**RUNO ANNUAL PROJECT REPORT TEMPLATE 4.4**

 

**PEACEBUILDING FUND (PBF)**

**ANNUAL PROJECT progress report**

**COUNTRY:** KYRGYZSTAN

**REPORTING PERIOD: 1 january – 31 December**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Title & Project Number |  |
| Programme Title: “Peace and reconciliation through strengthening the rule of law and human rights protection”Programme Number *(if applicable)* ***KGZ/B-4***MPTF Office Project Reference Number:[[1]](#footnote-1)00089348  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Recipient UN Organizations |  | Implementing Partners |
| List the organizations that have received direct funding from the MPTF Office under this programme: Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Regional Office for Central Asia (OHCHR ROCA) | List the national counterparts (government, private, NGOs & others) and other International Organizations:  - Department on Judicial Reform and Rule of Law of the Office of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic- Coordination Council on Human Rights under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic- National Preventive Mechanism for the prevention for torture- Supreme Court & its Judiciary Training Centre- General Prosecutor’s Office & its Professional Training Center |
| Programme/Project Budget (US$) |  | Programme Duration |
| PBF contribution (by RUNO) 973,753 USD |  |  | Overall Duration *(months)* 24 |  |
|  | Start Date[[2]](#footnote-2) *(dd.mm.yyyy)*  | 01/07/2014 |
| Government Contribution*(if applicable)* |  |  | Original End Date*[[3]](#footnote-3)* *(dd.mm.yyyy)* | 30/06/2014 |
| Other Contributions (donors)*(if applicable)* |  |  | Current End date[[4]](#footnote-4)*(dd.mm.yyyy)*  | 30/06/2014 |
| TOTAL: | 973,753 USD |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Programme Assessment/Review/Mid-Term Eval. |  | Report Submitted By |
| Assessment/Review - if applicable *please attach*[ ]  Yes [ ]  No Date:      Mid-Term Evaluation Report *– if applicable please attach*[ ]  Yes [ ]  No Date:       | Name: Bea FerenciTitle: Human Rights OfficerParticipating Organization (Lead): OHCHREmail address: bferenci@ohchr.org |

**PART 1 – RESULTS PROGRESS**

* 1. **Assessment of the current project implementation status and results**

**For PRF projects, please identify Priority Plan outcome and indicators to which this project is contributing:**

|  |
| --- |
| ***Priority Plan Outcome to which the project is contributing.*** **Outcome 1:** Laws, policies, reforms and recommendations of human rights mechanisms, including UPR39, are implemented to uphold the rule of law, improve access to justice and respect, protect and fulfill human rights.  |
| ***Priority Plan Outcome indicator(s) to which project is contributing.*** ***1.1:***  Proportion of cases brought to human rights and justice institutions which are satisfactorily resolved;***1.2:*** Number of key policies and laws adopted or amended;***1.4:*** Citizens' trust in national state institutions is increased. |

**For both IRF and PRF projects, please rate this project’s overall achievement of results to date:**

**For both IRF and PRF projects, outline progress against each project outcome, using the format below. The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes.**

**Outcome Statement 1:** Key legislation in the area of administration of justice is in line with international and constitutional human rights standards and the judiciary adjudicates several cases in line with these standards

**Rate the current status of the outcome:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator 1:Degree of compliance of key laws relating to the administration of justice with international and human rights standards: the Criminal and Criminal Procedure Codes, Code on Criminal Offences, Laws on the Ombudsman, State Guaranteed Legal Aid and on Bar and Legal Practice, Law on the Order of Consideration of Citizens’ Appeal, Law on Guarantee and Free Access to Information. Indicator 2:Number of resolutions adopted by the Supreme Court regarding unified judicial practice on criminal cases.Indicator 3:Extent to which human rights are institutionalized in the training curricula of the Judiciary Training Center (JTC) and Center for the Professional Training of Prosecutors (CPTP). | Baseline: TBA during baseline assessment study (index measuring compliance with international standards)Target: 50% (3) laws are in compliance with international standardsProgress: By October 2014, seven key draft laws, laws in the area of administration of justice, namely Criminal Code, Code on Misdemeanors, Criminal Procedure Code, Criminal Executive Code, Civil Procedure Code, Laws on enforcement proceedings and state guaranteed legal aid were finalized by the *Expert Working Groups*and submitted to the *Council for Judicial Reform* under the President of Kyrgyzstan. As a result of support provided by OHCHR ROCA, UNDP, UNODC and other organizations to the *Expert Working Groups* and the *Secretariat of the Council for Judicial Reform,* the compliance of the draft laws with international human rights standards has increased.Baseline: No such resolution has thus far been adopted by the Supreme Court on criminal cases.Target: One such resolution adopted by the Supreme Court by June 2016.Progress:Activities are scheduled to take place in 2015-2016. Baseline: The training curricula do not currently include human rights standards and will have to be updated in line with the new legislation.Target: The training curricula will have to be updated in line with the new legislation and will have to include human rights standards.Progress: Activities are scheduled to take place in 2015-2016.   |

***Output progress***

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit).Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

ROCA supported the overall drafting process of all key laws related to the administration of justice, with a specific focus on the drafting process of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC), based on an agreement among various donors.

The Expert Working Group (EWG) in charge of drafting the CPC discussed challenging provisions of the draft CPC, to bring them in compliance with international human rights standards (HR standards) during a four-day working retreat (11-15 August 2014) and a three-day working session (26-28 August 2014) supported by OHCHR jointly with the Department for Judicial Reform and Rule of Law of the Office of President of Kyrgyzstan, UNODC, OSCE CiB and "Soros-Kyrgyzstan" Foundation.

The first session was attended by local and international experts on criminal law, scholars and practicing lawyers, while the second working meeting was attended by 14 members of the EWG on CPC. As a result of these meetings, the compliance of the draft CPC with HR standards increased, especially with regards to provisions related to the right to fair trial, habeas corpus, presumption of innocence, and implementing views of international human rights mechanisms on individual cases.

On 21 August 2014, a one day meeting between members of the EWGs in charge of elaborating the new criminal code and CPC resulted in an agreement between the two EWGs to ensure consistency between the CPC and criminal code.

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?*

ROCA's support to the judicial reform process in Kyrgyzstan in close coordination with UNDP, UNODC and other international organizations and the Department for Rule of Law and Human Rights of the President's Office resulted in the finalization of seven key draft laws in the area of administration of justice by the EWGs. The Criminal Code, Code on Misdemeanors, Criminal Procedure Code, Criminal Executive Code, Civil Procedure Code, Laws on enforcement proceedings and state guaranteed legal aid were finalized by the *Expert Working Groups*and submitted to the *Council for Judicial Reform* under the President of Kyrgyzstan. The draft laws were considered by the *Council for Judicial Reform*with participation of members of the *Expert Working Groups*and civil society representatives on 30 September, 7 and 10 October 2014, and were approved in its enlarged session on 17 October 2014.

According to the preliminary analysis by a number of international experts, the draft Criminal Procedure Code contains a number of progressive provisions which comply with international human rights standards, further reform the criminal justice system of Kyrgyzstan and provide a transition from the inquisitorial model to a more adversarial model.However, the international experts and ROCA also noted a number of shortcomings, ie lack of full compliance of some provisions with international human rights standards, including in relation to excessive use of pre-trial detention, lack of legal certainty, and controversial articles on the implementation of views of international human rights mechanisms. The preliminary analyses were submitted to the *Expert Working Group* which is elaborating the *draft Criminal Procedure Code.* The EWG was tasked by the *Secretariat of the Council for Judicial Reform* to address the experts' commentstill the end of November 2014.

The support provided by ROCA, UNDP, UNODC and other international organizations to the judicial reform process in Kyrgyzstan was acknowledged in the press-release of the *Secretariat of the Council for Judicial Reform*dated 30 September 2014.

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

**Outcome Statement 2:** Adequate functioning of national human rights mechanisms and civil society actors leads to effective protection of human rights and increased accountability for their violation, including through holistic follow-up on UN human rights mechanisms’ recommendation.

**Rate the current status of the outcome:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator 1:Number of reports produced by the National Centre for Prevention of Torture (NPM).Indicator 2:Number of National Reports to UPR and number of implemented recommendations of UPR.Indicator 3:Number of lawyers trained and advised by Project who refer to national and international human rights standards and use international human rights mechanisms . Indicator 4: Number of public reports produced by human rights NGOs on the human rights situation in Osh and Jalalabad provinces of Kyrgyzstan. | Baseline: 0 preventive visit reports, 1 annual report for 2013, 0 special reportsTarget: By June 2016, the NPM produces 20 visit reports as a result of preventive visits, addresses two annual reports and four special reports with specific recommendations to the Kyrgyz Parliament.Progress:1 annual report is being drafted. By July 2014, the NPM was fully staffed and had its headquarters opened in Bishkek and regional offices established in Issyk-Kul, Talas, Naryn, Osh, Jalalabad and Batken provinces. It has since been conducting independent monitoring visits to various places of deprivation and limitation of liberty, including police detention facilities, prisons, psychiatric/medical facilities, orphanages and military units. Baseline: Zero, the Coordination Council functions since the end of November 2013.Target: By June 2016, the Coordination Council under the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic facilitates the preparation of a national report to the 2nd cycle of UPR and implementation of at least ten recommendations of UPR. Progress: One National Report for the 2nd cycle of the UPR was coordinated by the Coordination Council in a transparent manner and in consultation with the civil society. The National Report was submitted to the UPR in November 2014.Baseline: 12 lawyers trained and advised by OHCHR ROCA have used international standards and mechanisms in their work in the first half of 2013. Target: By June 2016, up to 24 lawyers-trainees manage their cases in line with international human rights standards and use international human rights mechanisms in their work to protect and promote human rights. Progress: Activities are scheduled to take place in 2015-2016. Baseline: Not available Target: By June 2016, two public monitoring reports with specific recommendations to the Government are produced by the project-supported NGOs on the human rights situation in Osh and Jalalabad with reference to international human rights standards. Progress: Activities are scheduled to take place in 2015-2016.  |

**Output progress**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit).Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

The Human Rights Focal Points of the Coordination Council on Human Rights (CCHR) increased their understanding and awareness on economic, social and cultural rights, particularly the rights to adequate housing, education, health and food, through a ROCA capacity building activity that took place 02-03 July 2014.

The CCHR increased its capacity to effectively engage with UN human rights mechanisms as ROCA seconded two Human Rights Experts to its Secretariat, starting from 1 August, and 1 October 2014 respectively. The Human Rights Experts serve as advisers to the Vice Prime Minister and the Deputy Minister of Justice.

ROCA’s support to the CCHR through the project resulted in the preparation of the National Report for the 2nd cycle of the UPR. With the support of ROCA the report was discussed with the civil society including on 24 October 2014.

The National Centre for Prevention of Torture of Kyrgyzstan (NPM) increased its capacity to conduct monitoring of places of detention including through a joint workshop ("Legal and Practical Reforms and Enhancing the Cooperation in Prevention and Investigation of Torture") organized by ROCA and other stakeholders, 9 and 12 September 2014 in Issyk-Kul.

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?*

The Coordination Council on Human Rights has become an important national mechanism that addresses human rights issues in Kyrgyzstan by coordinating and supporting the state's interactions with UN human rights mechanisms and follow up to their recommendations.

OHCHR provided technical support by means of providing two human rights experts to the Secretariat of the Coordination Council as well as by building the capacity of the human rights focal points within State agencies represented in the Coordination Council through trainings on economic, social and cultural rights, and on the Universal Periodic Review. These and other briefings resulted in the Coordination Council's active engagement with civil society representatives. During the Universal Periodic Review's preparatory stages the Coordination Council held two national consultations including in the south of Kyrgyzstan, and engaged in public discussions before submitting the National Report for the UPR.

At the same time, the Coordination Council is conducting its coordination tasks when it comes to compiling answers to the list of priority issues (answers to CEDAW LoI submitted in November 2014) and when dealing with communications from Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council. To date, the experts of the Coordination Council have advised the Government on answers to at least two urgent communications from Special Procedures.

By July 2014, the NPM was fully staffed, and had its headquarters in Bishkek and six regional offices established. It was conducting independent monitoring visits to various places of deprivation and limitation of liberty. From 1 July to 31 October 2014, the NPM carried out a total of 293 preventive visits together with NGOs to various places of detention across the country.

Another significant achievement towards this Project outcome and PP outcome 1 as well as peacebuilding at large was the approval of an Action Plan for Combatting Torture by the Government of Kyrgyzstan on 23 October 2014. The drafting of the Action Plan was supported by ROCA, and was followed by extensive advocacy for its approval. The Action Plan follows up on a number of recommendations by UN human rights mechanisms and serves as a policy document to increase cooperation between the relevant state and non-state actors to eradicate torture in Kyrgyzstan.

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

**Outcome Statement 3:**  Duty bearers and rights holders engage in dialogue about the importance of addressing grave human rights violations committed during and in aftermath of the June 2010 violence

**Rate the current status of the outcome:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicator 1:Percentage of population in targeted areas with increased appreciation of the importance of addressing human rights violations related to the June 2010 violence.  | Baseline: TBD Target: TBDProgress: ROCA conducted a number of advocacy meetings with key duty bearers and rights holders: Departments for Judicial Reform and Rule of Law,and on Ethnic, Religious Policy and Interaction with Civil Society of the Office of the President of Kyrgyzstan, State Agensy for Local Governance and Inter-ethnic issues, Vice Prime Minister, Deputy Minister of Justice, local authorities in Osh and Jalalabad, NHRIs and NGOs in order to pave the ground for further activities and consult on possible ways of addressing human rights violations, including those committed in the past.  |

**Output progress**

*List the key outputs achieved under this Outcome in the reporting period (1000 character limit).Outputs are the immediate deliverables for a project.*

On 16 July 2014, ROCA’s monitoring mission to Jalalabad, which was conducted as preparatory action, resulted in increased awareness and understanding of rights holders of the importance of claiming their rights and holding perpetrators accountable.

ROCA’s preparatory monitoring missions to Jalalabad on 19 August 2014, and Osh province between 8 and 16 September 2014 resulted in increased knowledge of duty bearers of the importance of their role in ensuring accountability for human rights violations and holding perpetrators of human rights violations accountable.

In October, advocacy meetings held in Bishkek including with the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Head of the Department of Judicial Reform and Role of Law under the Presidential Administration, as well as meetings held with the Osh city Mayor’s office and the office of the Governor and the Prosecutor’s office, resulted on the one hand in increased knowledge of duty-bearers of the importance of their role in ensuring accountability for human rights violations. On the other hand advice was provided to ROCA as to how to start tackling this component of the project.

**Outcome progress**

*Describe progress made during the reporting period toward the achievement of this outcome. This analysis should reflect the above indicator progress and the output achievement. Is there evidence of the outcome contributing to peacebuilding and to the specific conflict triggers? Is the theory of change that underpins the project design still relevant for this outcome (3000 character limit)?*

Despite the number of advocacy activities and consultations held by ROCA with key authorities, NHRIs and NGOs at central and local levels, their actual understanding of the need to address human rights violations, including those related to the June 2010 violence remained low.

Some authorities seemed reluctant to discuss the June 2010 violence and some considered any attempt to advocate for addressing related human rights violations as "sensitive and destructive". However, during the UPR public consultations, facilitated by ROCA, civil society actively engaged with authorities in discussions on concerns related to June 2010 violence.

The two examples mentioned below, have been raised by ROCA with various state authorities, including the Chairperson of the Coordination Council on Human Rights, and clearly illustrate how the authorities perceived and reacted to reminders of human rights violations committed during the June 2010 violence:

1. On 23 September, during the round table on "Building a multi-sectoral approach and strengthening the role of women in ensuring peace and security", where a film about sexual violence against ethnic Uzbeks during 2010 events was displayed, some participants asked the organizers to suspend the video; others left. The round-table was attended by members of the Parliament, Minister of Emergency Situations and the Deputy Interior Minister, other representatives of ministries and departments, as well as NGO representatives. The Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs reportedly publicly criticized the organizers of the round table and complained that the film should not have been shown. The event was hosted by the Committee on Defence and Security at Jogorku Kenesh and the Center for Research on democratic processes with the support of local authorities and international organizations.

2. On 30 September, the Office of the Association of Human Rights NGOs “Human Rights Advocacy Center” (the HRAC) in Osh was reportedly searched by six officers of the State Committee for National Security (SCNS) for more than two hours. The SCNS Officers reportedly presented an order of the SCNS investigator on launching a criminal case against the HRAC under the Article 299 of the Criminal Code of Kyrgyzstan - “incitement of ethnic, racial, religious or inter-regional hatred”. The reason for opening the case as stated in the order was the “conducting of a pilot survey on observance of the rights of ethnic minorities in Osh” by the HRAC.

**Reasons for low achievement and rectifying measures**

*If sufficient progress is not being made, what are the key reasons, bottlenecks and challenges? Were these foreseen in the risk matrix? How are they being addressed and what will be the rectifying measures (1500 character limit)?*

* 1. **Assessment of project evidence base, risk, catalytic effects, gender in the reporting period**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evidence base: What is the evidence base for this report and for project progress? What consultation/validation process has taken place on this report *(1000 character limit)?* | The evidence base for this report is: - ROCA's internal monthly reports submitted to the OHCHR Performance Monitoring System;- Drafts of the seven key laws in the area of administration of justice elaborated by the *Expert Working Groups;*- The National Report to the 2nd cycle of UPR prepared and submitted by the Coordination Council on Human Rights;- Number of promotional materials prepared and disseminated by ROCA within the project;- Talking points and internal minutes of advocacy meetings with the authorities conducted by ROCA within the project.  |
| Funding gaps: Did the project fill critical funding gaps in peacebuilding in the country? Briefly describe. *(1500 character limit)* | By seconding two Human Rights Experts to the Coordination Council on Human Rights the project is meeting the critical need of having full time staff working within the Secretariat of the Coordination Council to manage the workload.  |
| Catalytic effects: Did the project achieve any catalytic effects, either through attracting additional funding commitments or creating immediate conditions to unblock/ accelerate peace relevant processes? Briefly describe. *(1500 character limit)* | The project *inter alia* focuses on the elaboration of key pieces of legislation related to administration of justice; on the holistic implementation of UN human rights mechanisms’ recommendations; and on promoting dialogue between civil society and state authorities on past human rights violations. The overall aim is, improving the trust in state structures and in consolidating peace.The project furthermore facilitated that the National Preventive Mechanisms submitted a funding proposal to the OPCAT Special Fund. Also, the project increased the attention of the donors to the judicial reform, and with that increased their willingness in providing funding. Although the official starting date of the project is 1 July 2014, OHCHR started implementing the project using own resources from January 2014. |
| Risk taking/ innovation: Did the project support any innovative or risky activities to achieve peacebuilding results? What were they and what was the result? *(1500 character limit)* | ROCA supported the Coordination Council on Human Rights in organizing a public consultation in Osh in the context of the UPR during which concerns related to minorities and tranitional justice were discussed.      |
| Gender: How have gender considerations been mainstreamed in the project to the extent possible? Is the original gender marker for the project still the right one? Briefly justify. *(1500 character limit)* | Women’s representation has been ensured in all activities conducted so far in the project. Special attention has been paid to gender issues and the rights of women and girls while implementing project components related to the work of the Coordination Council, the Universal Periodic Review and other UN human rights mechanisms, in particular CEDAW. |
| Other issues: Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that should be shared with PBSO? This can include any cross-cutting issues or other issues which have not been included in the report so far. *(1500 character limit)* | ROCA is concerned with the draft bills on "foreign agents - NGOs" and against "uncovential sexual relations" currently being considered by the Parliament of Kyrgyzstan. If adopted, the bills would significantly shrink the democratic space, serve as a legal cause for discriminating vulnerable groups, crack down the civil society, limit RUNOs activities and negatively affect achievements in the peacebuilding process in Kyrgyzstan.  |

**PART 2: LESSONS LEARNED AND SUCCESS STORY**

**2.1 Lessons learned**

*Provide at least three key lessons learned from the implementation of the project. These can include lessons on the themes supported by the project or the project processes and management.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lesson 1 *(1000 character limit)* | Through the support provided to the Coordination Council on Human Rights the lesson learned is that the role of the Vice Prime Minister as the Chair of the Coordination Council is crucial. Ministries have shown resistance in lateral cooperation with each other. There is a great need for a strong coordination council as a body of coordination between ministries. For that a person with greater leverage in solving coordination difficulties is essential, therefore the role of the Vice Prime Minister, as the person with greater leverage, is central. |
| Lesson 2 *(1000 character limit)* | There is a large number of donors that are presently providing support to the newly established National Center for Prevention of Torture (NPM). This, including little coordination between donors, has led to training fatigue of members of the NPM. The lesson learned is the need for strong coordination among the donors and partners working with the NPM to ensure the best possible results and impact. |
| Lesson 3 *(1000 character limit)*  | The qualifications of the members of the Expert Working Groups (EWGs) are crucial in ensuring that the draft laws comply with international human rights standards. The lesson learned for ROCA is that more capacity building of the experts on international human rights standards related to criminal justice should have been provided, in order for the experts to ensure that these standards are fully incorporated into the new draft laws. |
| Lesson 4 *(1000 character limit)* |       |
| Lesson 5 *(1000 character limit)* |       |

**2.2 Success story (OPTIONAL)**

*Provide one success story from the project implementation which can be shared on the PBSO website and Newsletter as well as the Annual Report on Fund performance. Please include key facts and figures and any citations (3000 character limit).*

**PART 3 *–* FINANCIAL PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

* 1. **Comments on the overall state of financial expenditure**

*Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, slightly delayed, or off track:*

If expenditure is delayed or off track, please provide a brief explanation (500 characters maximum):

Please provide an overview of expensed project budget by outcome and output as per the table below.[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Output number | Output name | RUNOs | Approved budget | Expensed budget | Any remarks on expenditure |
| Outcome 1: **136,500** |
| Output 1.1 | Technical and expert support to the NCJR and the EWGs | **OHCHR** | **95,800** | **9,923** |       |
| Output 1.2 | Technical assistance to Supreme Court judges | **OHCHR** | **24,400** | **0** |       |
| Output 1.3 | Human rights training package/curricula | **OHCHR** | **16,300** | **0** |       |
| Outcome 2: **236,890** |
| Output 2.1 | NPM capacity building | **OHCHR** | **30,300** | **15,222** |       |
| Output 2.2 | CCHR capacity building | **OHCHR** | **30,300** | **15,324** |       |
| Output 2.3 | Capacity building for young defence lawyers | **OHCHR** | **69,490** | **0** |       |
| Output 2.4 | Grants for NGOs | **OHCHR** | **84,300** | **0** |       |
| Outcome 3: **104,500** |
| Output 3.1 | Awareness raising and capacity building on justice for 2010 events | **OHCHR** | **104,500** | **0** |       |
| Total: | **477,890**  |  | **477,890**   | 40,469 |       |

* 1. **Comments on management and implementation arrangements**

*Please comment on the management and implementation arrangements for the project, such as: the effectiveness of the implementation partnerships, coordination/coherence with other projects, any South-South cooperation, the modalities of support, any capacity building aspect, the use of partner country systems if any, the support by the PBF Secretariat and oversight by the Joint Steering Committee (for PRF only). Please also mention if there have been any changes to the project (what kind and when); or whether any changes are envisaged in the near future* (2000 character maximum):

1. The MPTF Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to “Project ID” on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](http://mdtf.undp.org/) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The start date is the date of the first transfer of the funds from the MPTF Office as Administrative Agent. Transfer date is available on the [MPTF Office GATEWAY](http://mdtf.undp.org/) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Please note that financial information is preliminary pending submission of annual financial report to the Administrative Agent. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)