



A Network of People  
Building Peace



FOUNDATION  
FOR TOLERANCE  
INTERNATIONAL



United Nations  
Peacebuilding  
Peacebuilding Fund

## **Summary of the Findings from Mid Term Review of the UN PBSO Project in Kyrgyzstan “Cameras in Hands”**

Author: Paul Kosterink, Coordinator Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning at GPPAC.

Please refer to the Terms of Reference for the mid term review, including the MTR objectives. This narrative summary follows the four MTR objectives as much as possible.

The project is well on track in terms of planned activities (see progress report of 15 November 2018 to UN PBF), but also in terms of the planned project outcomes. The reported results already contribute to a considerable extent to outcome 2 and to some extent to outcome 1. Especially in addressing the second project outcome some remarkable results at the level of behavioral change have been reported. Youth that participates in the project have clearly shown they are indeed ‘empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation’. This is confirmed through the mid term review interviews with the pupils and in discussion with several of their teachers. The reported results are in many cases going beyond outcome 2, with reported behavioral changes at schools: more open dialogues among pupils and more openness towards ‘other groups’ of society within the school were mentioned. From one community changes were reported from out of school as well: participating youth told about incidents among fighting boys. The children’s interferences led to decrease of incidents and even to ending of such ‘regular’ fights among boy groups. Several pupils also reported initial changes within their own family, where they had started discussing issues not addressed before, including sensitive issues on young-aged and arranged marriages and questioning the rationale behind perceptions of ‘the others’ in society.

Through the processes of discussing the choice of topics for the video production and developing the scripts and storyboards, the participating youth already show a remarkable notion of the sensitivity of many of the identified issues towards the community and decision-makers. This, for instance, translated in one community into a script to question the lack of street lighting, while actually addressing the underlying, structural issues of insecurity, especially for girls and women to walk in dark streets.

This and similar examples from the MTR indicate that the project is also achieving already some initial results that contribute to the first planned outcome (‘empowerment to formulate common messages to decision-makers’), while the project is only half-way and the actual engagements with decision-makers are planned to take place in the second half of the project period.

One of the main lessons learned from the first half of the project is that through local adaptation of the participatory video making methodologies, the underlying approaches for increased dialogue and social processes work (very) well in Kyrgyzstan. All directly involved parties provided the mid term review

team with predominantly positive feedback on the strengthened and often new social dynamics within the school and to some extent also in the community. It remains vital to keep engaging with different involved people and parties to sustain project results and maintain support from social circles around the video making teams, such as other pupils not part of the project, (other) school teachers, school administration and parents. The participating pupils in the project seem to be the best advocates to play such role. The project team learned from the mid term review interviews that the participating pupils feel already rather confident in their current roles as video makers and in many cases also as initiators of (new) social interactions and dynamics within and outside the schools.

From the project management point of view the project team is recommended to discuss (again) the steps taken until now to arrange the technical services for video production. For practical reasons (large scale of the project) and specifics of the Kyrgyz context, the video making teams and supportive project people around the teams were also trained in more technical aspects, such as editing of the videos. This probably - and seemingly - to some extent distracted their attention from the participatory video processes and conflict prevention purposes of the project. The project management team is asked to assess how the technical services that are needed for the video production can be organized most effectively. The MTR recommends that in seeking the balance to strengthening of the participatory (social) and (some) technical skills of the participants, the emphasis should be on the former (the social skills).

Among the staff members of the implementing partner there are, among others, two local project managers (coordinator and assistant) in each of the 4 Kyrgyz regions and an overall project leader operating from Osh. Through the Training of Trainers sessions at the start of the project and some additional workshops they were enabled to become the engines behind the successful local implementation of the project in the 16 schools. The project team is recommended to look at ways how to make the team of local project managers more of a self-learning team. This can be reached among others through more targeted interactions among team members, peer review and/or peer learning and more frequent visiting of the localities by the overall project leader and possibly through (short) exchange visits of the local project managers to the schools in other regions. This would strengthen the exchange of good practices and lessons learned and can become an important tool to develop the participative video methodology for conflict prevention in Kyrgyz circumstances further, also in light of the sustainability of the project results. Strengthening the local implementation at schools can be done through more frequent visits and show interest in the developments of the project at the local sites. Many involved people in the mid term review expressed that the visits by national and international project team members was very inspiring and supportive to the initiatives taken and - thus - towards other people and parties involved that are important to further strengthen the project results. After all, the social changes that are occurring through this project may sometimes seem 'small', but their impact appear in many cases to be ground-breaking and has already ignited new ways of communication and dealing with frictions within the communities in this project. The project team should revisit if and how this can be organized more consciously and to what extent the project allows implementation of these kind of recommendations. It is worth mentioning that at the later stages of the project, there are foreseen the feedback sessions on different levels (local, national, international) and exchange visits between children, which will at least to some extent address the above mentioned recommendations.

The overall project management and partnership in the project appear to work well. However, the efforts by the members of the project team are stretching their capacities to their limits. The project management should seek for mechanisms in the second half of the project to support the local project team, especially when the project will be geared more towards reaching out to the communities and specifically decision-makers. This will require new skills within the project team that probably go beyond the skills acquired in the first half of the project.

The project receives broad support from the schools and communities, including from many parents of the participating children. These are important indicators that the project could be scaled up for Kyrgyzstan. These indicators should be triggers for the key implementing agencies of the project, FTI and GPPAC, to start discussing the options for broadening of the project into a (national) program. The MTR recommends to formulate more explicitly a communication and fundraising strategy and start seeking support for enlargement of the project in Kyrgyzstan and possibly also for other countries in Central Asia. There is interest expressed through the global GPPAC network to start up similar projects and programs in other parts of the world as well. The experiences from Kyrgyzstan can inspire others around the world and GPPAC is able to organize further learning from Kyrgyz experiences. However, from experience we learned that this will only materialise when targeted action is taken while the project is still running and attractive results can be shown to a wider audience, including potential donors, (future) partners and other interested allies.