challenges in achieving some of its objectives. Nonetheless, the Project's comprehensive approach could also be viewed as a legitimate response to common critiques that such initiatives often address only isolated aspects of problems while neglecting the broader context.

2.3.8 Were timely corrective actions taken when necessary during the course of the Project?

67. The Project did sometimes take corrective measures when faced with implementation challenges. The Project had significantly ambitious and challenging objectives to achieve within a short two year timeline; therefore, it was not unexpected that it faced implementation challenges. For the most part, individual RUNOs took responsibility for managing corrections and adapting implementation with specific implementation partners in the face of challenges. Good examples where the Project responded to challenges and changed circumstances with useful adaptations included:

- **Sub-Activity 1.1.1—Operationalising the IMCM:** The Project faced significant challenges to establish a fully operational Interdepartmental Commission for the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept as the central national I4P platform. This included challenges of promoting coherence among multiple other overlapping government policies/initiatives and the reshuffling and reduction in the structure/staffing of key government bodies, which impacted on the Project's ability to meaningfully engage and support national counterparts to promote and join-up I4P at the central level. After time, the Project pivoted by responding to feedback and a government request to develop an Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion as the best adaptive course of action to reinvigorate the Project's original objectives under Output 1.
- **Sub-Activities 1.2.1, 1.2.3, 1.2.4—Passage of new/amended legislation for LSGs, PwD and Right to Equality and Protection from Discrimination:** The Project encountered delays in legislative processes to which it provided design and consultation support. Supporting the drafting and passage of four laws within a two-year project was perhaps overly ambitious, especially when some of these legislative processes had already been ongoing for several years. While the PwD and Right to Equality and Protection from Discrimination bills encountered delays at the ministerial level and by a change of the Ombudsperson, the Project pivoted and adapted by engaging and supporting parliamentarians to maintain forward momentum so the processes have continued beyond the end of the Project.
- **Sub-Activity 1.6.1—SACSLSG internships for young professionals from minority communities:** Legislative changes in the area of recruitment to the state and municipal services effectively blocked the ability of the Project to implement its envisioned internship programme. While the Project was unable to implement this component in the end, the Project made numerous attempts to make the

programme work under new legislative circumstances and proposed adaptations trying to overcome encountered difficulties.

- **Sub-Activity 2.1.3—SCRA monitoring/analysing indicators of social tensions in the religious sphere:** Processes to build the EWER monitoring/analysis capacities of the SCRA experienced challenges during the design and testing phases. First attempts developed a very sophisticated indicator and data matrix; however, this overwhelmed SCRA regional representatives due to the complicated structure of the matrix and a mismatch between staff competences and competences necessary to fill-in the matrix. The indicators and whole approach were revisited and redeveloped to be integrated into the MoCISYP's EWER monitoring system (i.e. Form 2), though formal approval is still pending.⁴⁹
- **Sub-Activity 2.1.4—Material assistance to MoCISYP's EWER data processing centre:** The Project responded well to emerging internal analysis that increasing hardware/software capacities for EWER data processing was, in fact, not a top priority or best use of resources. Therefore, the Project adapted this component to support a MoCISYP request to establish 6 additional PRCs by providing material assistance to each (i.e. laptop, printer and some basic office furniture).
- **Sub-Activities 3.2.3, 3.3.1-2—LSG social cohesion action plans:** Due to delays during the inception phases of the first 6-12 months of the Project, the Project was unable to develop and put in place the processes for supporting LSGs to develop and implement social cohesion action plans (which would also dovetail with the proposed Integrated National Social Cohesion Action Plan) before the end of the Project. However, the Project has made provisions for this component to be taken up and financed by the parallel PBF project "PBF/KGZ/B-8".⁵⁰

2.3.9 How did integration of gender equality advance Project effectiveness and results?

68. Observations during the Evaluation suggest two potential ways in which Project effectiveness was advanced because of the prioritization and integration of gender-equality. Firstly, the high participation of women and girls ensured that a much wider spectrum of key local conflict prevention and peacebuilding issues were identified through various Project activities. For example, this included the prioritisation of domestic violence during LSG-public dialogues and follow-on initiatives and approaches to tackle misogynistic hate speech through gender aware non-violent communications approaches. It is likely that these significant issues and approaches would have remained 'invisible' if women and girls were not adequately represented throughout most Project activities.

69. Secondly, Evaluation field interviews suggested that women and girls in certain rural areas are under growing pressure to withdraw from various forms of public participation, including even playing with other children on the street, or wearing certain clothing when in public. In this light, prioritising the participation of women and girls in Project activities and capacity development (such as mediation training, dialogue platforms and youth UPSHIFT training) not only supported Project objectives *per se* but generally helped maintain and enhance the presence and participation of women and girls in public spaces and processes in places where they are under pressure.

2.3.10 How did integration of human rights advance Project effectiveness and results?

⁴⁹ KII K-KAHA.

⁵⁰ "PBF/KGZ/B-8: Strengthening national capacities for conflict prevention and peacebuilding: Meaningful civil society engagement for trust-building and social cohesion—UNDP, UNESCO (Jan 2023-Jan 2026).

70. Project effectiveness and results faced some headwinds due to the significant rights-based components and goals of the Project. Two major pieces of rights legislation continue to face complicated paths. However, the Project remained persistent in upholding human rights principles and values. Despite challenges, it prioritised meaningful progress over superficial completion, refusing to compromise on core human rights commitments for the sake of merely finishing project components. It was suggested that grounding the Project within an international/national human rights framework also mitigated potential perceptions that the Project was appropriated by ‘political’ priorities and agendas.

2.3.11 How did integration of conflict sensitivity and do-no-harm advance Project effectiveness and results?

71. The Project can be described as having general awareness of CS/DNH but it implemented few concrete CS/DNH measures. Such general awareness supported RUNOs to generally navigate the political context and national stakeholders; however, there is no evidence that the Project made significant adjustments to improve effectiveness and results as a consequence of any specific CS/DNH measures.

2.4 Impact and Sustainability: What differences did the Project make? Will the benefits last?

72. In Section 2.4, the Evaluation takes a holistic view of assessing Project impact and sustainability based on the Evaluation’s key lines of enquiry and questions. The Evaluation combines its findings on these two criteria because of the deeply inter-related nature of the requested Evaluation questions for these two criteria—it is difficult to look at impact without also examining whether it will be sustained. Higher-level conclusions and recommendations based on these findings are presented in Section 3.

73. **The metrics selected by the Project to assess its contribution to its stated Outcome were not ideally suited for measuring Project impact and their achievement—or not—should be interpreted cautiously.** Consequently, changes in these metrics do not constitute robust or meaningful findings for determining Project ‘success’ or ‘failure’. Important caveats should be noted when assessing the Project’s impact and sustainability:

- **Project cannot establish reasonable causality for Outcome Indicators 1.a and 1.b:** Both the Fragile States Index (FSI) and National Trust Index (NTI) are influenced by multiple factors that likely overshadow the Project’s contribution, limiting their utility as key measurable indicators of the Project’s Outcome impact. Additionally, these indices are national in scope, while the Project predominantly focused on only 7 out of over 480 LSGs in the country (roughly only 8% of the national population). It is unrealistic for the Project to directly attribute causality for such changes.
- **Unrealistic and arbitrary expectations of change for a two-year Project:** The deeper changes envisioned by the Project’s Outcome statement (“a greater sense of shared and inclusive civic identity and trust”) are realistically only the result of long-term processes. With the Baseline/Endline Surveys being implemented just over a year apart, the Project also had little chance to register its contribution to such significant social changes. Lastly, the approach to determining Outcome Indicator performance targets (e.g., ‘increase of 20%’) appears arbitrary.

- **Inherent limitations of determining medium- to long-term impact and sustainability immediately after Project closure:** The Evaluation has only been able to identify impacts and sustainability immediate apparent as of Jun 2024. The Project and Evaluation can only speculate on what impacts and sustainability might be expected in the medium- to long-term after the Project based on current evidence, assumptions and feedback.

2.4.1 What measurable changes occurred in the Project’s higher-level Outcome indicators for greater/enhanced shared civic identity, social cohesion and inclusive governance?

74. Bearing in mind their inherent limitations, the Project’s Outcome Indicators exhibited positive measurable changes by the end of implementation:

- **Outcome Indicator 1.a:** The FSI for the Kyrgyz Republic decreased from 76.4 to 74.9 (i.e. became less fragile) but did not reach the Project’s target of decreasing to 74.
- **Outcome Indicator 1.b:** The NTI for LSGs increased by 0.5% but did not reach the Project’s target of a 1.8% increase.
- **Outcome Indicator 1.c:** A sense of shared civic identity and trust increased by 6.4% in target locations but did not reach the Project’s target of a 20% increase.

Table 8: Quick reference summary of Outcome Indicator Results		
Outcome 1: A greater sense of shared and inclusive civic identity and trust enhanced through inter-group dialogue, inclusive and accountable governance and stronger capacities for prevention and peacebuilding		
OUTPUT INDICATOR	PROJECT END (as of Jun 2024)	
	ACTUAL	TARGET
Outcome Indicator 1.a Fragile States Index (FSI) for the Kyrgyz Republic ⁵¹	2021: 76.4 2022: 77.1 2023: 75.6 2024: 74.9	Baseline: 76.4 (2022) Target: 74 (2023)
Outcome Indicator 1.b National Trust Index (NTI) ⁵² for LSGs ⁵³	2021 2nd Half: 51.7% 2022 1 st Half: 48.7% 2022 2 nd Half: 51.7% 2023 2 nd Half: 49.7% 2024 1st Half: 52.2% <i>(increase of 0.5%)</i>	Baseline: 43.2% (2021 1 st Half) Target: 45.0% (2023) <i>Increase of 1.8%</i>
Outcome Indicator 1.c A sense of shared civic identity and trust increased in target locations ⁵⁴	2022: 43.9% 2024: 50.3% <i>(increase of 6.4%)</i>	Baseline: TBD Target: 20% increase in target locations

⁵¹ FSI data sourced from the [Fragile States Index](#) (last accessed 28 Aug 2024).

⁵² NTI data sourced from the [National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic](#) (last accessed 28 Aug 2024).

⁵³ Specifically, the composite NTI for “Executive bodies of local self-government of cities of regional, district significance and village aimaks”.

⁵⁴ Data from Project Endline Survey Study Report, p.7.

75. Other measurable indicators of shared civic identity, social cohesion and inclusive governance across Project target locations showed varied changes by the end of implementation⁵⁵:

- Percentage of people sharing the goals and objectives of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept among those who are familiar with the Concept in Project target locations **increased (+60.7%)** to 86.9% from a baseline of 26.3% (more than a threefold increase).
- Measurable horizontal inter-group trust in Project target locations **decreased (-0.25 points)** to 3.84 from a baseline of 4.09 (1 indicates a low level of trust and 5 indicates a high level of trust).
- Measurable horizontal intra-group trust in Project target locations **increased (+0.08 points)** to 3.92 from a baseline of 3.84 (1 indicates a low level of trust and 5 indicates a high level of trust).
- Measurable vertical trust in government agencies and authorities in Project target locations **increased (+0.33 points)** to 4.14 from a baseline of 3.81 (1 indicates a low level of trust and 5 indicates a high level of trust).
- Measurable satisfaction of interaction with local authorities in Project target locations **increased (+0.08 points)** to 3.45 from a baseline of 3.37 (1 indicates a low level of satisfactory interaction and 5 indicates a high level of satisfactory interaction).
- Measurable importance of civic identity and involvement in governance in Project target locations **decreased (-0.37 points)** to 4.15 from a baseline of 4.52 (1 indicates a low level of importance and 5 indicates a high level of importance).

2.4.2 To what extent were the Project's net benefits already evident and demonstrating continuation? (i.e. 'actual' impact and sustainability)

76. The Evaluation suggests that the Project made immediately impactful contributions, including:

- **Sub-Activity 3.4.2—Strategic litigation succeeded in five accessibility and rights violations cases led by youth with disabilities:** Participants in the Human Rights and Advocacy Schools for Young People with Disabilities identified and researched numerous local situations of rights violations, such as the lack of accessible toilets, building entrances and transportation systems across key public infrastructure. From these, the Centre for Strategic Litigation launched 15 cases, winning 5 of these to-date (results of other cases are pending). The successful evidence-based strategic litigation not only resulted in compensation payouts and important infrastructure changes that improved access for people with disabilities. The cases also resulted in substantive engagement, awareness raising, trainings and new procedures among defendants (including government bodies) on the rights and needs of people with disabilities and their obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. It was suggested that the combination of litigation, negotiation and awareness raising was especially powerful: “Advocacy is important. However, [...] lawsuits create a different legal and psychological pressure” and leverage that cannot be ignored.⁵⁶ Youth with disabilities participated in all aspects of the cases, gaining direct knowledge and valuable experience of how to make the sorts of changes needed to build a more inclusive and tolerant society.
- **Sub-Activities 3.4.3-5—UPSHIFT youth participation and initiatives:** The 27 UPSHIFT community initiatives led by youth in collaboration with LSGs (as well as an additional 15 funded through other

⁵⁵ Data from Project Endline Survey Study Report but with control location data stripped out to show results for only Project target locations. The Project did not have specified performance benchmarks for these Baseline/Endline indicators.

⁵⁶ KII K-OZAN.

sources) were largely perceived as innovative, to have addressed a variety of real needs and to have brought some useful benefits to target communities. Though very small scale and some were more immediately impactful and potentially sustainable than others, the initiatives demonstrate credible first experiments by young people as they learn new skills, create new relationships with decision makers and develop capacities to self-organise. Some participants suggested that to have more profound effects, the scale of initiatives and funding would need to increase. Alternatively, some speculated that impact might have been increased if funds were pooled into one common initiative by all participants in cooperation across all locations instead of multiple small projects by sub-groups in multiple locations (though this might have other drawbacks, such as reducing innovation, leadership, etc.). Nevertheless, there is evidence that participating youth are now more active, better networked and have built allyships in their communities. Many participants remain in contact and networked across the country through online modalities (Instagram, Telegram, WhatsApp), as well as sometimes still meet-up locally. It was remarked that youth are now seen as credible and important stakeholders by LSGs: “Two years ago, they just met us and saw us as children. Now they take us seriously.”⁵⁷ One LSG even asked UPSHIFT participants for their research/concept materials for a previous proposal because the city itself is now contemplating such a project.

- **Sub-Activities 3.6.1-3—Pre-school curricula changing skills, mindsets and behavior of children and parents:** Though still waiting final approved and roll-out nationwide, feedback from testing/trial locations demonstrate ongoing results and impact of the new pre-school curricula. Local consultations with families at the outset of the Project identified that discrimination based on language, gender and disabilities were key sources of tension at the local-level and between families and children. The new pre-school curricula implemented through ECD Centres was believed to have created new knowledge and skills among participating children, parents and librarians about non-discrimination, tolerance, non-violent communication and collaborative behaviour. Participating librarians have reported examples of increased cross-gender, ethnicity and linguistic play and more cooperative behaviour among children: “Children who come to [ECD Centres], quickly get along with others, possess good abilities for thinking and understanding.”⁵⁸ However, the focus for impact has not just been pre-school children—parents (mothers *and* fathers) also actively participated in the curricula: “If parents are also onboard, these [values] will be sustained in the home life.”⁵⁹ Participating ECD Centres themselves have started to act as safe spaces and platforms promoting Kyrgyz Jarany, inclusion and social cohesion at the community-level, which is especially important in many small communities and villages where the library is a key community institution and often the only ‘educational’ institution. Many participating librarians have become trusted local advocates and educators on preventing intra-community conflicts, familiarisation with national documents, comprehensive child development, state language and multilingualism, tolerance and respect for the values of diversity.

2.4.3 What might be the most significant, long-term and potentially transformative benefits and effects of the Project? To what extent is it likely these will continue? (i.e. ‘prospective’ impact and sustainability)

77. The Project has successfully delivered many outputs that appear to be on the cusp of creating impact and/or are expected to result in more intangible impact over the medium- to longer-term, but only if they are now subsequently put into use. Most Project stakeholders generally believed that the

⁵⁷ KII K-HLCI.

⁵⁸ UNICEF internal reporting, “ECD Centres – stories and links”, p.2.

⁵⁹ KII K-MXEC.

main impacts of the Project are very much yet still to come. Therefore, assessing for most significant, transformative and long-term impacts is mainly speculative as many will not reveal themselves or be measurable for years from now.⁶⁰ The Evaluation suggests that the Project contributed to developing new capacities, tools and systems that—if stakeholders now put them into action and enable them to flourish—have strong potential for enduring and transformative impacts, even if “progress is piece by piece.”⁶¹ The most significant might be grouped into three categories:

PROSPECTIVE IMPACT: New educational capacities, tools and systems ready for application

78. Project stakeholders invested heavily in developing new national curricula as foundations for adapting law enforcement training and national education systems over the long-term. Sustainability is expected to be high as government possesses its own resources to operationalise the new curricula and educational materials (much of which will be accessible online). Processes to develop these educational tools were strongly led by national actors and locally contextualised rather than simply repackaging international materials. Developers went through significant awareness and preparation training in Kyrgyz Jarany, human rights, conflict prevention, peacebuilding, etc. before developing the curricula. In most cases, actual teachers/instructors were involved in developing and testing curricula and lessons plans rather than ‘outside experts’, so these are more practical and locally contextualised. Therefore, ownership during development was very high and the tools are expected to have high acceptance and application among national users. Many stakeholders suggested that because there is little educational material adapted to the Kyrgyzstan context, this material will be in high demand and teachers will use it. These new materials include:

- **Sub-Activity 1.1.5—New curricula for MoIA and law enforcement education/training:** Implementation of the new curricula is expected to commence in Sep 2024 and will form long-term core components for both MoIA Academy degree programmes and the MoIA Republican Training Centre’s training programmes. If the new curricula are operationalised as planned, some stakeholders expect that that a new generation of law enforcement will be better oriented towards and more effective in preventing/responding to social tensions and local conflict.
- **Sub-Activity 3.5.2 Promote Tolerance—New primary and intermediate/secondary school curricula:** Implementation of the two teacher Manuals is expected to commence in Sep 2024 and will form long-term core educational material for primary, intermediary and secondary students nationwide, potentially reaching over a million students. Development of the Manuals was especially indigenous and participatory and there are indications that teachers and schools already exposed to them are spreading the material further afield. Stakeholders are also positioning the new materials for inclusion of a new nationwide curriculum that is currently under development, expecting Kyrgyz Jarany to be included as a specific school subject in its own right. The Manuals provide an important resource as most teachers face the challenge of not having any ready-made materials for Kyrgyz Jarany education: “Now teachers [will] have a consistent guide and lots of material enabling them to translate Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity and inclusion policy into practical education [and] develop a whole generation under the Kyrgyz Jarany concept.”⁶²
- **Sub-Activities 3.5.3, 3.6.1-2 Promote Tolerance—New pre-school curricula:** While the new curricula have been implemented in 95 ECD Centres, there are currently over 250 such Centres nationwide and a government ‘road map’ plans to open a further 50 Centres (and potentially hundreds more in coming years). The new curricula can be replicated and implemented across all ECD Centres, which

⁶⁰ The Project did not have in place any methods for tracking long-term or transformative impacts.

⁶¹ KII K-JODO.

⁶² KII K-SFQE.

would significantly scale-up the curricula's impact beyond the original Project target locations. Alongside the curricula, the Project also involved and trained district-level head librarians to act as mentors to support continued implementation of the curricula after the Project was completed. The prospective impact is large as ECD Centres expand across in a country where the majority of children do not have access to or cannot go to kindergarten, especially in rural and poor communities. As pointed out by stakeholders, interventions need to be made from early childhood to make enduring change and the curricula provides first educational building. The curricula's focus on multi-lingual education was believed by many to be especially important for a multi-cultural society: "If we can understand each other's languages, then we can prevent and reduce conflict."⁶³ Prospective impact and sustainability are also presumed to increase because implementation of the curricula is planting the seeds for social cohesion, gender equality, tolerance within children and parents. The targeting of parents was also a strategy for sustaining new mindsets and behaviors within families, not just among children. Lastly, the use of LSG/MoCISYP-funded community libraries as ECD Centres was a good sustainability innovation. Using the existing facilities and human capacities of libraries in new ways was more cost effective than building new ECD Centres and running costs are already borne by government. This meant the Project could include more ECD Centres and that government will continue to sustain the ECD Centres after the Project ended. Sustaining further expansion hinges on continued government financing and commitment.

- **Sub-Activities 3.1.1 and 3.5.1—New publicly accessible online education tools:** The Project also developed and produced several additional online educational tools intended to be accessible for the general public (especially youth), including: an online anti-hate speech eManual ([‘From Hate Speech to Nonviolent Communication’](#)); and anti-hate speech Online Course ([‘From Hate Speech to Nonviolent Communication. How?’](#)); and the [‘Kyrgyz Jarany Board Game’](#). These are innovative, interactive and engaging products, well tested among youth audiences. All are publicly accessible and available online. The anti-hate speech manual and courses have also provided a basis for trainings and ‘hackathons’ conducted by implementing partners. UNDP is currently having 500 copies of the ‘Kyrgyz Jarany Board Game’ produced for eventual distribution to universities, schools and libraries. These tools are intended to engage young people, communicate ideas and create awareness around the legal/constitutional basis for Kyrgyz Jarany, the identification of hate-speech and misogyny and methods for non-violent communication. Testing and early use have demonstrated initial benefits; however, widespread and sustainable impact from these new tools will depend on how stakeholders can systematically disseminate and apply them.

PROSPECTIVE IMPACT: New institutional capacities, tools and systems ready for application

79. As originally intended, the Project did develop and put in place more durable institutional capacities, primarily new legislation, regulatory and policy frameworks and systems of working. Clearly, the building of legislative, regulatory, policy, institutional and staff capacities are necessary. At the same time, some stakeholders were somewhat unconvinced generally as to the extent that new government institutional capacities translate into impact. One obstacle they pointed out was the high turn-over of government officials at both the national and local levels, presenting obstacles for continuity. Interviewed stakeholders also emphasized that in the Kyrgyz Republic, it is common practice to adopt new laws, initiatives, and policies with great publicity, but have little meaningful follow-up. Moreover, some noted that LSGs are not sufficiently resourced to effectively deliver on the ever-growing list of policies they are

⁶³ KII K-QFYN.

expected to implement.⁶⁴ In that context, the following appear to be new institutional capacities developed by the Project with the most promise for more enduring impact, but only *if* they are employed and promoted in the near future:

- **Sub-Activities 1.2.1, 3.2.1-2—Amended LSG Law (when passed) and Local Community Charters will provide the regulatory and policy frameworks compelling local authorities to prioritise and act on conflict prevention/peacebuilding:** Many LSG authorities do not see conflict prevention and peacebuilding as their responsibility, but rather that of law enforcement. The amended law (expected later in 2024) and the Charters will statutorily compel LSGs to prioritise peace, delegate national peace-related plans/policies to local authorities and provide the means for LSGs to assign budget codes towards these priorities so they have the financial means to actually take action. If systematically supported and applied by the SACSLSG, these would underpin ‘official’ prevention/response and social cohesion promotion action at the local level where most tensions and conflicts occur. However, ongoing local administrative reform mean that new Charters will be required in locations where the boundaries of LSGs are merged/alterred.
- **Sub-Activity 1.3.1—Draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion will streamline and improve strategic interventions for social cohesion and prevention/peacebuilding:** The potentially longer-term impact beyond more coherent implementation of inter-linked national policies is that the Integrated National Action Plan is much more forward-looking (beyond 2025) and serves as the basis for deploying the more comprehensive conflict prevention/peacebuilding conception of social cohesion that goes beyond Kyrgyz Jarany, which itself is a specific and more limited concept. This could also streamline the workload of LSG staff that were frequently described as overworked trying to implement a multitude of national policies and, therefore, enable LSGs to more effectively and strategically contribute to social cohesion strengthening efforts.
- **Sub-Activities 1.4.2-4—Trial implementation of YCFLG Guidelines provide an institutional resource for government to sustain and expand YCFLG implementation.** UNICEF has been engaged with and advising government on how to amend the YCFLG to make the programme mandatory in the future and, therefore, to eventually have a deeper impact on youth engagement and participation in local governance and longer-term impact on wider social cohesion. In target locations, the Project made modest but important contributions towards creating awareness among young people and LSG authorities about how youth and local government can collaborate to make change in their communities. As one young participant remarked, “Our parents don’t know the mayor, but I can message him on WhatsApp.”⁶⁵ LSG personnel also realised how they and their work can benefit from youth participation and input: it not only helped LSG personnel score a higher ‘grade’ on their implementation of YCFLG but the approach generated more credible and effective ideas on how to address important social issues from a youth perspective. In target locations, the Project helped socio-economic development plans become more practical and concrete tools for LSG’s everyday work, rather than tick-box exercises imposed from above. Prospects for transformational effect over the long-term will depend on whether these efforts, tools and capacities can be extended nationwide.
- **Sub-Activities 2.1.1-3/2.2.1-2—Deepening EWER foundations with expanding national perspectives and building blocks for conflict prevention:** Step-by-step, Project investments supported a change in government perspectives on prevention—that not just inter-ethnic tensions but multi-faceted dynamics contribute to conflict—as well as recognition that partnerships are needed with wider governmental and civil society actors to deal with complex causes of conflict. Newly developed

⁶⁴ For example: “Government keeps saying that youth are a priority, but [it’s] tokenistic. [Youth participation] requires daily action and repetition to continue the work. We can’t take it for granted.” (KII K-UCSZ)

⁶⁵ Stakeholder feedback as described in KII K-UCSZ.

monitoring/analysis regulations, skills, tools and systems represent major new building blocks for the emerging system: “The new monitoring system is now integrated [and] will be sustained every day because it is a part of our everyday work now.”⁶⁶ Importantly, for prospective sustainable impact, EWER systems are becoming less ‘Bishkek-centric’ as the Project expanded and strengthened capacities at the local levels and linkages between the local/national levels. Stakeholders did not presume that the Project yet resulted in a fully operational and sustainable EWER system, but appreciate it represented a significant step towards such a goal. Deeper prospective impact will depend on not just extending technical capacities but also further elaborating regulatory, administrative and budgetary measures for a national EWER system. There is also a need to overcome EWER ‘feedback cycle’ challenges to better understand how EWER monitoring/analysis is considered by government and concretely translates into responses. Lastly, sustainability of PRC Executive Secretary posts needs consideration, as these have become more precarious in recent years with lower stipends and fewer expenses being covered.

- **Sub-Activity 3.4.2—Strategic litigation for youth with disabilities:** Successful litigation cases on behalf of youth with disabilities may prospectively generate deeper impacts. Many of these cases eventually escalated to the Supreme Court and the Constitutional Court, creating progressive jurisprudence on equality and non-discrimination by setting innovative legal precedents for the rights of people with disabilities. In addition to increasing access to justice for people with disabilities, the cases and advocacy have also triggered reforms in national laws, policies and practices. The litigation casework from these cases is also expected to inform the development of a publicly available eTool for preparing lawsuits for violations of the rights of people with disabilities.

PROSPECTIVE IMPACT: New personal/social capacities and networks available at the local level

80. Many stakeholders suggested that the most important impacts from the Project will be determined by the Project’s investments to ‘institutionalise’ personal/social capacities and networks at the local level, especially among youth and community members. Some stakeholders suggested that community stakeholders, in contrast to government, are a more sustainable target for impact because they largely remain in place and are more invested in promoting cohesion and sustaining peace in their communities. The Project’s small-scale investments among youth and community members for rights awareness, capacities to participate and capacities to act as ‘agents of peace’ potentially present the greatest potential for the most important and enduring—though also most intangible—Project impacts: equipping, connecting and transforming ordinary people so they can better foster social cohesion and prevent conflict in their everyday lives and communities. As one stakeholder described, “Six years from now we’ll see them contribute in different ways to their communities.”⁶⁷ While the Project has not explicitly measured or concretely demonstrated the prospective impacts of such changes, the Evaluation suggests that the Project had important prospective (though intangible) impacts to increase social capacities and networks for social cohesion, conflict prevention and peacebuilding, including:

- **A growing appreciation of conflict prevention, social cohesion, inclusivity, human rights and civic identity ‘vocabulary’ and mindsets among direct Project participants at the community-level.** Many Project components helped stakeholders create and expand their ‘vocabulary’ for thinking and speaking about what these issues mean and look like in the context of the Kyrgyz Republic and within their local communities. Some stakeholders expressed a shift away from ‘deterrence’ and ‘enforcement’ mindsets and approaches towards prevention and addressing root causes, as well as

⁶⁶ KII K-KAHA.

⁶⁷ KII K-UCSZ.

focusing on inclusive, collaborative and problem-solving processes: “Peacebuilding is a novel concept in Kyrgyzstan.”⁶⁸ This included recognition of and interest in better using and developing indigenous concepts, practices and infrastructure for prevention, peacebuilding, social cohesion, etc. rather than simply mimicking ‘international’ ideas wholesale without contextualising them. For some stakeholders, the Project broadened their understanding that citizenship, prevention, social cohesion and sustaining peace require the inclusion and representation of under-represented groups/actors within decision-making, problem identification and response processes.

- **Invigorating more ‘organic’ and pre-existing I4P actors at the community level.** It appeared that community-level Project participants were developing more robust and consistent understandings of who are the key actors in conflict prevention, what are the risk issues, who are the at-risk groups and what new and more inclusive approaches might work best. Interviewed PRC Executive Secretaries, Elders Courts, Women’s Councils, Youth Committees, Danakers, social pedagogues, police, neighborhood committee members, human rights activists, NGO representatives, etc. often referred to each other in discussing their networks of responders and prevention; they were articulate on what the potential conflict issues in their locality are and who are the vulnerable groups. It appeared as though the ‘webs’ of local I4P were expanding as more and different strands connected and concentrated in Project locations. Local stakeholders frequently told the Evaluation that the direct engagement by international and Bishkek-level actors at the LSG/community-level was especially beneficially for local I4P actors. On top of useful technical inputs and capacity development, the mere fact that outsiders recognised and worked in solidarity with local I4P was especially motivating and gave local I4P actors the visibility and access to platforms that allowed their voices to be heard.
- **PRC Executive Secretaries are often going beyond their EWER ‘monitoring’ mandate by also operating as essential prevention/response actors embedded in their local I4P ecosystems.** Having a dedicated person with full-time responsibility for monitoring and reporting may be ensuring that Bishkek better understands and acts to local situations. Regardless, many PRC Executive Secretaries appear to be going beyond simply ‘monitoring’ and are frequently a ‘bridge’ connecting local prevention/response actors, including often having an active role in PPCs. Anecdotes were given of their useful actions to prevent the escalation of disputes and tense situations. While the PRC Executive Secretary cadre may not be very diverse (most are ‘retired’ male civil servants), they generally seem well-positioned and have the appropriate status to engage local leaders and stakeholders.
- **Collaborative action and networks as vehicles for social cohesion.** The simple act of diverse community members coming together in solidarity to learn, exercise their rights, share perspectives and constructively collaborate to solve challenges was suggested by some local stakeholders as itself an important catalyst for social cohesion: “It helped strengthen interaction and cooperation among divided parties [...] It created bonding and connections for resolving local issues.”⁶⁹ For example, one of the outcomes of a Project supported public-LSG dialogue was a local anti-domestic violence campaign. The campaign was important in and of itself for creating awareness about and increasing the reporting of domestic violence campaign. However, some stakeholders also suggested that the very planning and activities around the campaign were an excellent vehicle for creating and improving social cohesion by getting diverse people at the grassroots level working together constructively in solidarity to solve common problems. The activities and coordination involved also garnered important feedback regarding the social welfare of specific community members and identified local ‘hot spots’ or issues that needed further attention and support. Many examples were given of how

⁶⁸ KII K-AGQH.

⁶⁹ KII K-YNWW.

participants continue to interact, support and share advice with others well after the specific Project activities ended, further adding to local networks of cohesion and activism.

- **Significant personal transformations that, if supported and fostered, could eventuate into community/social-level transformations.** The Evaluation frequently and strongly heard from stakeholders that many Project activities stood out as personally transformative, especially the case for some youth and others from small, rural communities. Even minor experiences, such as leaving town and staying with a peer group at a hotel for a workshop, had profound personal impacts. Observations from those involved with ECD Centers revealed that, despite some poor infrastructure, exceptional staff equipped with the new curricula and other materials provided transformative experiences for children and parents. Various Project initiatives not only exposed stakeholders to new concepts and skills but intentionally focused on fostering personal growth and ‘transformational thinking’, leading to visible changes in participants’ perspectives, their willingness to share ideas and their sense of responsibility as agents of change and cohesion in their communities. For vulnerable populations, education about their rights and subsequent networking fostered further community engagement and leadership, as exemplified by youth with disabilities who have gone on to become activists. Long-term impacts of pre-school curricula are anticipated to include enhanced social cohesion and the development of conflict-resolution and collaborative skills from an early age. Project methods often revolved around a model where: i.) training led to ii.) personal awareness/growth which was then iii.) tested and extended through action. Many interventions instilled positive self-views and trust in participants’ skills, which helped them approach challenges to cohesion and sustaining peace in their communities with assured and ‘activist’ attitudes.

81. However, it is not apparent how some Project components will translate to medium and longer-term change. While these interventions built new capacities and created certain benefits, many appeared ‘one-off’ in nature. These included:

- **Sub-Activities 1.1.1-2—Operationalise the IMCM:** The Interdepartmental Commission coordinating the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept is not fully operational. The Project did well to pivot and support development of a draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion, but the future application and impact of this revamped approach is unknown at the time of writing.
- **Sub-Activity 1.2.3 Policy Frameworks—Development and passage of the new Law on Youth:** It is not apparent how a new Law on Youth will be implemented to have an impact on conflict prevention/peacebuilding efforts.
- **Sub-Activity 1.4.1 Women’s Councils and Youth Committees trained in human rights, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, diversity, tolerance and right-to-participate:** Some participants of this components went on to also participate in components of Output 3. However, this was not connected to specific follow-up processes and its significant, long-term or transformative benefits are unclear.
- **Sub-Activities 2.1.6-9 Establish EWER—U-Report implementation:** The U-Report initiative was not implemented as part of the Project’s EWER components as planned and it is not clear how the results of its polls were applied or the data used for EWER. While the U-Report has potential as a powerful policy development tool, the Evaluation did not see any evidence that it was used as such for EWER.
- **Sub-Activity 2.2.3 Capacities for EWER (independent monitoring):** Though broadly focused on inclusion and rights, the Evaluation did not see compelling justifications for how the research/analysis by the NISS and Ombudsperson’s Office contributed substantively to improved EWER capacities and

impacts. The topics and findings seemed more applicable to good governance programming rather than as specifically informing conflict prevention and peacebuilding interventions.

- **Sub-Activity 3.1.1 Public Awareness—National Kyrgyz Jarany Public Awareness Campaign:** Although significant efforts and resources went into implementing the campaign, the Project has not been able to demonstrate this had much enduring impact on increasing public awareness and ownership of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept.
- **Sub-Activity 3.2.4 Capacities of LSGs—'Right-to-participate' LSG-public dialogues:** In and of themselves, most stakeholders felt these activities were beneficial and effective 'practice' for future public participation LSG decision making as stakeholders seek ways to institutionalise public dialogue. While creating awareness, raising key issues and getting more diverse and under-represented people interacting together and with local government is generally good, it was unclear to stakeholders whether this will be sustained and how it can lead to something transformative.
- **Sub-Activity 3.4.1 Community Dialogue—Danaker (insider mediator) trainings:** The wider application of these efforts is unclear and the Project did not link Danaker with other local I4Ps during implementation. However, after the Project closed, RUNOs reported consultations with the Ministry of Justice for how to further develop capacities, coordination, policies and legislation that could bring Danaker in as part of wider national systems for mediation.
- **Sub-Activity 3.4.2 Community Dialogue—Rights of youth with disabilities:** There have been some excellent Project results and impacts promoting the rights of youth with disabilities. But these efforts were largely dependent on the Project. The Project did not have an exit strategy to ensure that the work, capacities and impacts not only endured but also potentially scaled-up.
- **Sub-Activities 3.4.3-5 Community Dialogue—UPSHIFT youth participation and peacebuilding:** Similar to the Project's support to rights of youth with disabilities, the UPSHIFT methodology had impressive results and impacts but largely concluded with the end of the Project. Again, the Project did not have an exit strategy to ensure that UPSHIFT work, capacities and impacts not only endured but also potentially scaled-up.

2.4.4 How did different stakeholders (especially youth, women, and CSOs) contribute to and were differentially impacted by the Project's results?

82. The Evaluation suggests that participating women, youth and youth with disabilities both differentially contributed to and were differentially impacted by the Project. The Project intentionally promoted the participation of women through most components; though gender disaggregated data is not available for all Project components, available information suggests that more women participated in the Project and may have differentially benefitted from activities and impacts. Active participation of women indicates they had a critical role in spreading and benefitting from the Project's values and goals. Interviews suggest an acceptance that women are often best placed to prevent/respond to some common forms of tensions and conflicts at the community-level and are essential for prioritising and taking action on usually 'overlooked' aspects of social cohesion and sustaining peace (i.e. neighborhood/family squabbles, domestic abuse/violence, etc.). The high rates of women and girls participation in certain components might, however, reflect existing gender-based social and occupation segregation—i.e. a large majority of interviewed high school teachers, ECD Centre librarians and Danaker training and UPSHIFT participants were female, while, in contrast, all PRC Executive Secretaries and heads of LSGs were men.

83. Youth also had an ‘outsized’ rate of participation in the Project and represent a significant portion of its beneficiary base. The Evaluation suggests that youth participants likely felt a greater level of personal transformation and impact, with Project activities often providing their first exposure to new places, people, ideas, capacities and ways of inter-relating with authorities and society. Youth are obviously an essential ingredient for future social transformation; however, the scale of the Project was very modest and only a small proportion of youth nationally and locally were directly involved and impacted. The Evaluation suggests, however, that Project support to successful litigation efforts by youth with disabilities and the Centre for Strategic Litigation did generate important concrete differential impacts for people with disabilities in numerous locations that would not likely have occurred without the Project’s emphasis on this differential result.

84. While the Project disaggregated the gender of participants/beneficiaries across many components, it did not track this for all activities. The Evaluation estimates that at least half or more of Project stakeholders were female. The Project did not have in place M&E systems for in-depth results monitoring in general, let alone for differential results by gender or other stakeholder typologies (including marginal and vulnerable groups).

2.4.5 To what extent did other intersecting social barriers contribute to differential stakeholder impacts?

85. Project data and Evaluation methods did not enable analysis of how intersecting social barriers contributed to differential stakeholder impacts. Anecdotally, Evaluation interviews suggest that community-level Project participants and beneficiaries sometimes faced intersecting social barriers to participation in the Project, such as:

- **Language:** Many Project activities over-emphasised the use of the Russian language, often frustrating non-Russian speaking participants because not all citizens are fluent in Russian; many only speak (or feel comfortable speaking) in Kyrgyz or minority-languages. Several interview respondents highlighted the importance of promoting Kyrgyz as the state language and the policy of multilingualism, as stated in the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept. Therefore, some were confused as to why so many Project activities relied on Russian speakers/material. Remedies, workarounds and other measures often resolved challenges, but it is not clear whether the Project systematically ensured that Kyrgyz and minority-language participants were not disadvantaged or left to silently face language barriers during Project activities. This issue likely led to some selection bias and a lowered participation rate of non-Russian speaking people within the Project. It also likely diminished the quality of certain activities and expected impact/benefit for non-Russian speaking stakeholders.
- **Ethnicity:** Data on the ethnic/cultural profile of Project participants/beneficiaries was largely not collected by the Project. Anecdotal evidence suggests that efforts and considerations were often made to mitigate potential barriers for the participation of stakeholders from minority ethnic communities but the extent to which these succeeded cannot be assessed.
- **Religion:** The Evaluation frequently heard observations that promoting Project objectives and participation in activities in locations with large adherent/unorthodox religious communities was difficult. While presenting engagement challenges, participation from such communities was essential as members of these communities were often identified by some stakeholders as crucial for promoting civic identity and social cohesion. However, the Evaluation did not find evidence that the Project systematically reached out to and engaged those communities—approaches were ad hoc, varying among activities and implementing partners.

- **Social privilege (i.e. time, money and social status):** Many prospective stakeholders were likely unable to directly participate in and benefit from Project activities because they were not compensated in some fashion (i.e. they could not afford to participate) or did not have the significant free personal time necessary for participation. Moreover, though the Project was often successful in involving 'ordinary' people in its activities, there were suggestions that more innovative efforts could have been explored in order for the Project to include more stigmatised and self-stigmatised social groups and people. UPSHIFT activities did take especially strong efforts to prioritise the participation of youth from vulnerable backgrounds from which the Project could extract bigger lessons for overcoming social barriers to participation.
- **Accessibility for people with disabilities:** The Project experienced some instances where transportation, sign language requirements, accessibility to buildings, etc. presented barriers of participation for people with disabilities. Remedies, workarounds and other measures often resolved the challenges, but the experiences underline the need for more participatory foresight and planning involving (if not driven by) stakeholders with disabilities to ensure that accessibility and other barriers they face are factored into implementation.

2.4.6 How did the Project employ 'exit strategies' to promote sustainability and the continuance of results after the Project ended?

86. The Project would have benefitted from monitoring specific metrics for sustainability. The Project's SRF and wider M&E approaches were concerned with quantifying numbers of participants, beneficiaries, activities and outputs. There were no specific targets or approaches for measuring how these results would endure, including Project work at the community level.

87. Many Project components assumed sustainability of results rather than planning explicit exit strategies. Many activities assumed that, once capacities, tools and systems were developed and in-place, they would by definition be adopted and continued. The Project succeeded in conducting trainings, developing certain legislation, curricula and tools, trialing new initiatives, guidelines and processes; however, there were often no formal commitments, frameworks or implementation mechanisms ensuring these would be continued, applied or updated after the Project concluded. LSGs especially face capacity, staff turn-over and policy framework challenges that may limit their ability to continue some of the Project's work without ongoing external support. Some implementing partners made recommendations to improve potential sustainability; however, it is not clear how the Project integrated and acted on such recommendations.

2.4.7 To what extent are net Project benefits of gender equality and human rights persisting or likely to continue?

88. The Project made significant investments in promoting the participation, capacities and priorities of women and girls, especially as leaders. Yet, there is no specific evidence that the Project has fundamentally changed systemic gender equality barriers, gender relations or gendered power dynamics. It is only clear that many female participants have newly acquired skills, networks and confidence that may contribute to their further rise to positions of greater public, community and/or domestic leadership in the medium- to the long-term. Like many of the Project benefits, the lasting impact of its human rights results will be determined by how stakeholders apply what was achieved through the Project (and perhaps the eventual passage of key legislation).

2.4.8 To what extent has the Project had a catalytic effect, as defined by PBF criteria?

89. The Project exhibited modest PBF defined ‘financial’ catalytic effects in a few components. Most notably, the Project could only fund 27 UPSHIFT youth initiatives but was able to promote LSG and KOICA funding for the additional 15 initiatives not funded by the Project. The Project also collaborated with OSCE on support of national EWER systems; while the Project focused resources on PRC Executive Secretaries and development of specific monitoring tools and skills, the OSCE has focused on supporting the MoCISYP Monitoring Centre. The Project also collaborated with the OSCE Office of the High Commissioner for National Minorities in the development of the Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion course manuals for the MoIA Academy and RTC. The Evaluation does not believe that the Project has achieved any significant PBF defined ‘non-financial’ catalytic effects: i.e., it is not clear whether Project contributed to changes in political will and/or institutional practices of national, local and/or international stakeholders that has allowed other significant peacebuilding efforts to move forward.

2.5 Efficiency: How well were resources used and managed?

90. Section 2.5 examines and presents findings regarding the extent to which Project implementation delivered its results in an economic and timely way, as well as regarding the Project’s operational efficiency (i.e. how well the intervention was managed), given the dynamics of the context. Higher-level conclusions and recommendations based on these findings are presented in Section 3

91. The Evaluation carried out a “Level 0” efficiency assessment: “Describing and providing an opinion on some efficiency-related aspects of an aid intervention”.⁷⁰ The Evaluation itself had limited data and capacity to conduct an in-depth efficiency review, while the ToRs prioritised other criteria. Moreover, the Project would have benefitted from systematically monitoring efficiency aspects—that is, maintaining internal criteria, data and/or monitoring systems that assess the efficiency of management processes, expenditure progress, cost-benefits, etc. that allow the Project to identify and solve efficiency challenges.

2.5.1 To what extent did the Project deliver results in an economic and timely way?

92. The Project spent most of its funds; however, expenditure rates varied between RUNOs and of much of the Project was not implemented until the final six months, indicating some efficiency challenges. RUNOs estimated they expended 97% of the total approved budget by the end of the Project. While UNICEF had a consistent expenditure rate during the first two years of the Project (2022 and 2023), UNDP and OHCHR took longer to begin making major expenditures and spent a large portion of their funds during the 2024 no-cost-extension phase. More than 42% of UNDP’s expenditure and 36% of UNICEF’s expenditure occurred in the seven months from Jan-Jul 2024. Both agencies actual average monthly spends during 2024 were far above their expected average monthly spends: UNDP spent almost 88% over its expected monthly average during 2024 and OHCHR spent 62% higher. The ‘push’ of spending on activities into the final seven months of the Project suggests that inputs and expenditure were not in accordance with original plans and that UNDP and OHCHR experienced implementation delays and

⁷⁰ OECD Publishing, Paris, 2021, OECD. [Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully](#). Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021, p.80.

challenges in the efficient use of resources.⁷¹ **Table 9** provides an overview of estimated Project expenditure by RUNO and year.

Table 9: Overview of estimated Project Expenditure (2021-2024)⁷²

	2021 (Dec)	2022 (Jan-Dec)	2023 (Jan-Dec)	2024 (Jan-Jul)	Total Exp (31 months)	Approved Budget
UNDP	\$0.00	\$177,689.43	\$394,386.18	\$488,141.13	\$1,060,216.74	\$1,150,000.00
<i>\$ per month</i>	<i>\$0.00/m</i>	<i>\$14,807.45/m</i>	<i>\$32,865.52/m</i>	<i>\$69,734.45/m</i>	<i>\$34,200.54/m</i>	<i>\$37,096.77/m</i>
<i>Delivery %</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>15.5%</i>	<i>34.3%</i>	<i>42.4%</i>	<i>92.2%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
UNICEF	\$0.00	\$520,421.03	\$455,302.95	\$24,276.02	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
<i>\$ per month</i>	<i>\$0.00/m</i>	<i>\$43,368.42/m</i>	<i>\$37,941.91/m</i>	<i>\$3,468.00/m</i>	<i>\$32,258.06/m</i>	<i>\$32,258.06/m</i>
<i>Delivery %</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>52.0%</i>	<i>45.5%</i>	<i>2.4%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
OHCHR	\$0.00	\$198,385.97	\$340,260.04	\$311,353.99	\$850,000.00	\$850,000.00
<i>\$ per month</i>	<i>\$0.00/m</i>	<i>\$16,532.16/m</i>	<i>\$28,355.00/m</i>	<i>\$44,479.14/m</i>	<i>\$27,419.35/m</i>	<i>\$27,419.35/m</i>
<i>Delivery %</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>23.3%</i>	<i>40.0%</i>	<i>36.6%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Total	\$0.00	\$896,496.43	\$1,189,949.17	\$823,771.14	\$2,910,216.74	\$3,000,000.00
<i>\$ per month</i>	<i>\$0.00/m</i>	<i>\$74,708.04/m</i>	<i>\$99,162.43/m</i>	<i>\$117,681.59/m</i>	<i>\$93,877.96/m</i>	<i>\$96,774.19/m</i>
<i>Delivery %</i>	<i>0.0%</i>	<i>29.9%</i>	<i>39.7%</i>	<i>27.5%</i>	<i>97.0%</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

2.5.2 To what extent were Project inputs converted to results in the most cost- and time-effective ways?

93. The Evaluation was not able to assess whether Project inputs were converted to results in the most cost- and time-effective ways. The nature of the Project and the design of the Evaluation did not allow for traditional economic measures and related tools, such as cost-benefit analysis, rates of return, cost-effectiveness analysis, benchmarking comparisons, etc., to evaluate efficiency. The Evaluation could not determine appropriate cross-project comparisons, did not have the required analytical expertise and did not have access to the necessary data for efficiency analysis (i.e. detailed internal/external data on the cost-benefit of specific activities).

2.5.3 To what extent did the Project deliver results within the expected timeframe?

94. An extended ‘inception’ phase during the first 6-12 months of the Project likely caused significant delays in the implementation of activities and delivery of results, some of which were not achieved by Project closure. Though the Project received a no-cost-extension of six months, this was still insufficient for the Project to complete all expected outputs and activities. As highlighted under Section 2.1 Relevance, the Project was approved by the PBF JSC and then somewhat delegated to the MoCISYP and other state bodies to agree on implementation details. Delays in implementation appear mostly due to this extended ‘inception’ period during the first 6-12 months that required a great deal of negotiation with national partners on implementation details: while approval was given at the political level, moving

⁷¹ Significant delay is also evidenced in the Project’s first Annual Report that key management milestones were still incomplete after a year of implementation: Contracting of Partners-Partially completed; Staff Recruitment-Partially completed; Collection of baselines-Initiated; Identification of beneficiaries-Completed (Project Annual Report 2022, p.4).

⁷² As per data of estimated expenditure supplied by RUNOs on 24 Jul 2024. Expenditure data presented in the Evaluation derives from working figures provided by the Project; they are indicative and not intended as representing an ‘auditable’ financial statement for the Project.

forward on implementation required facilitating more consensus about what both sides wanted and how it would be achieved. For example, the Aligned Kyrgyz Jarany Concept/Project Work Plan was not agreed until May 2022, more than five months after the Project started. This inception period appears to have especially delayed the start of Output 1 (policy frameworks and institutional mechanisms) and Output 2 (EWER system) and Baseline surveying.

95. Though not systematic, some Project implementation delays were caused by challenges with RUNO procurements and financial payments. Different examples were given where government stakeholders and implementing partners experienced long delays in receiving payments or receipt of procured materials/services that, in turn, delayed or lessened the efficient implementation of activities.

2.5.4 To what extent did RUNOs and Project management systems ensure synergies and support the efficient and effective achievement of results?

96. The Project was designed to promote collaboration and synergies between RUNOs. It is noteworthy that all RUNOs implemented components across all Project Outputs. Internal coordination documents indicate that messages of 'avoiding business as usual' and the need to elaborate and manage a common approach as 'one Project' were often reinforced among RUNOs, which also conducted joint 'kick-off' meetings when scoping and initiating activities in target locations. Stakeholders at the local-level frequently appreciated the multi-pronged approach by three different RUNOs, each bringing complementary perspectives and added value. UN stakeholders frequently applauded the Project as a good example of a coherent jointly managed UN project in comparison to others they have experienced.

97. Coordination between governmental and UN stakeholders increased over time to improve coherent oversight/management of the Project. The Project experienced some coordination frictions during its first 6-12 months, partly because of diverging expectations among stakeholders and partly by the MoCISYP not feeling entirely consulted by RUNOs in the planning, development and deployment of certain project activities. RUNOs predominantly got on with planning and implementing directly with national partners, sometimes belatedly coordinating with the wider Project and MoCISYP. Managing and mitigating these types of issues improved by increasing governmental-UN coordination dialogue over the course of implementation. The MoCISYP requested alternating weekly in-person/online coordination meetings with the Project. The Project also began holding 'All Stakeholder' Project Coordination Meetings on a regular basis. Over the course of 30 months of implementation, the Project held nine formal Project-MoCISYP Coordination Meetings (twice with the Deputy Minister and once with the Minister) and five formal 'All Stakeholder' Project Coordination Meetings—this amounts to a formal Project-national partner coordination meeting of some sort roughly once every two months. Working-level meetings and contacts between UN and government stakeholders occurred much more frequently. Depending on the different tempos of different Project activities, bi-weekly, weekly and even daily interactions involved governmental stakeholders in substantively shaping and informing Project activities.

98. Nevertheless, RUNOs primarily implemented their respective components independently and opportunities for efficient and integrated Project implementation were not fully realised. To achieve more efficient and integrated implementation, the Project would have benefitted from:

- **Streamlined oversight/management structures providing more substantive scrutiny.** PBF JSC and UN HoA PBF Project Coordination Meetings were not held frequently and oversaw multiple ongoing projects. While held more frequently, Project-MoCISYP Coordination Meetings, 'All Stakeholder' Project Coordination Meetings and TCG meetings principally involved implementation status updates,

opportunities for feedback/new requests and general information sharing of ongoing and upcoming activities. Servicing multiple oversight/management structures involved significant Project coordination workload while providing limited substantive management scrutiny. Fewer structures providing more substantive scrutiny would lower management support workload while better holding the Project to account for more efficient and integrated approaches to managing its performance.

- **Increasing the MoCISYP's leadership authority among government partner entities.** Though designated as the principal governmental counterpart, the MoCISYP experienced limitations in its coordination authority over other governmental entities implementing Project components. Empowering the MoCISYP with a more robust leadership and oversight role among government partner entities would have reinforced more coherent and coordinated behaviour by RUNOs.
- **Dedicated project management/coordination capacities.** The designated 'lead agency' and 'Project Coordinator' had limited authority over other independent RUNOs and their implementing partners. They were also expected to simultaneously manage implementation of major Project components, diminishing the time and capacities available for the ongoing coordinating requirements of a Project of this scope and complexity. Many challenges for efficient and integrated implementation could have been mitigated by dedicating capacities solely to project management/coordination. The existing Project Coordinator could have been supported in management of day-to-day coordination systems by an adjunct Project Coordination Officer, or resources re-allocated to create a dedicated Project Coordinator post without any direct responsibilities for component implementation.
- **More integrated and operationally detailed planning, implementation and monitoring.** Only two documents present unified Project work plans. The first was an original Project budget-work plan for the PBF, which allocated funds per Output/Activity but did not include scheduling or detailed Sub-Activities. The other was the Aligned Kyrgyz Jarany Concept/Project Work Plan, in which about half of the scheduling for corresponding government activities is absent. Both documents are very macro-level and have no specifics about exactly what was supposed to be implemented and when. There is no evidence of the Project monitoring and updating these two work plans over the course of implementation and the no-cost-extension request to the PBF does not include an updated work plan. Project work planning was effectively down to individual RUNO work plans that (from what the Evaluation has seen) provide little operational detail to understand exactly what was supposed to be implemented and when. Some stakeholders suggested that the Project did not take enough measures to jointly plan and carryout their local-level activities (often involved the same participants and locations) and pointed out examples of last minute changes and the 'rushed' scheduling of activities, which sometimes diminished stakeholder participation/preparation and contributed to some 'project fatigue' among certain stakeholders at the local-level. This supports the Evaluation's observation that many Project Activities and Sub-Activities were effectively projects in their own right, submerged within the Project but planned and operated separately.

99. The Project did not take full advantage of opportunities for integrating cross-sectoral work and synergies to increase its overall effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency. Such opportunities potentially included:

- **Integrated development of learning materials:** Multiple Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion-related learning materials were developed for numerous different applications in isolation from one another. While content of the material was rooted in much of the same conceptual foundations (i.e. human rights, inclusivity, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, non-violent communication, social cohesion, etc.), RUNOs did not collaborate, explore crossovers or compare experiences as they developed these

materials. Additionally, the Project developed both an e-Manual and an online course for anti-hate speech and non-violent communication, but the two initiatives had no interaction with each other.

- **Integrated development of systems and capacities for conflict prevention analysis:** Opportunities for coherence and synergies were lost under the Output 2 EWER components, where the efforts to develop MoCISYP EWER monitoring, SCRA capacities for monitoring social tensions in the religious sphere and U-Reporter polling on youth perspectives of conflict issues were implemented separately. U-Reporter and MoCISYP EWER elements were intended to be integrated, but never were. Only in the latter stages were efforts made to create synergies between MoCISYP EWER and SCRA religious sphere monitoring. It also did not appear that the significant consultations and interactions with local stakeholders under Outputs 1 and 3 to identify conflict issues and sources of tensions were utilised as inputs into the development of conflict prevention analysis systems/capacities under Output 2.
- **Integrated model for inclusive public participation with LSGs:** RUNOs implemented several streams of multi-stakeholder public engagement with LSGs for identifying, planning and implementing responses to local tensions and promoting social cohesion. UNDP supported LSG Local Community Charter awareness and implementation, OHCHR supported ‘right-to-participate’ LSG public dialogue forums and UNICEF supported implementation of YCFLG guidelines and youth-informed LSG planning. Though involving common stakeholders on inter-related issues through similar methods for inclusive participation, these three ‘legs’ were implemented largely independently of each other.
- **Integrated approach to strengthening local I4P:** RUNOs made several investments in local I4P capacities: PRC Executive Secretaries as local EWER monitors, local ‘Danaker’ mediators, youth U-Reporters, LSG social cohesion action plans, etc. Despite its intention of “linking local and national level actors and institutions to enhance the country’s infrastructure for peace”⁷³, the Project engaged these I4Ps separately and did not take connect them or support their cross-collaboration.

2.5.5 To what extent did monitoring mechanisms effectively measure and inform management of project performance and progress?

100. The Project would have benefitted from oversight/management structures that comprehensively monitored Project implementation and progress. It is not evident that the JSC, UN HoA PBF Project Coordination Meetings, Project-MoCISYP Coordination Meetings or ‘All Stakeholder’ Project Coordination Meetings comprehensively scrutinised or vetted the Project’s detailed work plans, M&E data, annual reports or other planning/M&E information. This would have created greater opportunities for harmonising diverging expectations among different stakeholders and better holding the Project to account for more efficient and integrated approaches to managing its performance.

101. While RUNOs employed M&E for their respective components according to their agency procedures/standards, overall Project performance would have benefitted from developing and employing integrated M&E approaches. The Project’s TCG and M&E/Communications Group did not employ any significantly integrated M&E tools or systems, other than coordinating the Baseline/Endline Surveys and compiling annual reports.⁷⁴ The PBF annual report templates used by the Project emphasised aggregating macro-level results, they did not present how Outputs/Activities contributed to reported results or how implementation compared to expected progress. Because of this, annual reports did not provide a strong basis for tracking what the Project was achieving and what it *wasn’t* achieving against its

⁷³ Project ProDoc, p.7.

⁷⁴ According to available Project management documents, the TCG met roughly on a quarterly basis rather than monthly as prescribed by the ProDoc and the M&E/Communications Group met four times rather than on the intended quarterly basis.

original expectations. Project planning and monitoring was largely delegated, planned and overseen by RUNOs independently of each other. The Project's M&E Plan was essentially a document to annually update the Project SRF rather than outlining how RUNOs would operationalise joint planning and M&E.⁷⁵ The Project maintained an 'Events Calendar' spreadsheet for RUNOs to jointly list implemented activities; however, it did not contain sufficient data to track activity/result progress back to work plans, SRF indicators or other instruments. There was no integrated single point of reference instrument to compile and track Project activities and results against planned expectations. There was also no single point of reference mapping/register documenting all core Project stakeholders. There were no apparent attempts to link Project M&E with the government's M&E of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept Action Plan. Not having sufficiently integrated planning and M&E systems undermined Project management's ability to assess whether overall implementation was going according to plan and to adjust as needed. Without such tools and systems, management was unable to continuously assess whether overall implementation was going according to plan and to adjust as needed.

102. Other challenges experienced by the Project in conducting effective planning/M&E included:

- ***Outcome and Output Indicators were too narrow to capture a reasonable picture of the Project's full scope.*** Many did not explain or demonstrate clear Project causality/attribution and/or were inappropriate or not feasible to measure—i.e. not 'SMART': specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound.
- ***Challenges with the Baseline/Endline perception surveys.*** Baseline surveying did not start until nearly a year into Project implementation and Endline surveying was conducted just a little more than a year later, not enabling a very significant timeframe to register change. The Report on the surveys would benefit by more clearly presenting data and findings for Project target locations and providing comparative analysis with the control location.
- ***Project M&E approaches were mostly conventional and quantitative: i.e. 'counting' participants, beneficiaries and activities.*** The Project could have more comprehensively monitored qualitative aspects, especially the more 'internal' changes/impacts on individuals and whether new skills and knowledge were not only learned but whether they were applied and what were the results of this. More innovative M&E methods for measuring such changes could have been employed, such as systematic use of pre/post assessments and surveying of participants. Beyond gender data disaggregation when counting participants/beneficiaries, the Project did not appear to collect gender differentiated data. Unfortunately, original plans for using a 'community-based monitoring' (CBM) tool did not come to fruition; this might have significantly helped the Project to demonstrate its impacts and qualitative/intangible changes at the local-level.
- ***There was little consistency in the format, depth and quality of M&E reporting from implementing partners across RUNOs.*** An opportunity was missed to systematically inform Project M&E by RUNOs establishing common reporting methods and data for their implementing partners.

⁷⁵ On 14 Nov 2023 (almost two years into Project implementation) the Project did conduct a one-day workshop on joint M&E with implementing partners to update the Project M&E Plan and find ways to link project-level data to M&E indicators.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Evaluation Conclusions

103. Overall, the “Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development” Project was an important continuing contribution to building capacities for sustaining peace in the Kyrgyz Republic. The Project succeeded in launching essential activities and achieving important results while showing notable strengths in many of its strategies and approaches. The Project set ambitious aims to introduce new systems, processes, and capacities that would foster a greater sense of shared and inclusive civic identity, enhance trust and strengthen social cohesion within a short two-year timeframe. While some Project components and results were not entirely achieved as expected, key challenges experienced by the Project—ambitious objectives and scope for such a short timeline, reconciling diverging stakeholder expectations and challenges with oversight/management arrangements—highlight opportunities for refinement and growth for future interventions.

104. The Project was highly relevant in contributing to national priorities for building peace and stability. In the context of the Kyrgyz Republic, where peace and stability remain inherently fragile, the Project’s focus on inclusive governance, shared civic identity and social cohesion addressed some of the country’s most pressing needs. Small-scale tensions and conflicts continue to arise in certain ethnically and religiously diverse communities, underscoring the challenges of rebuilding inter-group trust and restoring confidence in public institutions after previous large-scale violence, such as the events of 2010. National stakeholders and policies increasingly understand that multi-faceted socio-economic, inclusion, governance and other dynamics are also contributing to tensions and conflicts. The Project rightly identified and concentrated on these critical issues as necessary foundations for more sustainable peace.

105. The Project was clearly relevant and aligned with a wide array of national and international strategies and policies, including important cross-cutting human rights, gender and youth agendas. Leveraging established relationships with partners and adapting from previous initiatives often strengthened Project relevance and ownership. Ownership and appreciation of Project priorities was especially high among LSG, civil society and community stakeholders in target locations. Despite challenges of some diverging expectations among a very wide stakeholder base—particularly in converging and operationalising social cohesion and Kyrgyz Jarany Concept objectives—that contributed to some subsequent implementation delays, the Project made important strides in aligning and fostering collaborative partnerships between national stakeholders and RUNOs.

106. Despite existing gaps in wider conflict prevention/peacebuilding ‘sector coordination’, the Project coordinated as required to ensure effective implementation. There was some especially valuable collaboration and coordination with other international partners, including on development of the MOIA’s new Kyrgyz Jarany and social cohesion curricula for law enforcement, enhancing national EWER capacities and the deployment of new Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity and multi-lingual education curricula at ECD Centres.

107. The Project achieved good results and demonstrated effectiveness across many components, through both vertical and horizontal modes of implementation. While the wide scope of the Project makes it difficult to generalise about its effectiveness, impacts and sustainability, national capacities for

conflict prevention and social cohesion are now better placed because of the Project. Most participants felt that their respective components were vitally needed and immediate impacts on capacities for social cohesion and conflict prevention, while incremental, were beneficial. Participants highlighted many innovative subjects, concepts and approaches introduced by the Project. Some stakeholders suggested that, without the Project, there could have been possible reversals on Kyrgyz Jarany Concept principles and social cohesion.

108. The Project made significant contributions to making the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept of civic identity more accessible and understood. Attributing the Project’s measurable impact on public awareness and acceptance of the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept on a national scale has proved challenging. However, the Project’s Endline Survey indicates a significant (over threefold) increase among people familiar with the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept who now share its goals and objectives.

109. The Project made significant contributions to making the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept of civic identity more accessible and understood. Surveying among people already familiar with the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept in Project target locations indicates a threefold increase in those who share its goals and objectives. This result is strongly corroborated by responses from participants regarding the value of workshops and training provided by the Project. However, attributing the Project’s contribution to measurable increases in the “sense of shared and inclusive civic identity and trust” has proved challenging. The metrics selected by the Project to assess its contribution to its stated Outcome were not ideally suited for measuring Project impact. Changes in these should be interpreted cautiously and do not constitute robust findings for determining Project ‘success’ or ‘failure’.

110. The Project strengthened foundations for social cohesion, inclusive governance and conflict prevention. Work done in local communities created a foundation for dialogue and cooperation that directly supports the broader Project outcome of enhancing trust between different groups. Significant steps were taken to enhance policy and institutional mechanisms for inclusive and accountable local governance, including by developing new Local Community Charters, enhancing YCFLG approaches and empowering young people to take an active role in identifying and implementing local solutions in partnership with LSGs. Important advances were made in the monitoring tools, systems and other capacities of national EWER systems, while local-level I4P have been further invigorated. A comprehensive national EWER/I4P system is yet to be fully institutionalised but the Project leaves in its wake stronger foundations on which a step-by-step approach can more realistically build towards these goals. The Project strengthened capacities across a wide array of governmental and civil society/community actors. It especially impacted local governance structures by ensuring that community members—especially women, youth and marginalised people—were actively involved in decision-making processes. The Project successfully mobilised potentially over 18,000 stakeholders around these values, embedding them with values, skills and tools to make them more effective agents of change for social cohesion, inclusivity and conflict prevention.

111. Some of the most immediately tangible impacts of the Project have stemmed from its support of youth. Strategic litigation on accessibility and rights for youth with disabilities has not only led to compensation and significant accessibility improvements but raised awareness and local changes to better meet disability rights obligations. Through these efforts, youth with disabilities have gained invaluable experience and are now positioned as future leaders for promoting an inclusive society. The Project’s YCFLG dialogues and youth-led local initiatives under UPSHIFT not only addressed specific youth needs in communities, but fostered youth skills for self-organization and collaboration, expanded youth networking and strengthened the voice of youth in local government planning. New pre-school curricula

centred on Kyrgyz Jarany, diversity and social cohesion has already begun to shape the values and behavior of thousands of children and parents, promoting non-discrimination, tolerance and cooperation in the everyday lives of their families and communities.

112. The most valuable results of the Project are likely the prospective and potentially transformational impacts of the new awareness, mindsets, skills, practices, tools, networks and other capacities that it leaves behind. The most significant might be grouped into three categories:

- iv.) **New educational capacities, tools and systems now ready for nationwide application**, including: new curricula for MoIA and law enforcement education/training; primary and intermediate/secondary school curricula; pre-school curricula; and publicly accessible online education tools;
- v.) **New institutional capacities, tools and systems now are ready for nationwide application**, including: Local Community Charters and an amended LSG Law (when passed); the draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion; YCFLG implementation guidelines; expanded EWER monitoring and analysis methods and tools; and strategic litigation cases expanding accessibility and rights for youth with disabilities;
- vi.) **New intangible social capacities and networks available at the local-level**, including: growing appreciation of conflict prevention, social cohesion, inclusivity, human rights and civic identity ‘vocabulary’ and mindsets; invigorated I4P actors at the community level, especially PRC Executive Secretaries; collaborative action and networks being used as vehicles for social cohesion; and significant personal transformations that, if supported and fostered, could eventuate into community/social-level transformations.

113. Most stakeholders accepted that the higher-level outcomes intended by the Project required much longer-term interventions and approaches than were possible within the two-year timeframe. Attributing Project causality for significant and complex societal change, such as a more cohesive society, more inclusive governance or stronger civic identity, was not reasonable. Recognising the importance of continued, long-term engagement on social cohesion and conflict prevention, stakeholders acknowledged that it was more reasonable to evaluate the Project as an important ‘next step’ or progression towards its stated higher-level outcomes rather than as a standalone ‘solution’. The Project built upon and further laid important groundwork—a longer timeframe would have been required to begin seeing the types of higher-level change envisioned. Overall, the Project leaves a foundation for future support and national stakeholders at several levels are better equipped on a myriad of fronts for the hard work to promote social cohesion and sustain peace in the years to come.

114. Along with Project successes, the Evaluation has identified some aspects of design and/or implementation that would have benefited from adjustments or reconsiderations. In particular:

- **Additional measures during the design phase would likely have enhanced Project performance.** Conducting a Project-specific context, peace and CS/DNH analysis during design could have better interrogated and validated the Project’s objectives, change logic and implementation strategies/modalities. Developing a clearer Project theory of change (ToC) could have focused implementation strategies and Project scope while helping to harmonise stakeholder expectations. Greater participation of Project stakeholders at all levels during the design phase could also have helped better align expectations and strengthen ownership of Project objectives and methods from the outset, mitigating potential follow-on ‘inception’ delays.

- **The Project would have benefitted from designing more specific and feasible results and narrower scope of interventions given the time and resources available.** The broad scope of interventions, expected results and locations may have diluted the Project’s ability to achieve certain impacts at scale. In addition to having a longer implementation timeframe from the outset, design might have benefitted from refining the Project’s balance between ‘breadth’ and ‘depth’.
- **Prospective sustainability could have been strengthened by more clearly defining how certain new capacities would be applied/institutionalised in the future.** Given the short timeframe and known challenges involved in building institutional capacities in this context, some Project components could have more explicitly planned how newly developed capacities and impacts would be systematically sustained to endure long after the Project concluded. For example, not only train staff but integrate those new skills into operations by additionally supporting new ordinances mandating the training and new policies/procedures requiring specific applications of the training.
- **As one of the largest peacebuilding interventions in the country, the Project could have benefitted from more proactively coordinating and seeking synergies with wider actors in the field of conflict prevention/peacebuilding.** Deepening coordination with others could have offered greater opportunities for partnerships and synergies that might have increased Project coherence, effectiveness, impact and efficiency.
- **Measures for context awareness and CS/DNH should have been more comprehensive and ongoing.** Given the sensitivities of the issues on which it was working, employing CS/DNH measures throughout design and implementation would have enabled the Project to be better informed of changing contexts, make adaptations, manage emerging risks and monitor impact.
- **The Project faced difficulties implementing some activities in a timely and efficient manner.** Some of these difficulties were outside the Project’s control, such as structural changes, shifting responsibilities and high turn-over among governmental actors. Delays with some UN procurement/financial administration partly contributed to timeliness challenges. However, the main factors impacting operational efficiency were time and efforts required to reconcile diverging stakeholder expectations and the need for oversight/management structures that were more streamlined but also provided more frequent and substantive scrutiny of Project implementation.
- **Greater synergy between RUNOs, partners and Project components could have enhanced overall Project relevance, efficiency and impact.** RUNOs largely implemented activities as separate sub-projects under the ‘umbrella’ of the Project, weakening the rationale for uniting diverse components under the Project’s overarching change logic. Managing the Project as a unified intervention could have better harmonised stakeholders, improved effectiveness and efficiency and enabled the Project to achieve much more than the sum of its parts.

3.2 Strategic Recommendations

115. The Evaluation presents a set of targeted strategic-level recommendations for four key categories of stakeholders: the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund, RUNOs, national partners (including the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic and local self-governments) and any actors implementing peacebuilding interventions at the local-level. Built on Evaluation findings, as well as successful practices

and lessons learned, these recommendations are intended to help stakeholders design and implement more effective peace-related initiatives in the future.

United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF):

- 1. Continue supporting national and local actors to build inclusive, effective and transparent infrastructures for peace (I4P) in the Kyrgyz Republic.** Further consolidation of peacebuilding and social cohesion remain essential. The PBF should leverage the momentum generated by, and lessons learned from, this Project to ensure the long-term sustainability of I4P efforts at both national and local levels. Prioritising the empowerment of local actors and securing national buy-in are foundational to achieving impactful and lasting outcomes. It may be reasonable to conduct a new 'conflict and peace analysis' (CPA) of the Kyrgyz Republic involving a wide range of national stakeholders, given that the previous summary CPA is over four years old.
- 2. Consider longer timeframes for multifaceted and ambitious joint projects.** Multi-RUNO interventions involving complex, overlapping issues, like conflict prevention and peacebuilding, require extended timeframes to achieve meaningful outcomes. A two-year cycle is insufficient to address deeply rooted challenges or adapt to evolving dynamics in a comprehensive way. Longer timeframes (three to five years) will allow deeper learning, iterative adjustments and sustained engagement with stakeholders to maximise impact.
- 3. Encourage projects to create space and mechanisms for learning and adaptation.** Peacebuilding interventions come with a high degree of uncertainty, particularly in contexts that tend to change rapidly. This makes flexibility essential for success. The PBF should prioritise creating an enabling environment for projects to experiment, learn from challenges/failures and adapt strategies as needed throughout implementation. Allocating resources for learning, reflection and adaptation, including feedback mechanisms, will enhance the relevance and effectiveness of initiatives.
- 4. Invest in dedicated capacities for integrated management and monitoring to enhance the effectiveness of joint projects.** These capacities would enable RUNOs to navigate the increased complexities of joint project implementation while more effectively achieving expected synergies. With dedicated support, joint projects can better manage diverse stakeholders, track overall progress, make timely adjustments and streamline operations for increased efficiency. Ultimately, this supports joint projects in having a greater impact than the sum of their parts. Such capacities should focus solely on coordination and oversight, without responsibility for implementing project components.

Recipient United Nations Organisations (RUNOs):

- 1. Continue supporting sustainable and transparent national EWER/I4P systems and enhancing local peacebuilding capacities.** The UN should assist in further institutionalising and deepening national EWER/I4P systems, focusing on early prevention, transparency, and independent oversight. Strengthening and integrating an array of local I4P actors in critical areas will especially foster community-driven peacebuilding while protecting their independence. RUNOs should take guidance from multiple analysis of existing EWER/I4P capacities and needs undertaken by the Project.
- 2. Establish clear benchmarks and guardrails for continued UN support to national frameworks like the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, EWER and I4P.** Aligning projects to national priorities is essential. However, engagement with sensitive national policies must adhere to UN values and avoid inadvertently contributing to exclusionary practices. Benchmarks and standards would ensure that

UN support for national frameworks remains transparent and aligned with long-term peacebuilding goals. These can also provide measurable criteria for monitoring UN support and mitigating risks.

- 3. Establish substantive partnership and coordination mechanisms with government stakeholders from the outset and regularly maintain these.** Such mechanisms should be streamlined, but still provide robust scrutiny to ensure ownership, accountability and the flexibility to adjust to emerging national dynamics and priorities. These could be reinforced by collaborative monitoring measures and mid-term reviews with government partners. Regular engagement of senior UN representatives, such as the UN Resident Coordinator or Heads of Agencies, with senior levels of government can help overcome challenges arising at the technical, local or political levels. By regularising and making these more substantive moments of engagement, projects can enhance national ownership, increase relevance and avoid/reduce delays.
- 4. Enhance local relevance and sensitivity to the context by adopting reflective learning, applying conflict sensitivity measures and integrating indigenous knowledge.** Conducting deeper learning and reflection exercises across a project's components, in consultation with stakeholders, will allow project teams to draw on insights from diverse experiences and contextualise international practices to the Kyrgyz Republic's unique environment. Applying CS/DNH measures at every stage, informed by early context analysis and training, will help mitigate risks and align the project with evolving stakeholder expectations. Additionally, integrating indigenous/local knowledge and international expertise will strengthen project approaches, ensuring that solutions reflect local realities and foster collaborative, sustainable peacebuilding interventions.
- 5. Commission and update project-specific context analysis regularly.** An initial pre-design project specific context analysis is an essential starting point of reference, but regular updates are necessary. Given the dynamic nature of conflict and peacebuilding contexts, projects must remain sensitive to changes on the ground at the national and local levels. Regular context analyses will enable projects to respond proactively to emerging challenges and opportunities, as well as potentially feed into project risk and results monitoring.
- 6. Ensure projects employ clearer change strategies and match resources to expected impacts.** Confirming that projects are tailored to available resources, timelines and local contexts is essential. A well structured theory of change (ToC) outlines how project actions link to intended outcomes through clear causal mechanisms. By aligning ToC with realistic implementation strategies, projects can establish a coherent narrative, enhancing effectiveness and accountability.

National Partners:

- 1. Elaborate the EWER/I4P regulatory framework to institutionalise and resource joined-up national systems, with a greater emphasis on early prevention.** A more elaborated regulatory framework is essential for ensuring that the EWER system is systematic, transparent and adequately resourced. This framework would prioritise connecting early warning to *early preventative responses* and local I4P. Institutionalising such elements would provide continuity and allow for a more structured approach to long-term peacebuilding.
- 2. Increase the transparency of government's EWER capacities and put in place safeguards to ensure these capacities are not misused.** Government capacities in conflict prevention and EWER must be transparent. Establishing an independent experts council or other forms of oversight would help provide accountability, ensuring that EWER systems uphold ethical standards. Transparency and safeguards would build public trust and prevent the misuse of tools intended to foster social cohesion.

3. **Focus on enhancing and integrating existing local-level EWER/I4P capacities, particularly in known hot spots.** Local-level EWER/I4P actors are at the forefront of peacebuilding and are often best placed to respond to early signs of tension. A broad spectrum of Project I4P 'alumni' (e.g., Danaker mediators, youth with disabilities, UPSHIFT and YCFLG youth, public-LSG dialogue participants, Women's Council representatives, ECD Centre Librarians, etc.) are already motivated, equipped with the basics and eager for more opportunities to contribute. Increased capacity at the local level will ensure that peacebuilding initiatives remain community-driven.
4. **Consider PRC Executive Secretaries and PPCs as priorities for further I4P capacity development, as well as LSG instruments for implementing longer-term peacebuilding strategies.** Public Prevention Centers (PPCs) can especially serve as integrative platforms where both official and non-official I4P actors collaborate on peacebuilding. Strengthening PPCs' capacity will allow them to play a critical role in coordinating local initiatives and building comprehensive, community-led prevention strategies, especially if these are reinforced by consultatively developed LSG peacebuilding plans/strategies. Such approaches will help ensure that peacebuilding efforts are inclusive, sustainable and reflective of diverse local perspectives.
5. **Avoid over-burdening and/or 'co-opting' local I4P actors in national EWER systems to protect their integrity and credibility.** Local I4P actors are crucial for grassroots peacebuilding, but their independence must be preserved. When local actors are overburdened or seen as instruments of the state, they risk losing credibility in their communities.
6. **Provide lead government entities the authority required to lead and coordinate other 'peer' entities in joint initiatives.** This would ensure horizontal coherence across government during joint project implementation and reinforced more coherent and coordinated behaviour by UN partners.

Actors implementing peacebuilding interventions at the local-level:

1. **Prioritise a bottom-up approach that places local stakeholders at the heart of project design and implementation.** Directly involving local actors in project planning and delivery fosters a sense of ownership, ensures cultural relevance and supports sustainable, community-driven change. This approach should also emphasise diversity and the participation of marginalised and/or stigmatised groups relevant to the locality (e.g. incoming migrants, children of 'out migrants', people with disabilities, ethnic or religious minorities, etc.) across all project phases.
2. **Maximise local languages and use approachable terminology appropriate to the context.** Delivering activities in the locally understood language is key to ensuring community engagement. Due to an implicit 'hierarchy' of languages rooted in the Kyrgyz Republic's historical legacies, people may not always reveal their discomfort using Russian. Related, is the importance of adapting terms, such as "social cohesion" or "civic identity," to the local context to make local participation more meaningful. Actors should remain aware of the urban-rural differences when 'translating' international values and standards of peace and social cohesion to local actors.
3. **Prioritise practical, hands-on training that respects the daily realities of rural participants.** Many community members experience training fatigue from repeated sessions that do not present immediately tangible application and benefits. Training should incorporate hands-on activities to enhance learning and retention, enabling participants to apply new skills directly. Additionally, periodically conducting training sessions outside participants' regular environments can foster group cohesion and substantive immersion. This approach allows for exchange visits and peer-to-peer learning, which are often more relevant and impactful than lecture-style training, especially in rural contexts where daily life realities are less conducive to classroom-style learning.

- 4. Be mindful of the unintended effects of research/surveying at the community level.** Surveys and interviews, particularly on sensitive topics, can create or exacerbate tensions in local communities. It is essential to consider these effects and approach data collection with care to avoid unintentional harm. Ensuring that community members understand the purpose of research and how their responses will be used can help minimise negative impacts.

4. ANNEXES

4.1 ANNEX: Evaluation Approaches and Methods

Purposes and Scope

This Evaluation was conducted for the purposes of:

- i.) **accountability**—supporting Project accountability to management, partners and stakeholders by providing independent and objective information regarding Project performance; and
- ii.) **learning and adaptation**—providing insights to inform and refine the future design, implementation and management of similar strategies, policies and interventions by documenting lessons learned during Project implementation.

The period under review was the entire cycle of the Project, from Dec 2021 to Jun 2024 (approximately 30 months). The Evaluation examined both the national- and local-levels of Project performance, including in the Project’s 7 target locations.

The overall Evaluation process was supported and guided by the Project’s Evaluation Management Group (EMG) comprising representatives from all three RUNOs (UNDP, UNICEF and OHCHR).

The Evaluation was conducted by an independent Evaluation Team that comprised two consultants: one International Lead Evaluator and one National Evaluator. In combination, the Team represented deep experience in: the social, political and economic contexts of the Kyrgyz Republic and region; international conflict prevention and peacebuilding practice; project design, management and evaluation; and social science research methods. The Evaluation Team reported to the Team Leader of the Governance and Social Cohesion Cluster, UNDP in the Kyrgyz Republic.

Approach

The Evaluation was conducted in accordance with the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) [‘Norms and Standards for Evaluation’](#), UNDP [‘Evaluation Guidelines’](#) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) [‘Quality Standards for Development Evaluation’](#). It was further informed by the OECD-DAC [‘Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities in Settings of Conflict and Fragility: Improving Learning For Results’](#), the OECD-DAC [‘Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully’](#) and the UNICEF [‘Global Evaluation Report Oversight System \(GEROS\) Handbook’](#). The Evaluation Team signed and abided by the UNEG Code of Conduct. The Evaluation was conducted in an impartial, transparent and participatory manner with full consideration of gender and human rights norms.

Overall, the Evaluation undertook a holistic review of the full range of Project activities/outputs/outcomes implemented during the period under review against all criteria, assessing performance across expectations outlined in the PBF Eligibility request/approvals, JSC decisions, Project Document, Project Strategic Results Framework, Project work plans, TCG minutes/decisions and other strategic management and M&E documents. As possible, the Evaluation included summative ‘impact evaluation’ elements because the Project was concluding. It also took a holistic view of Project performance from a lens of

processes evaluation (i.e. the way in which interventions worked, not just results per se), including the impact of Project implementation and management modalities on delivery.

The Evaluation operated from a 'curious' posture and utilised 'open frame' approaches to 'stay out of judgement' while collecting and analysing diverse perspectives that valued the voices, expertise and lived experiences of Project stakeholders. The Evaluation endeavored to create conditions that enabled participants to speak freely, reflectively and without fear.

Criteria and Key Lines of Enquiry

The scope of evaluation criteria was very wide, with the original ToRs containing 45 evaluation questions across 14 criteria for assessment. Some questions and criteria were repetitive/overlapping, while others could not be feasibly measured or assessed because of information/documentation/stakeholder gaps or because of time/technical limitations of the Evaluation Team. Carrying out an evaluation so significantly expanded beyond standard UNEG/OECD-DAC criteria would have required an Evaluation Team with significantly more available planning, preparation, resources and time.

Therefore, the Evaluation Team integrated and streamlined evaluation questions/criteria from the ToRs within a workable evaluation framework of adapted key lines of enquiry (KLEs) organised by the standard six UNEG/OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency (see **Annex 4.2: Evaluation Matrix**). Original evaluation questions/criteria especially emphasised the need to assess the Project's relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability; therefore, there was an outsized focus on these criteria/KLEs in the Evaluation. **Sections 2.1-2.5: Evaluation Findings** of the Report provide a narrative assessment of Project implementation across the six evaluation criteria organised by sub-sections answering KLEs. **Section 3.1: Project Performance Conclusions** draws upon those findings to draw conclusions about whether the Project met standards and expectations across criteria. Lastly, original evaluation questions sought significant analysis and identification of lessons learned, good practice and recommendations; these have been synthesised and presented in **Section 3.2: Good practices, lessons and recommendations**.

Methodology

The Evaluation was non-experimental in design and employed a mixed-methods approach, using qualitative and quantitative research methods and aspects of data and methods triangulation to compare information and enhance the validity and reliability of findings when assessing a Project with such a wide scope of activities, outputs and outcomes. The Evaluation scope of work did not provide the time or means for an experimental or quasi-experimental design involving a control or comparison group.

This Evaluation is not a social science research study designed to rigorously test a specific hypothesis. Instead, it has been tasked to make reasonably substantiated assessments for multitude of Project performance criteria and KLEs across a diverse range of activities, outputs and outcomes. However, employing elements of these research methods allowed the Evaluation to explore the convergence/divergence of different levels and perspectives of performance, especially with some existing data being insufficient and dissimilar. This also enabled the Evaluation to use different sources and methods i.) to answer the same question, ii.) to answer different parts of the same question and iii.) to answer different questions. The Evaluation sought to 'make sense' of information from the totality of sources and methods and provide nuanced and reasonably substantiated descriptions (what happened), judgements (performance against expectations) and interpretations (inferred relationships/effects).

Evaluation Phases

The Evaluation was carried out in four operational phases from May-Nov 2024:

- **Inception:** The Evaluation commenced with a 2-week in-country mission to Kyrgyzstan during May 2024 to: design evaluation methodologies through consultation with key stakeholders; conduct trial consultation and data collection from stakeholders in one Project target location (Tokmok); and conduct initial key informant interviews (KIIs) with national stakeholders in Bishkek.
- **Data collection:** Data collection was conducted from Jun-Jul 2024 in parallel tracks: i.) the Lead Evaluator led a programme of virtual individual/group KIIs at the national-level; ii.) the National Evaluator conducted a programme of individual/group KIIs in the remaining 6 Project target LSGs; iii.) Document review and processing was ongoing as the Project Team supplied necessary documents through a collaborative process of discovery.
- **Data processing and analysis:** As KIIs were conducted and documents reviewed, during Jul-Aug 2024 data was collected, edited/cleaned for inconsistencies and compiled to identify emergent threads and themes and to support a grounded, credible and coherent set of findings, conclusions and recommendations against Evaluation criteria/KLEs.
- **Report drafting, feedback and finalisation:** Based on synthesised data, the Evaluation Team compiled draft findings and conclusions during Aug-Sep 2024, as well as catalogued good practices, lessons and recommendations to potentially inform future interventions and policy. The Draft Evaluation Report was submitted to the EMG for its review in Sep 2024. After this review, the EMG returned a consolidated 'Management Feedback and Response' to the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team reviewed, assessed and then integrated valid/relevant EMG feedback into this revised Final Report, which was submitted to the EMG in Nov 2024.

Data Collection

The Evaluation relied on both primary and secondary sources:

- **Secondary: Document and literature review.** The Evaluation Team reviewed relevant and available Project documentation (project document, strategic results frameworks, M&E reporting, work plans, etc.) and other relevant publicly available international and national data/analysis, UN policy and guidance documents, analytical/research reports and lessons-learned/best practice exercises related to the Project and conflict prevention/sustaining peace in general. The Document Review was used to: develop background for the Evaluation and clarity on Project management and implementation measures; bring clarity to the Evaluation's questions and methods; supplement and triangulate primary data collected by the Evaluation; and contextualise the Evaluation's findings. Some internal monitoring of specific components by RUNOs and implementing partners were analogous to case studies and used to corroborate other information. All reviewed documents, cited texts and data sources are located in **Annex 4.4**.
- **Secondary: Baseline/Endline Survey.** The Project conducted independent Baseline and Endline Surveys, the reports for which were supplied to the Evaluation Team (though not the raw data) and served as a basis for determining Project performance against specific Outcome/Output Indicators.
- **Primary: Semi-structured individual/group KIIs at the national-level.** After trialing the methodology during the Inception Phase of the Evaluation, a standardised interview protocol was employed by the

Lead Evaluator to conduct semi-structured individual/group KIIs across all identified national-level key stakeholder typologies.

- **Primary: Field visits to 7 Project target locations for observation and semi-structured individual/group KIIs.** The Evaluation Team visited all 7 Project target locations. After the Evaluation team trialed the methodology during the Inception Phase of the Evaluation, a standardised interview protocol was employed by the National Evaluator to conduct semi-structured individual/group interviews across all identified local-level stakeholder typologies. Each field visit typically lasted one working day in each Project target location.

KII Sampling and Methods

No consolidated Project stakeholder mapping existed from which to develop KII sampling plans. Therefore, the Evaluation Team constructed a basic stakeholder mapping across all components and levels of the Project with support from the EMG. The Evaluation took a broad definition of Project stakeholders, including direct participants and/or direct ‘beneficiaries’ of Project activities, RUNOs, implementation partners, contracted service providers/consultants, involved governmental counterparts at the national and local levels, and ‘indirect’ stakeholders also working in the wider conflict prevention/peacebuilding sector of the Kyrgyz Republic. This formed the basis for developing purposive ‘Sampling Frameworks and Plans’ for the national- and local-levels that identified and prioritised unique stakeholder entities while ensuring that all stakeholder entities were represented in the final KII sampling.⁷⁶ The Evaluation identified 57 unique UN- and national-level stakeholder typologies (comprising a potential sample frame ranging from 57-72 individuals) and 13 unique local-level stakeholder typologies (comprising a potential sample frame ranging from 70-154 individuals).

The Evaluation organised KII sampling with considerations of diversity to enable a representative sample. Within the given time, budget and logistical constraints of the exercise, the Evaluation engaged as diverse and inclusive a range of stakeholders as possible (i.e. by gender, language, religion, socio-cultural identities, people with disabilities, state/non-state actors and actors who are typically marginalised) and efforts were made to seek information from all perspectives.

By the conclusion of data collection, the Evaluation Team interviewed 145 key informants (58.6% female and 41.4% male). Nearly 39% of key informants were based/focused at the national-level, while 61% were based/focused at the local-level. In total, 8.3% of key informants were UN personnel, 55.2% were governmental actors, 31.0% were national civil society actors and 5.5% were from other international organisations and INGOs. As a percentage of all interviewed key informants from the Project’s seven target locations, 11.2% were from Aidarken Town, 15.7% were from Suzak Village Municipality, 11.2% were from Balykchy Town, 19.1% were from Osh City, 13.5% were from Nookat Town, 12.4% were from Uzgen Town and 16.9% were from Tokmok Town.

The standardised KII interview protocol utilised open-framed questions both i.) to reduce external bias and pre-determining responses, but also ii.) to provide participants the opportunity to articulate responses according to their own language, perspectives, priorities and experiences.

⁷⁶ The three levels of priority were: ‘high’ priority stakeholders were involved in or adjacent to multiple Project components, components with fully observable outputs/results and/or otherwise ‘scarce’ in overall numbers; ‘medium’ priority stakeholders were involved in or adjacent to a Project component and/or components with partially observable outputs/results; ‘low’ priority stakeholders were involved in or adjacent to a subsidiary Project component and/or were indirect stakeholders.

Lastly, the Evaluation Team took necessary steps to protect participants from potential negative consequences of participating in the Evaluation. Prior informed consent was secured from all participants prior to the commencement of interviews and discussions. KII reports were randomly coded for anonymity and were not shared outside the Evaluation Team. Specific individuals or organisations have not been attributed to specific statements, instead interview codes have been assigned for all KII quotes.

Limitations and caveats

Certain limitations and caveats have potentially impacted the Evaluation:

- **Limitations on assessing for impact and sustainability:** The Evaluation has only been able to identify impact and sustainability apparent as of Jul 2024. Knowing that peace-related impacts are the result of long-term process of change and transformation, the Evaluation took efforts to collect feedback on and consider what impacts and aspects of sustainability *might be expected* in the medium- to long-term. However, by definition, these are speculative rather than conclusive.
- **Language constraints:** The Lead Evaluator did not speak local languages, potentially constraining KIIs. The National Evaluator equipped with local languages interviewed a majority of key informants and simultaneous translation services were provided for KIIs involving the Lead Evaluator.
- **Scheduling and the availability of key informants:** In the end, not all intended key informants were available for interview to the Evaluation Team. Overall, the Evaluation Team interviewed 114% of the minimum potential KII sample frame, 82% of the median potential KII sample base and 64% of the maximum potential KII sample base.
- **Potential logistical constraints:** Certain logistical constraints (e.g. travel planning, remote communications, key informant availability, etc.) imposed delays and complications when conducting field visits. To mitigate, the Evaluation Team continuously coordinated with and updated the Project Team and EMG regarding any such challenges.
- **Non-inclusion of stakeholders under 18 years old as interview subjects:** A segment of the Project's stakeholders are children under the age of 18 years (they are a significant proportion of stakeholders for UNICEF implemented components of the Project). However, the Evaluation Team was not allocated adequate time and means to develop/submit the enhanced methods and protocols necessary to comply with Ethical Review (Instruction 3) requirements of the [UNICEF Procedure on Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis](#) and then receive approval by the Ethical Review Board (ERB). It is not permissible to include children as research/evaluation subjects without passing ERB requirements because such evidence generation "involves cohorts whose personal agency is limited due to age" (i.e. children under the age of 18 years). Therefore, the Evaluation Team could not directly interview Project stakeholders under the age of 18 years. With support from RUNOs and implementing partners, the Evaluation Team made every effort to interview past/current child participants who had 'aged-up' to 18 years old by the time of the Evaluation.
- **Socio-cultural and gender sensitivities:** The Evaluation Team was mindful that perceptions of its composition potentially influenced and diminished the quality of its engagement with some stakeholders in some contexts. As an all-male Team, the Evaluation Team considered additional female accompaniment/facilitation when interviewing female stakeholders in certain contexts. The Team was also mindful of and made adjustments in order to sensitively and safely interview stakeholders from different social, cultural, linguistic and religious communities. Trusted RUNOs/implementing partners facilitated the Evaluation Team's sensitive entry into stakeholder spaces. Informed consent was a guiding practice of the Evaluation. The Evaluation Team was mindful

of language and behavior that could potentially put women, youth and certain social, cultural, linguistic and religious communities at risk.

- ***Different interpretations, expectations and sensitivities around the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept across stakeholders:*** While the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept is central to the Project and current government policy, understandings and expectations about the meaning and application of the concept are inconsistent among many stakeholders, including within different parts of government. Mindful of this fact, the Evaluation Team remained ‘curious’ and utilised ‘open frame’ approaches to ‘stay out of judgement’ while collecting, presenting and analysing these diverse perspectives within a framework of UN principles.
- ***Stakeholder self-censorship and hesitancy:*** Some stakeholders may have been concerned about the consequences of openly expressing personal views in an information collection exercise conducted by external actors. The Evaluation Team clarified at the outset of interviews how collected information will be secured/non-attributable and confirmed consent before proceeding. The Evaluation Team prioritised individual interviews for the most part to mitigate risks of real/perceived third-party scrutiny, otherwise organising group interviews with stakeholders who were already known to one another (ideally already having had a history of ‘safe’ collaboration).
- ***Risks of disaffecting stakeholders with evaluation methodology and vocabulary:*** The Evaluation Team adapted its language and engagement approaches to avoid jargon and other behaviours that might disaffect stakeholders and diminish the Evaluation’s ability to collect information. This may be especially important for any Team interactions with youth, stigmatised and/or grassroots stakeholders. The Evaluation Team mindfully met stakeholders ‘where they were at’ and operated from a ‘curious’ and ‘listening’ posture that valued their voices, expertise and lived experiences.
- ***Risks of stakeholders expectations for the Evaluation’s effect on funding decisions:*** Evaluation engagement and questions did not make reference to any future programmatic funding decisions. When asked, the Evaluation Team clearly communicated that the Evaluation was a specific Project-related process and has no connections to future funding decisions.
- ***Constraints on engaging ‘secondary’ beneficiaries and the wider public:*** ‘Secondary’ beneficiaries are a significant stakeholder group as the Project exposed large parts of the population to public media campaigns, educational curricula, youth initiatives, etc. However, within available time and means, the Evaluation could only engage stakeholders who participated directly in Project activities. The Project’s Baseline/Endline Surveys were used to understand changes in sentiment of the ‘general public’ in Project target locations regarding the Kyrgyz Jarany Concept and values.
- ***Inherent limitations:*** Evaluation research faces a number of inherent limitations, including: bias towards UN/Project-supported stakeholders and a necessarily circumscribed sampling frame; challenges in undertaking virtual interviews and remotely managing research processes; inherent researcher bias, including bias towards English-language sources and contexts; and inherent replicability challenges when conducting qualitative research exercises. Due to space and scope limitations, this Final Report cannot present elaborated case studies or examples; instead, it sought to synthesise insight from different Project contexts and experiences. Given the Project’s multiple levels and large array of stakeholders, the Evaluation will inadvertently exclude certain voices or not satisfactorily cover all issues of importance to all stakeholders. Therefore, its findings are presented with modesty and humility.

4.2 ANNEX: Evaluation Matrix

The table below documents how the Evaluation Team integrated, streamlined and adapted original criteria/questions into an operational set key lines of enquiry under each standard evaluation criteria. These are organised and numbered to reflect the corresponding sections of the Report.

Operationalised Evaluation Criteria and Key Lines of Enquiry (KLEs)	
2.1 RELEVANCE: Did the Project do the right things?	
Evaluation KLEs and sub-questions	Original criteria/questions from ToRs
<p>2.1.1 To what extent was the Project designed and implemented according to the priorities and needs of national stakeholders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was Project design and implementation consistent with and support peace-related national development strategies, policies and legislation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - national gender equality and WPS priorities? - national youth/YPS priorities? - national human rights priorities? To what extent was Project design and implementation conducted in consultation and partnership with national stakeholders at all levels, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - national government? - LSGs? - civil society? - a diverse range of local stakeholders, including: women; youth; people with disabilities; national minorities; and marginalised groups? 	<p>Relevance</p> <p>2. To what extent were the project results relevant to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries, especially of the young women and young men?</p> <p>3. To what extent is the project consistent with key national development strategies, including in the area of peacebuilding, and youth empowerment?</p> <p>5. To what extent and how has the issue of equity been integrated into the design, planning and implementation of the project activities?</p> <p>Coherence</p> <p>7. [...] How were stakeholders involved in the project's design and implementation?</p> <p>National Ownership</p> <p>29. Assess the degree of involvement of national partners and aligning to existing priorities of the local government in targeted areas.</p> <p>Localisation</p> <p>34. Were national and local stakeholders sufficiently consulted and involved throughout the project cycle?</p> <p>General instructions</p> <p>- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project in Kyrgyzstan in terms of: [...] 2) alignment with National Peacebuilding Policy and national priorities; [...] 4) the degree to which the project addressed cross-cutting issues such as conflict and gender equality.</p>
<p>2.1.2 To what extent was Project design and implementation consistent with UN development policies and priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was Project design and implementation aligned to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - current UNSDCF? - Agenda 2030 and SDGs? - key UN human rights conventions/policies? - international gender equality and rights (i.e. CEDAW, Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, etc.)? - UN women, peace and security agenda? - UN youth, peace and security agenda? 	<p>General instructions</p> <p>- Assess the project's overall added value to Strategic Results Framework of the United Nations in Kyrgyzstan.</p> <p>- With respect to PBF's contribution, the evaluation should evaluate whether the project helped advance achievement of the SDGs, and in particular SDG 16.</p> <p>- Assess whether the Project has promoted the Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) agenda and allowed a specific focus on young people's participation in peacebuilding processes.</p> <p>- Assess whether the Project has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women's participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality.</p>
<p>2.1.3 To what extent was the Project designed and implemented consistent to key cross-cutting priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was Project design and implementation aligned to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GEWE/WPS - human rights - UN women, peace and security agenda? - UN youth, peace and security agenda? To what extent were inputs allocated in ways that considered gender equality? Were such differential GEWE input allocations appropriate? 	<p>Gender Equality and Human Rights</p> <p>30. To what extent have gender and human rights considerations been integrated into the project design and implementation?</p> <p>General Instructions</p> <p>- Assess whether the Project has promoted the Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) agenda and allowed a specific focus on young people's participation in peacebuilding processes.</p> <p>- Assess whether the Project has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women's participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality.</p>

<p>2.1.4 To what extent was the Project sensitive to the context, including over time?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was design based on thorough analysis of contextual dynamics, such as: conflict and peacebuilding factors; risk, do-no-harm and conflict sensitivity; social, political, economic, human rights and gender factors; timely entry-points/windows of opportunity; etc.? How did the Project monitor the context and adjust implementation to changing contextual dynamics over time? 	<p>Relevance</p> <p>1. To what extent were the design and objectives of the project-based on solid conflict analysis? Was the project relevant in addressing conflict drivers and factors for peace identified in a conflict analysis?</p> <p>6. To what extent did the project respond to peacebuilding gaps?</p> <p>Conflict Sensitivity</p> <p>24. Did the project have an explicit approach to conflict-sensitivity?</p> <p>25. To what extent conflict sensitivity and do-no-harm principles have been integrated into the project design and implementation?</p> <p>28. Was an ongoing process of context monitoring and a monitoring system that allows for monitoring of unintended impacts established?</p> <p>Risk-Tolerance and Innovation</p> <p>39. If the project was characterized as “high risk”, were risks adequately monitored and mitigated?</p> <p>General instructions</p> <p>- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project in Kyrgyzstan in terms of: 1) addressing key drivers of conflict and the most relevant peacebuilding issues; 4) the degree to which the project addressed cross-cutting issues such as conflict and gender equality.</p>
<p>2.1.5 To what extent was the Project based on a valid and relevant Theory of Change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How valid and relevant was the ToC in design and in practice? To what extent do the ToC and Project design reflect the UN’s added value /comparative advantages in the Kyrgyz Republic? 	<p>Relevance</p> <p>4. To what extent is the project based on a valid Theory of Change and how relevant and coherent was it in practice?</p> <p>General instructions</p> <p>- Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the project in Kyrgyzstan in terms of: [...] 3) whether the project capitalized on the UN’s added value in the country [...]</p>
<p>2.2 COHERENCE: How well did the Project fit with other interventions?</p>	
<p>Evaluation KLEs and sub-questions</p>	<p>Original criteria/questions from ToRs</p>
<p>2.2.1 To what extent was Project design and implementation compatible, coordinated and complimentary to other key stakeholders and interventions in the peacebuilding sector?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did the Project coordinate and collaborate with actors in the wider peacebuilding sector? 	<p>Coherence</p> <p>8. To what extent interventions under this project were complimentary, harmonized, coordinated with the governments’ and other peacebuilding actors’ interventions?</p> <p>Localisation</p> <p>34. Were national and local stakeholders sufficiently consulted and involved throughout the project cycle?</p>
<p>2.3 EFFECTIVENESS: Did the Project achieve its objectives?</p>	
<p>Evaluation KLEs and sub-questions</p>	<p>Original criteria/questions from ToRs</p>
<p>2.3.1 To what extent did the Project realise its objectives and expected results (i.e. activities and outputs)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were expected sub-activities, activities and outputs implemented as per the Project’s Strategic Results Framework, work plans and other guiding management documents/decisions? 	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>9. To what extent have the expected results of the project been achieved on both outcome and output levels?</p>
<p>2.3.2 To what extent did the Project strengthen the capacities of i.) governmental stakeholders (duty bearers) and ii.) civil society and local communities (rights-holders)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What types of stakeholder types benefitted from what types of capacity development? How were newly developed capacities demonstrated or applied? 	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>12. How did the project succeed or not in involving and building the capacities of rights-holders, duty-bearers as well as the project partners?</p> <p>Localisation</p> <p>35. Did the project strengthen capacities of national and local stakeholders (national and local governments and CSOs)?</p>
<p>2.3.3 To what extent did national- and local-level stakeholders perceive the Project’s support as beneficial/useful?</p>	<p>Localisation</p> <p>36. How useful did national and local stakeholders perceive PBF’s support?</p>

<p>2.3.4 Were there any unintended/indirect positive and/or negative results of the Project?</p>	<p>Impact 18. What are the indirect, unintended positive and negative and potential consequences of the intervention in the areas where the project was implemented? [...] Conflict Sensitivity 27. Was the project responsible for any unintended negative impacts?</p>
<p>2.3.5 To what extent did Project results contribute to gender equality?</p>	<p>Gender Equality and Human Rights 30. To what extent have gender and human rights considerations been integrated into the project design and implementation? General Instructions - Assess whether the Project has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women’s participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality.</p>
<p>2.3.6 What factors influenced the achievement or non-achievement of Project results?</p>	<p>Effectiveness 13. What were the main factors influencing achievement or non-achievement of the project results and in what ways?</p>
<p>2.3.7 To what extent were Project strategies and approaches innovative in achieving results?</p>	<p>Effectiveness 10. To what extent have the strategies and approaches been innovative in achieving the project results? [...]</p>
<p>2.3.8 Were timely corrective actions taken when necessary during the course of the Project?</p>	<p>Effectiveness 10. [...] Were timely corrective actions taken when and where necessary during the course of the project?</p>
<p>2.3.9 How did integration of gender equality advance Project effectiveness and results?</p>	<p>Gender Equality and Human Rights 31. How has attention to/integration of gender equality and human rights concerns advanced the area of work? Conflict-sensitivity and do-no-harm principles? General Instructions - Assess whether the Project has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women’s participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality.</p>
<p>2.3.10 How did integration of human rights advance Project effectiveness and results?</p>	<p>Gender Equality and Human Rights 31. How has attention to/integration of gender equality and human rights concerns advanced the area of work? Conflict-sensitivity and do-no-harm principles?</p>
<p>2.3.11 How did integration of conflict sensitivity and do-no-harm advance Project effectiveness and results?</p>	<p>Gender Equality and Human Rights 31. How has attention to/integration of gender equality and human rights concerns advanced the area of work? Conflict-sensitivity and do-no-harm principles?</p>
<p>2.4 Impact and Sustainability: What differences did the Project make? Will the benefits last?</p>	
<p>Evaluation KLEs and sub-questions</p>	<p>Original criteria/questions from ToRs</p>
<p>2.4.1 What measurable changes occurred in the Project’s higher-level Outcome indicators for greater/enhanced shared civic identity, social cohesion and inclusive governance?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were expected outcome indicators achieved as per the Project’s Strategic Results Framework? To what extent did the Project’s Baseline/Endline Survey demonstrate increases in shared civic identity, social cohesion and inclusive governance indicators across Project target locations? 	<p>Effectiveness 9. To what extent have the expected results of the project been achieved on both outcome and output levels? 11. How effective have the project strategies and approaches been in contributing to social cohesion and shared civic identity? Impact 18. What are the indirect, unintended positive and negative and potential consequences of the intervention in the areas where the project was implemented? What might be the most significant, long-term and potentially transformative effects of the project?</p>
<p>2.4.2 To what extent were the Project’s net benefits already evident and demonstrating continuation? (i.e. ‘actual’ impact and sustainability)</p>	<p>Impact 19. How likely is it that the project will contribute to a broader positive impact of improved social cohesion and peacebuilding in country? Sustainability 21. How effectively has the project generated national ownership of the results achieved? 23. How effectively has the established partnerships with relevant stakeholders developed national capacities to ensure sustainability of efforts and results?</p>

<p>2.4.3 What might be the most significant, long-term and potentially transformative benefits and effects of the Project? To what extent is it likely these will continue? (i.e. ‘prospective’ impact and sustainability)</p>	<p>Impact 19. How likely is it that the project will contribute to a broader positive impact of improved social cohesion and peacebuilding in country? Sustainability 21. How effectively has the project generated national ownership of the results achieved? 23. How effectively has the established partnerships with relevant stakeholders developed national capacities to ensure sustainability of efforts and results?</p>
<p>2.4.4 How did different stakeholders (especially youth, women, and CSOs) contribute to and were differentially impacted by the Project’s results?</p>	<p>Impact 20. How did young women and men, CSOs contribute to social cohesion and peacebuilding in their communities or beyond? General Instructions - Assess whether the Project has promoted the Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) agenda and allowed a specific focus on young people’s participation in peacebuilding processes. - Assess whether the Project has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women’s participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality.</p>
<p>2.4.5 To what extent did other intersecting social barriers contribute to differential stakeholder impacts?</p>	
<p>2.4.6 How did the Project employ ‘exit strategies’ to promote sustainability and the continuance of results after the Project ended?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the Project measure sustainability of outputs/results? • What agreements, frameworks or modalities existed with national stakeholders ensuring continuance of Project outputs/results? 	<p>Sustainability 22. Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of national capacity etc.) to support positive changes in peacebuilding after the end of the project?</p>
<p>2.4.7 To what extent are net Project benefits of gender equality and human rights persisting or likely to continue?</p>	<p>Gender Equality and Human Rights 30. To what extent have gender and human rights considerations been integrated into the project design and implementation? General Instructions - Assess whether the Project has promoted the Women, Peace and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women’s participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable to gender equality.</p>
<p>2.4.8 To what extent has the Project had a catalytic effect, as defined by PBF criteria?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the Project created momentum for the removal of barriers to addressing key peacebuilding priorities? • To what extent has the Project facilitated the engagement of additional stakeholders and/or resources into peacebuilding efforts? 	<p>Catalytic 32. Was the project financially and/or programmatically catalytic? [as per PBF catalytic criteria] 33. Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding?</p>
<p>2.5 Efficiency: How well were resources used and managed?</p>	
<p>Evaluation KLEs and sub-questions</p>	<p>Original criteria/questions from ToRs</p>
<p>2.5.1 To what extent did the Project deliver results in an economic and timely way?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent were Project inputs and expenditure in accordance with approved plans? 	<p>Efficiency 15. Have project interventions been implemented within intended timeframe or timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context? General instructions - The evaluation should look at the collective way of working and coordination among the participating entities.</p>
<p>2.5.2 To what extent were Project inputs converted to results in the most cost- and time-effective ways?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent can the Project demonstrate it achieved an appropriate cost-benefit, rate of 	<p>Efficiency 14. To what extent the level of achievements (outputs and outcome) justifies the financial and human resources used?</p>

return and/or cost-effectiveness when compared to alternative models/approaches?	
2.5.3 To what extent did the Project deliver results within the expected timeframe? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did the timeliness of actual activity implementation compare with expected workplans? How did the Project reasonably adjust its delivery timeframes to the evolving context? 	Efficiency 15. Have project interventions been implemented within intended timeframe or timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context?
2.5.4 To what extent did RUNOs and Project management systems ensure synergies and support the efficient and effective achievement of results? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did the Project coordinate and collaborate across multiple national stakeholders? To what extent did RUNOs ensure efficient and integrated Project implementation? How did RUNOs make the most of integrated and cross-sectoral work to increase the overall contribution of the project? 	Coherence 7. To what extent UNDP, UNICEF and OHCHR were able to ensure synergies and interlinkages in design and implementation of the project? Has UNDP, as the leading agency, in collaboration with other participating entities been able to make the most of integrated and cross-sectoral working to increase the overall contribution of the project? [...] Efficiency 16. To what extent does the management structure of the project support efficiency for programme implementation and achievement of results? Localisation 34. Were national and local stakeholders sufficiently consulted and involved throughout the project cycle? General Instructions - Look at the collective way of working and coordination among the participating entities.
2.5.5 To what extent did monitoring mechanisms effectively measure and inform management of project performance and progress?	Efficiency 17. To what extent are the monitoring mechanisms in place effective in measuring and informing management of the project performance and progress towards the targets?

3.2 Good practices, lessons and recommendations

Evaluation KLEs and sub-questions	Original criteria/questions from ToRs
What good practices, lessons and/or recommendations might be derived from findings/conclusions under each KLE?	Lessons learnt/Conclusions 41. What are the lessons learnt from the project? 42. What are the good practices that could be applied in the future activities and similar projects? 43. An analysis of the main lessons learnt in relation to the effectiveness of foreseen strategies and theories of change to achieve a peacebuilding impact. 44. An analysis of the main lessons learnt in relation to the effectiveness of implementation modalities. 45. The evaluation must identify lessons learned that would have wider applicability and relevance to other similar interventions in Kyrgyzstan and in other contexts, and provide no more than 10 useful, realistic and actionable recommendations (including on cross-cutting themes and M&E system), with clear identification of responsible stakeholders. General Instructions - Identify lessons learnt and recommendations to overcome potential challenges

Original criteria/questions from ToRs NOT integrated into the Evaluation

Conflict Sensitivity

26. Were funds' recipients' internal capacities adequate for ensuring an ongoing conflict-sensitive approach?

Time-Sensitivity

37. Was the project well-timed to address a conflict factor or capitalize on a specific window of opportunity?

38. Was PBF funding used to leverage political windows of opportunity for engagement?

Risk-Tolerance and Innovation

40. How novel or innovative was the project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere?

General instructions

- Assess to what extent the PBF-funded project has made a concrete contribution to reducing a conflict factor in Kyrgyzstan.

4.3 ANNEX: Stakeholders Interviewed

Note: Not all interviewed stakeholders are listed here as some requested to remain anonymous. Titles and organisations are denoted as they were known at the time of interview. Respondents within each category are listed in alphabetic order.

United Nations Personnel

Aigul Aitmamat kyzy	Programme Associate, OHCHR
Aizhan Abdesova	Youth Engagement Officer, UNICEF
Chinara Dzhumagulova	Early Childhood Development Program Officer, UNICEF
Erkin Isakulov	Human Rights Officer, OHCHR
Fabio Piana	Deputy Resident Representative, OHCHR
Gulzhigit Ermatov	UN Peace and Development Officer, RCO
Kurtmolla Abdulganiyev	Former UN Peace and Development Adviser, RCO
Marc Fumagalli	UN Peace and Development Adviser, RCO
Mukash Kaldarov	Senior Advisor on Social Cohesion, UNDP
Nargiza Tashtemirova	Project Associate on Peacebuilding, UNDP
Nuriia Karakulova	Adolescents Development & Participation, UNICEF
Sylvi Hill	Head of Child Protection Section, UNICEF

Governmental Project Stakeholders

Akjol Abdulkerimov	Head of the Consolidated Analysis, Planning and Control Section, Office of the Akyikatchy (Ombudsperson) of the Kyrgyz Republic
Almaz Toktomametov	Head of Institute, Republican Teacher Training Institute, Ministry of Education and Science
Askar Shaikidinov	Head, Youth Policy Department, Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy
Bermet Asanbaeva	Focal person, Kyrgyz Academy of Education, Ministry of Education and Science
Chingiz Esengul	Deputy Minister, Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy
Dastan Bekeshev	Member of Parliament, Jogorku Kenesh (Parliament of the Kyrgyz Republic)
Eliza Taitelieva	Former officer at Center for Research of Religious Situation, State Commission for Religious Affairs
Iskender Eshimbekov	Head, Interethnic Department, Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy
Jazgul Tumenova	Former Head, Interethnic Department, Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy
Kanatbek Midin uulu	Deputy Director, State Commission for Religious Affairs
Kubanychbek Abakirov	Specialist, Center for Research of Religious Situation, State Commission for Religious Affairs

Muratbek Imankulov	Head, Laboratory of Social and Humanitarian Education, Kyrgyz Academy of Education, Ministry of Education and Science
Rinat Askarbekovich	Specialist, Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy
Salkyn Sarnogoeva	Head, Information Policy Department, Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy
Sanzharbek Tajimatov	Director, Monitoring Centre, Ministry of Culture, Information, Sports and Youth Policy
Shukur Shermatov	Director, Center for Research of Religious Situation, State Commission for Religious Affairs
Zhanara Dootalieva	Specialist, Ministry of Education and Science

Non-Governmental Project Stakeholders

Aijan Satimbay kyzy	Coordinator, Youth of Osh
Ainura Ormonova	Director, Nash Golos
Almaz Ismanov	Media Expert, Prevention Media
Artur Bakirov	Director, Association of Legal Clinics of Kyrgyzstan
Atyrkul Alisheva	Independent expert on Kyrgyz Zharany, human rights and diversity
Begimai Kulova	Project Coordinator, IDEA CA
Cholpon Achikeeva	Independent expert on local self-governance
Elmira Nazarkulova	Trainer on multilingual education in ECD Centres
Elnura Kalybaeva	Coordinator, Eurasian Foundation of Central Asia
Gulmira Kazakunova	Head, Ravenstvo (Equality): The Union of People with Disabilities
Mira Karybaeva	Independent expert on social cohesion
Nargiza Zhenisheva	Project Coordinator, Association of Legal Clinics of Kyrgyzstan
Nazgul Turdubekova	Director, Child's Rights Defenders League
Salia Isabekova	Specialist, Eurasian Foundation of Central Asia
Sardor Abdukhalilov	Director, Centre for Strategic Litigation
Semetei Suiunbek uulu	National Institute for Strategic Studies
Shakdar Suleiman	International University of Central Asia
Zakir Chotaev	Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University
Zaure Sydykova	Independent expert on curriculum development
Zhyldyz Iskakova	Consultant, Media Content Distribution

Indirect Stakeholders

Chinara Esengul	Regional Advisor for Central Asia and Country Manager for Kyrgyzstan, PeaceNexus
Dominik Rastinger	Senior Political Adviser, OSCE Programme Office in Bishkek
Guljan Ermekbaeva	Programme Officer, Office of the OSCE High Commissioner for National Minorities
Samara Papiieva	Country Director, Kyrgyzstan, Search for Common Ground

Community-Level Stakeholders

Aidarken

Abdijapar Momunov	Former Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations
Aisuluu Kojomkulova	Mediation training participant
Aizada Burkanbek kyzy	ECD Centre/Library
Alisher Sadykov	Mediation training participant
Azamat Saitov	Vice-Mayor
Kasiet Murzaeva	Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Nishanbubu Joldosheva	UPSHIFT participant
Nurbek Kasymov	UPSHIFT participant
Nurjamal Akimova	UPSHIFT participant
Ulpat Jakypova	Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant

Balykchy

Abilbiihan Kanybekov	Youth Center “Ordo”
Adilet Kalykov	Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
Aisalkyn Erkinbek kyzy	Mediation training participant
Asel Abdylbaeva	ECD Centre/Library
Baiei Shaimbetov	UPSHIFT participant
Begimai Baktybekova	UPSHIFT participant
Edil Tokonbaev	Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations
Gulbara Beishembieva	Mediation training participant
Nurzat Rakhmatova	UPSHIFT participant
Zubarzhad Zhalilova	UPSHIFT participant

Nookat

Aisuluu Pazylova	UPSHIFT project participant
Akmataly Bobulov	HR, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Akylai Uraimova	ECD Centre/Library
Baktygul Kaldarova	Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Charos Inakova	Head, Mayor's Office, City of Nookat
Jypar Aidarova	ECD Centre/Library
Mamazhonus Abylov	Deputy Head, State Administration of Nookat District
Mansur Daniyar uulu	Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Manzurkhan Satkinova	Department Head, State Administration of Nookat District
Minura Niyazbayeva	UPSHIFT participant

Ulan Mamasherov UPSHIFT participant
Zakhidzhan Abidzhanov Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations

Osh

Aibike Abdykalykova Mediation training participant
Almagul Kokoeva Dean of the Law department, Kyrgyz-Uzbek International University
Argen Toktomametov Mediation training participant
Baktygul Midinova Director of Osh Regional Museum of Fine Arts
Baktygul Myrzaeva ECD Centre/Library
Berdikul Sultanov Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations
Damira Usonova Mediation training participant
Elida Narbotoeva Head, Legal Clinic, Kyrgyz-Uzbek International University
Furkatbek Adilbek uulu Head, Southern Department, State Commission for Religious Affairs
Khimiya Suerkulova Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Kurmanzhan Aibek kyzy UPSHIFT participant
Larisa Kuznetsova Head, Smile KG
Mairambek Taalaibek uulu Staff member, Novyi Ritm (New Rhythm)
Maksatali Topchubaev Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Mukhadamin Kanatov Head, Jibek Jolu Municipal Territorial Administration, Osh City
Nuraiym Kalilova Mediation training participant
Omurali Arzykulov Head, Department of Organisational and Inspection Work and Local Self-Government

Suzak

Aidanek Sultanova UPSHIFT participant
Aigerim Karaeva Social work specialist, Suzak Village Administration (municipality)
Ainura Zakirova ECD Centre/Library
Arapatkhon Yuldasheva Mediation training participant
Azamat Mamatjanov Head, Social Department, Suzak District Administration
Bekmamat Baktybekov Head of Office, Suzak District Administration
Bektur Akmatov UPSHIFT participant
Kalyskan Baimurzaeva Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Kurmanjan Sultanova UPSHIFT participant
Mahabat Botasheva Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Mahomadsoli Begimkulov Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Malika Akimkulova Mediation training participant
Nuskaiym Shergazieva Mediation training participant
Turdukul Karaev Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations

Tokmok

Alexander Artemov	UPSHIFT participant
Alisher Turatbek uulu	Vice-Mayor
Berdibek Asanov	Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations
Gulbara Amankulova	Former Social Development Department, Mayor's Office
Kurmanbek Makeshev	Mediation training participant
Medet Turkmenov	Chairman of the Council of Veterans; former Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations
Olga Lavrinovich	Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant

Uzgen

Adashkan Kochkorbaeva	Mediation training participant
Dilnoza Sabirova	Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Jalal Aliev	Editor in chief, Uzgen Nuru Newspaper; former Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations
Khozhiakbar Mavlyanov	UPSHIFT participant
Klara Karimjanova	Human rights, diversity, Kyrgyz Jarany training participant
Matlyubakhon Musabaeva	Chairwoman, Uzgen District Women's Council
Rahimbek Myrzakulov	Deputy Head, Uzgen District Administration
Salamat Mamytova	Mediation training participant
Syimyk Maturaimov	Mediation training participant
Talant Abdrazakov	Executive Secretary, Public Reception Centre for Interethnic Relations
Ulukbek Mamadaliev	Mediation training participant

4.4 ANNEX: Document Review and Bibliography

Internal Project Documentation Reviewed

Most recent Kyrgyz Republic PBF Eligibility Request

- The Summary of the [Kyrgyzstan] Conflict and Peace Analysis (Mar 2020)
- Regional Consultation on UN Peacebuilding Architecture in Central Asia, Bishkek (10-11 Mar 2020)
- Kyrgyz Republic PBF Re-eligibility Request – Letter from President (26 Apr 2021)
- Kyrgyz Republic PBF Re-eligibility Request – Programme (26 Apr 2021)
- Kyrgyz Republic PBF Re-eligibility Request – Approval by UN SG (14 Jun 2021)
- PBF: Kyrgyzstan Strategic Results Framework, 2021-2026
- Presentation, “Introduction - PBF Eligibility Cycles” (21 May 2024)

Project Document and related management documents

- ProDoc for the “Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development (Dec 2021 -Jun 2024) PBF/KGZ/B-7,” UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR (Dec 2021)
- No-Cost-Extension ProDoc for the “Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development (Dec 2021 -Jun 2024) PBF/KGZ/B-7,” UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR (Oct 2023)
- Project Social and Environmental Screening Template (Jan 2022)
- General project Work Plan (as provided 13 Jun 2024)
- Aligned Kyrgyz Jarany Concept/Project Work Plan (13 May 2022)
- Minutes, First Technical Meeting to agree Aligned Kyrgyz Jarany Concept/Project Work Plan (13 May 2022)
- Minutes, Second Technical Meeting to agree Aligned Kyrgyz Jarany Concept/Project Work Plan (30 May 2022)
- UNDP Project Annual Work Plan (17 Jan 2022)
- UNDP Project Annual Work Plan (5 Jun 2023)
- UNDP Project Annual Work Plan (29 Mar 2024)
- UNICEF Project Annual Work Plan (provided 18 Jun 2024)
- Presentation, “Project Conflict sensitivity induction workshop for UN staff,” RUNO staff workshop (20 Apr 2022)
- Presentation, “Integrating Conflict Sensitivity Across Development Efforts,” RUNO and implementing partner staff workshops (Jun 2024)

Project oversight/management related

- Order No. 228 Establishing the UN PBF Joint Steering Committee (JSC), Chairman of the Cabinet Of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic (22 Mar 2022)
- JSC Meetings (2 meetings) – agendas/minutes/project presentations: 17 May 2022, 8 Feb 2023
- UN HoA PBF Project Coordination Meetings (3 meetings) – agendas/minutes/project presentations: 30 Aug 2022, 12 Jun 2023, 27 Nov 2023
- Project-MoCISYP Coordination Meetings (9 meetings) – agendas/minutes: 14 Apr 2022, 29 Jul 2022, 13 Sep 2022, 7 Dec 2022, 1 Mar 2023, 23 Jun 2023, 31 Jul 2023, 2 Apr 2024, 5 Apr 2024
- ‘All Stakeholder’ Project Coordination Meetings (5 meetings) – agendas/minutes: 13 May 2022; 30 May 2022; 29 Mar 2023; 1 Aug 2023; 6 Jun 2024
- TCG Meetings (11 meetings) – agendas/minutes: 22 Feb 2022, 13 Mar 2022, 15 Mar 2022, 29 Mar 2022, 16 Aug 2022, 30 Aug 2022, 29 Nov 22, 28 Feb 2023, 27 Apr 2023, 23 Jun 2023, 31 Oct 2023
- Project M&E/Communications Meetings (4 meetings) – agendas/minutes: 4 Mar 2022, 3 Oct 2023, 14 Nov 2023, 13 Mar 2024

Project M&E documents

- Project M&E Plan

- Project Baseline Survey Study Report (26 Jun 2023)
- Project Endline Survey Study Report (as provided 7 Nov 2024)
- Project Semi-Annual Report 2022 (14 Jun 2022)
- Project Annual Report 2022 (Nov 2022)
- Project Semi-Annual Report 2023 (20 Jun 2023)
- Project Annual Report 2023 (Nov 2023)
- Project Semi-Annual Report (14 Jun 2024)
- Project Annual Financial Report 2022
- Project Annual Financial Report 2023
- Project Semi-Annual Financial Report 2024 (Jun 2024)
- Project Events Calendar 2022-2024 (as provided 18 Jul 2024)

UNDP project documentation (organised by Output/Sub-Activities)

General:

- UNDP, Presentation, "Inclusive governance and shared civic identity for sustainable peace and development Project" (20 May 2024)
- UNDP, Presentation: "Infrastructures for Peace – Kyrgyzstan Overview" (20 May 2024)
- UNDP, Presentation: "UNDP interventions: Peacebuilding Architecture and Social Cohesion" (20 May 2024)
- UNDP, Presentation, "Inclusive governance and shared civic identity for sustainable peace and development Project— Updated" (19 Jun 2024)

Output 1:

- UNDP, ToRs: "Assistance in holding public hearings of the draft on amendments and additions to the Law of the Kyrgyz Republic On Local state administration and local self-government bodies" (19 Sep 2022)
- 1.2.1 Nash Golos, Project Report: "Report on public hearings on the draft law on amendments and additions to the Law of the Kyrgyz Republic 'On Local State Administration and Local Self-Government Bodies'", Osh (1 Nov 2022)
- 1.2.1 Proposed changes to Draft Law for Amendments to the LSG Law
- 1.2.1 Response - Department of Expertise to proposed Draft Law on Amendments to the LSG Law
- 1.2.1 Nash Golos, Project Report: Seminars on "Issues of implementation and development of laws in the sphere of civil service and local self-government," in Osh Region, Alai District, Uzgen District and Jalal-Abad Region (1-4 Nov 2022)
- 1.2.2 Karybaeva, Mira, Report: "Adapted conceptual framework for social cohesion for the Kyrgyz Republic and policy recommendations to ensure a holistic approach to the implementation of state policy" (2024)
- 1.2.2 UNDP, Back to Office Report: On optimization and stocktaking of certain adopted national programs and strategies of the Kyrgyz Republic (24-29 Dec 2023)
- 1.3.1 UNDP, Draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion (2023)
- 1.3.1 UNDP, Back to Office Report: Consultations on Draft Integrated National Action Plan on Social Cohesion (28 Sep 2023)
- 1.3.1 UNDP, Press Release: Support for Strengthening Comprehensive Initiatives in Implementing National Programs and Strategies of the Kyrgyz Republic in the Field of Social Cohesion (29 Sep 2023)

Output 2:

- 2.1.1 Analytical Report: "Development of infrastructures for peace at the national and local levels and policy recommendations" (2023)
- 2.1.2 MoCISYP "Regulation/Manual on the procedure for conducting joint monitoring to prevent conflicts (ethnic, religious, social, etc.) and establish peace in the districts, cities, and rural areas of the Kyrgyz Republic" by MoCISYP Order No. 55. (30 Jan 2024).
- 2.1.3 State Commission for Religious Affairs, Letter of Agreement with UNDP (31 May 2023)
- 2.1.3 Center for Central Asian Studies at the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Abridged Report: "On the implementation of the research project "Conducting conflict sensitive analysis related to peacebuilding in pilot locations" within the framework of the UNDP Program "Inclusive Governance and Common Identity for Sustainable Peace and Development" (5 Aug 2022)

- 2.1.3 Center for Central Asian Studies at the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Full Report: “On the implementation of the research project “Conducting conflict sensitive analysis related to peacebuilding in pilot locations” within the framework of the UNDP Program “Inclusive Governance and Common Identity for Sustainable Peace and Development” Full (5 Aug 2022)
- 2.1.3 Center for Central Asian Studies at the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Presentation: “Theoretical aspects and research methodology,” at Round table to discuss the results of a sociological study to identify sensitive issues in the implementation of the Concept Kyrgyz Jarany (24 Aug 2022)
- 2.1.3 Center for Central Asian Studies at the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Report: “Perception of the Concept of ‘Kyrgyz Jarany’ by Ethnic and Religious Communities” (2022)
- 2.1.3 Center for Central Asian Studies at the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Report: “Indicators For Assessing Social Tension In The Religious Sphere Of Kyrgyzstan” (2023)
- 2.1.3 Center for Central Asian Studies at the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Report: “Matrix of indicators for assessing social tension in the religious sphere” (2023)
- 2.1.3 Center for Central Asian Studies at the Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, Project Report: “Report on project implementation: Validation and implementation of indicators for assessing social tension in the religious sphere” (2024)
- 2.1.3 Helena Puig Larrauri, Report: “Towards a Social Cohesion Barometer for the Kyrgyz Republic: Concept Note,” Build Up (28 Mar 2024)
- 2.2.1-3 UNDP, Monitoring Report: Workshop on “Implementation of indicators for assessing social tension in the religious and interethnic spheres through the prism of human rights,” in Bishkek (20-21 Jul 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Report: “Interim report on the review of the current monitoring and data management system for peacebuilding and social cohesion at national and local levels” (2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Training Agenda: “Modernization of the monitoring and data management system in the field of peacebuilding and social cohesion at the national and local levels in the Kyrgyz Republic,” Bishkek (23-24 Mar 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Report: “Expert consultations with employees of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic, SCRA, local state administrations, independent experts, civil society organizations to discuss and develop monitoring plans aimed at preventing interethnic and intergroup conflicts at the national level,” (Jun-Aug 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Report: “Meetings held with local councils, public advisory councils, local government bodies, local state administrations, and civil society organizations at the community level” (2-5 May 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Training Agenda: “Involvement of representatives of civil society organizations in the system for monitoring peacebuilding processes, development of civil identity and conflict prevention at the local level,” (Sep 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Training Report: “Training for representatives of civil society organizations of pilot municipalities in order to increase their monitoring and peacekeeping potential,” Balykchy (27-28 Sep 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Training Report: “Training for representatives of civil society organizations of pilot municipalities in order to increase their monitoring and peacekeeping potential,” Osh (11-12 Sep 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Training Report: “Training for representatives of civil society organizations of pilot municipalities in order to increase their monitoring and peacekeeping potential,” Uzgen (13-14 Sep 2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Report: “Review of existing system of monitoring and data management in peacebuilding and social cohesion” (2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Report: “Review of proposed recommendations on Forms No. 1 and No. 2” (for MoCISYP EWER monitoring)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Updated Draft Form 1 (for MoCISYP EWER monitoring)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Updated Draft Form 2 (for MoCISYP EWER monitoring)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Project Report: “Program report for tranche 2” (01/03/2023 to 15/04/2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Project Report: “Program report for tranche 3” (16/04/2023 to 16/07/2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Project Report: “Program report for tranche 4” (17/11/2023 to 30/09/2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Project Report: “Program report for tranche 5” (01/10/2023 to 20/11/2023)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Project Report: “Program report for tranche 6” (21/11/2023 to 19/02/2024)
- 2.2.1-3 Eurasia Foundation CA, Project Report: “Program report for tranche 2” (20/02/2024 to 31/03/2024)

Output 3:

- 3.1.1 UNDP, ToRs: “Develop youth-friendly materials explaining the basics of the values of shared civic identity and Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic using game format as a tool” (2023)
- 3.1.1 Association of Kyrgyz Legal Clinics, Programme: “Seminar to familiarize teachers with the ‘Constitution of the Kyrgyz Citizen’” in developing the Kyrgyz Jarany Board Game (29 Nov 2023)
- 3.1.1 Association of Kyrgyz Legal Clinics, Kyrgyz Jarany Board Game Instructions (2024)
- 3.1.1 Association of Kyrgyz Legal Clinics, Project Report: “Final Report of the Project ‘Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic’” (3 Apr 2024)
- 3.1.1 MoCISYP, Letter to UNDP requesting Project support o the national Kyrgyz Jarany Concept awareness campaign (31 Oct 2022)
- 3.1.1 MoCISYP, Programme: “Fifth Coordination Meeting” of the national Kyrgyz Jarany Concept information campaign for regional local government bodies, Osh (26 May 2022)
- 3.1.1 MoCISYP, Communications Strategy for the national Kyrgyz Jarany Concept awareness campaign 2021-26 (13 May 2022)
- 3.1.1 MoCISYP, Media Plan for the national Kyrgyz Jarany Concept awareness campaign in 2022 (13 May 2022)
- 3.1.1 MoCISYP, Note: “Information campaign on Kyrgyz Jarany in numbers” (8 Dec 2022)
- 3.1.2 MoCISYP, Agenda: “Training program on information promotion of the Concept of Kyrgyz Jarany” for journalists/media (23 Nov 2023)
- 3.2.1-2 Nash Golos, Report: “Policy recommendations for LSGs on peacebuilding and social cohesion” (May 2023)
- 3.2.1-2 Nash Golos, Minutes: “Public Hearings on LSG Law amendment” (Nov 2022)
- 3.2.1-2 City of Osh, Local Community Charter (11 Oct 2023)
- 3.4.1 UNDP, Request for Proposals: “Procurement of services for Development and implementation of training on conflict prevention through mediation practices and conflict and gender sensitivity for local self-governments, local CSOs” (2023)
- 3.4.1 Child’s Rights Defenders League, Training Module: “Danaker: role in conflict prevention and resolution and basic conflictology and mediation tools” (2024)
- 3.4.1 Child’s Rights Defenders League, Training Agenda: “Development and implementation of training on conflict prevention through mediation,” Balykchy (5-6 Feb 2024)
- 3.4.1 Child’s Rights Defenders League, Project Report: Final Report for "Danaker - Prevention conflicts through mediation" trainings (Nov 2023-Feb 2024)
- 3.5.1 UNDP, ARTurduuluk Exhibition Catalogue (2024)
- 3.5.1 Osh Regional Museum of Fine Arts, Project Report: Final Report “ARTacceleration. Creative Laboratory/Plein Air” (Nov 2023)
- 3.5.1 UNDP, Amended ToRs: “Addressing hate speech and information pollution for social cohesion in Kyrgyzstan (PID 00129350)” (14 Jul 2023)
- 3.5.1 IDEA Central Asia, Project Report: “Sozdun Kuchu project - Combating hate speech and information pollution for social cohesion in Kyrgyzstan” with Appendixes 1.1-1.4 (16 Nov 2023)
- 3.5.1 IDEA Central Asia, Anti-hate Speech Hackathon List of Teams/Projects (as provided 13 Aug 2024)
- 3.5.1 UNDP, ToRs: “Addressing hate speech and information pollution for social cohesion in Kyrgyzstan (PID 00129350)” (21 Sep 2022)
- 3.5.1 Prevention Media, Manual: “From Hate Speech to Non-Violent Communication” (2023)

UNICEF project documentation (organised by Output/Sub-Activities)

General:

- UNICEF, Presentation: “Inclusive governance and shared civic identity for sustainable peace and development Project” (28 Jun 2024)
- UNICEF, Programme Document with Youth of Osh: KYR/PCA2023144/PD2022160 (27 Jun 2022 – 30 Sep 2023)
- UNICEF, Amended Programme Document with Youth of Osh: KYR/PCA2023144/PD2022160-amd/1 (27 Jun 2022 – 27 Jan 2024)
- Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: “Peacebuilding training,” Osh (13-14 Oct 2023)
- Youth of Osh, Project Report: “Progress Report – 1st Tranche”
- Youth of Osh, Project Report: “Progress Report – 2nd Tranche”

- Youth of Osh, Project Report: “Progress Report – 3rd Tranche”
- Youth of Osh, Project Report: “Progress Report – 4th Tranche”
- Youth of Osh, Project Report: “Progress Report – 5th Tranche”

Output 1:

- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Manual: YCFLG “Methodological guide on work with youth for local governments and specialists in work with youth at the local level” (2023)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Manual: YCFLG “Methodological guide for the youth of the Kyrgyz Republic for a better understanding of the work of the state and local governments” (2023)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: “Kyrgyz Jarany and Youth” (Aug 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Presentation: “Kyrgyz citizen citizenship identity” (Aug 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Presentation: “Kyrgyz citizen citizenship identity” (Aug 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Biyalieva, Training Report: “Kyrgyz Jarany and Youth” (Aug 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Sydykova, Training Report: “Kyrgyz Jarany and Youth” (Aug 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Presentation: “Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation” (2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: “Municipal development programs together with youth” (2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Training Report: “Balykchy SEDP Training” (5-7 Oct 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Training Report: “Tokmok SEDP Training” (15-17 Oct 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Training Report: “Southern region SEDP Training” (14-23 Nov 2022)
- 1.4.1-4 Youth of Osh, Youth Position Paper: “We Want Development and Change Together” (2023)

Output 2:

- 2.1.5-10 UNICEF, U-Reporter Poll Result Analysis: “Kyrgyz Jarany Concept” (12 Aug 2022)
- 2.1.5-10 UNICEF, U-Reporter Poll Result Analysis: “Bullying Survey” (2 Mar 2023)
- 2.1.5-10 UNICEF, U-Reporter Poll Result Analysis: “Online Safety” (1 Sep 2023)

Output 3:

- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Presentation: “UPSHIFT Introduction” (Aug 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Program for Selection of UPSHIFT Participants (15 Aug-3 Sep 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, UPSHIFT Participant Selection Procedure (Aug 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Workshop Protocol for the Selection of UPSHIFT Participants/Teams (Aug 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, UPSHIFT Code of Conduct (Aug 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: “Personal growth, self-awareness and self-esteem” (7-27 Sep 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Reports: “Personal growth, self-awareness and self-esteem” for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (7-27 Sep 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Feedback: “Personal growth, self-awareness and self-esteem” for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (7-27 Sep 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: “UPSHIFT Bootcamp 1” (20 Sep – 5 Oct 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Presentation: “UPSHIFT Bootcamp 1 – Day 1” (20 Sep – 5 Oct 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Presentation: “UPSHIFT Bootcamp 1 – Day 2” (20 Sep – 5 Oct 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Reports: “UPSHIFT Bootcamp 1” for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (20 Sep – 5 Oct 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: “UPSHIFT Bootcamp 2”
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Reports: “UPSHIFT Bootcamp 2” for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (8-26 Oct 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Feedback: “UPSHIFT Bootcamp 2” for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (8-26 Oct 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, UPSHIFT Initiatives Pitching Agendas for Jalal-Abad (5 Nov 2022), Osh (8 Nov 2022), Aidarken and Nookat (8 Nov 2022), Issykkyl (10 Nov 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, UPSHIFT Protocol for Reviewing Initiatives and Selecting Teams for Uzgen and Suzak (5 Nov 2022), Osh (8 Nov 2022), Aidarken and Nookat (8 Nov 2022), Bishkek (10 Nov 2022)

- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Proposed UPSHIFT Initiatives for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (Nov 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Progress Reports UPSHIFT Initiatives for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (Nov 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Spreadsheet UPSHIFT Initiatives Budgets for Aidarken, Balykchy, Nookat, Osh, Suzak, Tokmok, Uzgen (Nov 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: "Principles of Positive Parenting" (Oct-Nov 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Report: "Principles of Positive Parenting and Conscious Parenting within the framework of the project "Zharatman Zhashtar 2.0" for Balykchy (27-28 Oct 2022), Tokmok (29-30 Oct 2022), Nookat (1-2 Nov 2022), Aidarken (5-6 Nov 2022), Suzak (7-8 Nov 2022), Uzgen (9-10 Nov 2022), Osh (11-12 Nov 2022)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Agenda: "Second Training-of-Trainers – Strengthening youth interaction and local government bodies" (25-26 Feb 2023)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Presentation: "Second Training-of-Trainers – Reflective seminar for mentors of pilot locations and representatives of partner organizations" (25-26 Feb 2023)
- 3.4 Youth of Osh, Training Report: "Second Training-of-Trainers – Mentors of pilot locations and representatives of partner organizations" (25-26 Feb 2023)
- 3.4 Meder/Sydykova, Training Agenda: "Peacebuilding Training," Bishkek (28-29 Sep 2023), Osh (13-14 Oct 2023)
- 3.4 Meder/Sydykova, Presentation: "Peacebuilding and Inclusive Governance" Bishkek (28-29 Sep 2023), Osh (13-14 Oct 2023)
- 3.4 Meder/Sydykova, Presentation: "Branches of power" Bishkek (28-29 Sep 2023), Osh (13-14 Oct 2023)
- 3.4 Meder/Sydykova, Presentation: "Public Policy" Bishkek (28-29 Sep 2023), Osh (13-14 Oct 2023)
- 3.4 Meder/Sydykova, Training Report: "Peacebuilding Training," Bishkek (28-29 Sep 2023), Osh (13-14 Oct 2023)
- 3.5.3, 3.61-5 UNICEF, Monitoring Report: "Commitment of local authorities to ECD Centres"
- 3.5.3, 3.61-5 Kyrgyz Academy of Education, Pre-School Curricula: "Program for the upbringing, development and education of children aged 3-5 years in Child development centers based in libraries and other social facilities" (2021)
- 3.5.3, 3.61-5 Nazarkulova/Sardarova, Training Report: "Training seminar for librarians of Osh, Jalal-Abad, Batken regions" (Aug 2022)
- 3.5.3, 3.61-5 UNICEF, Monitoring Report: "ECD Centres – stories and links"
- 3.5.3, 3.61-5 UNICEF, Monitoring Report: "Examples of changes in children's behavior"
- 3.5.3, 3.61-5 UNICEF, Monitoring Report: "Report on the work of Early Development Centers, 2023-2024" (2024)

OHCHR project documentation (organised by Output/Sub-Activities)

General:

- OHCHR, Presentation: "Inclusive governance and shared civic identity for sustainable peace and development Project" (16 Jul 2024)

Output 1:

- 1.2.3 OHCHR, Roundtable Agenda: "Discussion of the new draft Law of the Kyrgyz Republic 'On the rights and guarantees of persons with disabilities,'" Osh (13 Feb 2023)
- 1.2.3 OHCHR, Draft Law: "Law of the Kyrgyz Republic on the rights and guarantees of persons with disabilities"
- 1.2.3 OHCHR, List of Participants: Public consultation on the draft Law on Youth, Osh 2 March 2023
- 1.2.3 OHCHR, Report: "Conclusion on the Results of the Examination: Law of the Kyrgyz Republic on the Fundamentals of State Youth Politicians for Compliance with International Human Rights Standards"
- 1.2.3 OHCHR, Draft Law: "Law of the Kyrgyz Republic on youth"
- 1.2.4 OHCHR, Agenda: "Launch of the Practical Guide to the Development of Comprehensive Anti-discrimination Legislation," Bishkek (16 Apr 2024)
- 1.2.4 OHCHR, Agenda: "Public discussion of the draft Law of the Kyrgyz Republic 'On ensuring the right to equality and protection from discrimination,'" Bishkek (10 Oct 2023)
- 1.2.4 Tolonova, Presentation: "Draft Law On ensuring the right to equality and protection from discrimination"
- 1.2.4 OHCHR, Draft Law: "Law of the Kyrgyz Republic on Ensuring the Right to Equality and Protection against Discrimination"

- 1.4.1 Training Agenda: “Human rights, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, diversity, tolerance and right-to-participate,” for the Women’s Councils of Balykchy (17-19 May 2022)
- 1.4.1 Training Agenda: “Human rights, Kyrgyz Jarany Concept, diversity, tolerance and right-to-participate,” for Youth Committees/activists of Uzgen (11-13 May 2022)
- 1.5.1 OHCHR, ToRs: “Supporting MIA training centers in updating training modules on human rights and diversity” (2023)
- 1.5.1 OHCHR, Concept Note: “Implementing the Concept of Development of Civil Identity ‘Kyrgyz Zharany’ through the development and updating of the content of the Training Course on Conflict Prevention and Management Skills” (2023)
- 1.5.1 Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic: Draft “Study Guide: Features of law enforcement activities to strengthen interethnic relations and form social cohesion” (2024)
- 1.5.1 Republican Training Centre of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic: Draft “Activities of internal organs [on] matters of strengthening interethnic relations and” developing social unity of citizens [in the] Kyrgyz Republic (2024)
- 1.5.1 Sydykova, Project Report: Report 2 “Report on work performed under the Agreement for the provision of services dated 08.05.2023” (May 2023)
- 1.5.1 Sydykova, Project Report: Report 3 “Report on work performed under the Agreement for the provision of services dated 08.05.2023” (June 2023)
- 1.5.1 Sydykova, Project Report: Report 4 “Report on work performed under the Agreement for the provision of services dated 08.05.2023” (Nov 2023)
- 1.5.1 Sydykova, Project Report: “Report on completed Work” (2023)

Output 2:

- 2.2.3 OHCHR, ToRs: ToRs 1 “Monitoring of access of Kyrgyz citizens to decision-making processes at the local and national level” (2023)
- 2.2.3 OHCHR, ToRs: ToRs 2 “Monitoring of access of Kyrgyz citizens to decision-making processes at the local and national level” (2023)
- 2.2.3 National Institute for Strategic Studies, Report: Draft “Monitoring access of citizens of the Kyrgyz Republic to decision-making processes at local and national levels” (2024)
- 2.2.3 Office of the Akyikatchy (Ombudsperson) of the Kyrgyz Republic, Report: Abbreviated “Information and analytical note on the results of monitoring the observance of the rights and freedoms of ethnic Kyrgyz-settlers” (2023)
- 2.2.3 Office of the Akyikatchy (Ombudsperson) of the Kyrgyz Republic, Report: “Information and analytical note on the results of monitoring the observance of the rights and freedoms of ethnic Kyrgyz-settlers” (2023)

Output 3:

- 3.1.1 OHCHR, ToRs: “Production of videos on social cohesion and inclusion” for national Kyrgyz Jarany Concept awareness campaign (2023)
- 3.2.4 OHCHR, ToRs: “Increasing public participation in decision-making processes, through support for dialogues” (28 Sep - 15 Nov 2023)
- 3.2.4 Media Content Distribution, Agenda: “Program of the 1st ‘New Step’ conference” Dialogue, Balykchy (31 Jul 2023)
- 3.2.4 Media Content Distribution, Agenda: “Social benefits, their types and eligibility criteria” Dialogue, Suzak (23 Aug 2023)
- 3.2.4 Media Content Distribution, Agenda: “Social benefits, their types and eligibility criteria” Dialogue, Nookat (25 Aug 2023)
- 3.2.4 Media Content Distribution, Project Report: “Performance report: Public dialogue platforms” (23 Oct 2023)
- 3.2.4 Media Content Distribution, Project Report: “Performance report: Public dialogue platforms” (28 Nov 2023)
- 3.4.2 OHCHR, ToRs: “Advocating for the rights of persons with disabilities in Jala-Abad province of the Kyrgyz Republic” (2023)
- 3.4.2 OHCHR, ToRs: “Increasing public participation in decision-making processes, through support for dialogues” (2024)
- 3.4.2 Centre for Strategic Litigation, Report: “Level of Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities to Social Infrastructure Facilities in Cities Bishkek and Osh: Analysis of Monitoring Results” (2022)
- 3.4.2 Centre for Strategic Litigation, Project Report: “Brief Report” of litigation cases (2023)
- 3.4.2 OHCHR, Request for Quotation: “Provision of expert services to accompany the School of Human Rights for young people with disabilities” (16 Jan 2023)
- 3.4.2 OHCHR, Agenda: “School for Youth with Disabilities” (15-17 Mar 2023)

- 3.4.2 OHCHR, Agenda: “School for Youth with Disabilities” (24-26 Apr 2023)
- 3.4.2 OHCHR, Agenda: “School for Youth with Disabilities” (8-10 May 2023)
- 3.4.2 OHCHR, Statement of Work Performed by NGO Union of People with Disabilities ‘Equality’ (12 May 2023)
- 3.5.2 OHCHR, ToRs: “Increasing public participation in decision-making processes, through support for dialogues” (Mar 2024)
- 3.5.2 Media Content Distribution, Project Report: “Performance Report” (6 Feb 2023)
- 3.5.2 Media Content Distribution, Project Report: “Performance Report” (15 Apr 2024)
- 3.5.2 OHCHR, Curriculum: “Formation of the civil identity of the Kyrgyz people in the system of school education. Collection of lessons in 2 parts. Part 1. 1–4 grades” (2024)
- 3.5.2 OHCHR, Curriculum: “Formation of the civil identity of the Kyrgyz people in the system of school education. Collection of lessons in 2 parts. Part 2. 5-11 grades” (2024)

Works Referenced and Cited

- “A New Agenda for Peace.” *Our Common Agenda Policy Brief 9*. United Nations, Jul 2023. <https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/our-common-agenda-policy-brief-new-agenda-for-peace-en.pdf>.
- Action Plan for the Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security for 2022-2024, 183-r, Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2022. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/57-18323/edition/1165387/ru>.
- Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. *The Fourth World Conference on Women*, 1995. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/01/beijing-declaration>.
- Concept on Development of Civic Identity - Kyrgyz Jarany in the Kyrgyz Republic for the Period 2021-2026, 39, Decree of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2020. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/430346/edition/1253187/ru>.
- Concept of Spiritual and Moral Development and Physical Education of the Person, 313, Decree of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2021. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/430539/edition/1084953/ru?anchor=pr>.
- Concept of State Policy of the Kyrgyz Republic in the Religious Sphere for the Period 2021-2026, Pub. L. No. 412, Decree of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2021. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/430711/edition/1098958/ru>.
- Concept on Youth Policy for 2020-2030, 562, Resolution of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2019. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/157204/edition/978698/ru>.
- DW. “An Analogue of the Foreign Agents Law: What Threatens NGOs in Kyrgyzstan.” [Analog Zakona ob Inoagentakh: Chto Grozit NKO v Kyrgyzstane], 6 Oct 2023.
- Fragile States Index. “Country Data.” <https://fragilestatesindex.org/country-data/>.
- Matveeva, Anna. “Early Warning and Early Response: Conceptual and Empirical Dilemmas” Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, Issue Paper 1, 2006. <http://www.gppac.net/documents/130492842/130493035/Early+Warning+and+Early+Response.pdf/1cc6d8eb-c2f8-4a60-b669-75048462dc2f>.
- Media.kg. “The Soros Foundation Is Leaving Kyrgyzstan: What Will Happen to Other NGOs?” [Fond Sorosa Ukhodit iz Kyrgyzstana: Chto Budet s Drugimi NKO?], 24 Apr 2024.
- Molesworth, Timothy. “Good Practice Note: Conflict Sensitivity, Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace,” UN Sustainable Development Group, 2022. <https://unsdg.un.org/resources/good-practice-note-conflict-sensitivity-peacebuilding-and-sustaining-peace>
- National Development Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic for 2018-2040, 221, Decree of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2018. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/430002/edition/1095562/ru?anchor=undefined>.

National Statistics Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic. "Population's Trust Index." <https://stat.gov.kg/ru/indeks-doveriya-naseleniya/>.

National Strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic for Achieving Gender Equality until 2030, 513, Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2022. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/159472/edition/1189691/ru>.

OECD. *Applying Evaluation Criteria Thoughtfully*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1787/543e84ed-en>.

On Freedom of Religion and Religious Organizations, 282, The Law of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2008. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/202498/edition/1061634/ru>.

On Local State Administration and Local Self-Government Bodies, 123, Law of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2021. <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/112302>.

On State Guarantees of Equal Rights and Equal Opportunities for Men and Women, 184, The Law of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2008. <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/202398?cl=ru-ru>.

On the Rights and Guarantees of Persons with Disabilities, 38, The Law of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2008. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/202329/edition/805556/ru>.

Program of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic on Countering Extremism and Terrorism for 2023-2027, Pub. L. No. 141, Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2023. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/160032/edition/1241419/ru>.

Rogers, Patricia. "52 Weeks of BetterEvaluation: Week 10: Having a Theory in the Theory of Change." *BetterEvaluation.org*, 7 Mar 2013.

The Code of the Kyrgyz Republic on Children, 100, 2012. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/203700/edition/1208810/ru?anchor=%D1%8011>.

24.kg. "Protection Against Discrimination: A Deputy Believes That the Law May Be Used by LGBT." [Zashchita ot Diskriminatsii: Deputat Schitaet Chto Zakonom Mogut Vospol'zovat'sya LGBT], 25 Dec 2023.

UN Resident Coordinator. "UN Resident Coordinator Raises Alarming Concerns: Proposed Laws Risk to Jeopardize Kyrgyzstan's Human Rights Gains and Achievement of Sustainable Development Goals." Welcoming Remarks by UN Resident Coordinator at Roundtable on 'Freedom of Speech and Human Rights in Kyrgyzstan: Threats of Legislative Initiatives,' 13 Jun 2023. <https://kyrgyzstan.un.org/en/236030-un-resident-coordinator-raises-alarming-concerns-proposed-laws-risk-jeopardize-kyrgyzstans>.

UN Sustainable Development Group. "2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals." <https://unsdg.un.org/2030-agenda/universal-values>.

UN Sustainable Development Group. "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment." <https://unsdg.un.org/2030-agenda/universal-values/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment>.

UN Sustainable Development Group. "Goal 16: Promote Peaceful and Inclusive Societies for Sustainable Development, Provide Access to Justice for All, and Build Effective, Accountable, and Inclusive Institutions at All Levels." <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16>.

UN Sustainable Development Group. "Human Rights-Based Approach." <https://unsdg.un.org/2030-agenda/universal-values/human-rights-based-approach>.

UN Sustainable Development Group. "Leave No One Behind." <https://unsdg.un.org/2030-agenda/universal-values/leave-no-one-behind>.

UN Women. "Global Norms and Standards: Peace and Security." <https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/peace-and-security/global-norms-and-standards>.

United Nations. "Secretary-General's Call to Action for Human Rights," 2020. <https://www.un.org/en/content/action-for-human-rights/index.shtml>.

United Nations. "Our Common Agenda – Report of the Secretary-General," 2021.

<https://www.un.org/en/common-agenda>.

United Nations. "The Youth Peace and Security Agenda." <https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/policy-issues-and-partnerships/policy/youth>.

United Nations CERD/C/KGZ/11-12, "Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination Combined eleventh and twelfth periodic reports submitted by Kyrgyzstan under article 9 of the Convention, due in 2022." 15 Jun 2023. <http://undocs.org/en/CERD/C/KGZ/11-12>.

United Nations Country Team and Government of the Kyrgyz Republic. "The Kyrgyz Republic: United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework 2023-2027," Jun 2022.

<https://kyrgyzstan.un.org/en/download/154125/260996>.

United Nations (General Assembly). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 1948. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>.

United Nations (General Assembly). *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*, 1979. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-elimination-all-forms-discrimination-against-women>.

United Nations (General Assembly). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, 1989.

<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child>.

United Nations (General Assembly). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*, 2006.

<https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-persons-disabilities>.
