
# RUNO Half Yearly Reporting TEMPLATE 4.3

**[**Kyrgyzstan**]**

**PROJECT HALF YEARLY PROGRESS UPDATE**

**PERIOD COVERED: JANUARY – JUNE 201**5

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project No & Title:** | PBF/KGZ/A3 Building Trust and Confidence Among People, Communities and Authorities (Part 2 - PPP Outcome 2) | | |
| **Recipient Organization(s)[[1]](#footnote-1):** | UNHCR | | |
| **Implementing Partners (Government, UN agencies, NGOs etc):** | Government: Ombudsman's Office, Department of Local Self-Governance and Interethnic Relations  NGOs: PU Abad, Human Rights Organization Spravedlivost, FTI | | |
| **Location:** | Osh, Jalalabad and Batken provinces of the Kyrgyz Republic | | |
| **Total Approved Budget :[[2]](#footnote-2)** | 1 073 287 USD | | |
| **Preliminary data on funds committed : [[3]](#footnote-3)** | 923 481 USD | **% of funds committed / total approved budget:** | 86% |
| **Expenditure[[4]](#footnote-4):** | 680 209 USD | **% of expenditure / total budget: (Delivery rate)** | 63% |
| **Project Approval Date:** | 21.11.2013 | **Possible delay in operational closure date (Number of months)** | 0 |
| **Project Start Date:** | 01.01.2014 |
| **Expected Operational Project Closure Date:** | 31.12.2015 |
| **Project Outcomes:** | Outcome 2  LSGs, LSGA and other oversight entities are enabled to provide effective feedback/conflict resolution mechanisms for the population and by actively listening to the population, providing impartial feedback and taking remedial measures, thus demonstrating their accountability. | | |
| **PBF Focus Area[[5]](#footnote-5)** | 2,4 | | |

**Qualitative assessment of progress**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *For each intended outcome, provide evidence of progress during the reporting period.*  *In addition, for each outcome include the outputs achieved.*  *(500 words max.)* | Outcome 2  All measures to enhance the capacity of local self-government entities and increase their role in conflict resolution are designed to have medium to long term effect. However, there are several hopeful signs for UNHCR's success: All 20 small scale Peacebuilding Initiatives (PBIs) implemented so far in 2015 (Target: 20 over 24 month) have been developed employing a community base approach through working groups which include local self-government bodies, civil society organizations (e.g. women's councils) and agents of change (e.g. teachers or elders). Each working group was tasked to identify key conflicts in their village and develop a plan to resolve such conflicts. A small project was developed and discussed by a joint selection committee. UNHCR on average contributed USD 3000 to USD 5000 while local governments and interest groups co-financed the vast majority of projects. The community based approach enhanced problem solving capacity of both people and their local authorities. Working group meetings served as a forum where problems and conflicts are discussed and solved. Often for the first time, local self-government representatives, interest groups, civil society actors and local population came together to discuss potential conflict resolution strategies. The PBIs address the individual conflict resolution needs of the respective communities and include water management projects, intercultural dialogue clubs for school students, enhanced capacity of local self-government bodies and delivery of basic services by government entities. One exemplary PBI, implemented in 2015, includes an impressive irrigation water project in Nookat rayon of Osh province. Here, two communities had a history of conflict during the economically important irrigation season. Even though the problem had been addressed numerous times with the authorities, no resolution had been achieved. With the help of UNHCR, both communities gathered and discussed the best method to increase the volume of irrigation water for agricultural use. A technical solution was jointly agreed upon and with the help of both communities, water user associations, local self-government heads and technical specialists the water volume in the main channel could be increased by over 300 % (from 300 liter to 1000 liter per second). This infrastructure project helped to address the cause of the conflict, while, at the same time conflicting communities worked together to solve a problem and thereby established trust and confidence. This experience will serve the communities beyond the irrigation water project supported by UNCHR. This is just one example of a successful PBI. In total, UNHCR has already implemented 74 of such initiatives in both 2014 and 2015.  Open budget hearings started in 2014 have been conducted again in 2015. Citizens are now aware that they are entitled to receive detailed information on expenditures of their A/O. Trainings and awareness raising campaigns on land plot allocation and social benefits involved both government officials and the wider population. Now, both right holders and duty bearers are aware of the legal mechanisms. |
| *Do you see evidence that the project is having a positive impact on peacebuilding?*  *(250 words max.)* | During the past 16 month, UNHCR has been able to have a positive impact on peacebuilding in target communities. In 2014, many focused trainings were carried out for local self-government staff on topics like budget planning, conflict resolution, land management and community mobilization. In 2015, the focus has shifted towards the application of the acquired skills. The implementation of community based peacebuilding initiatives allows for targeted resolution of conflicts on the local level. So far, UNHCR has implemented 74 of these projects. While the problems addressed range widely (from trash collection to irrigation water, from increasing local taxes to installation of offices for village heads in rural communities), all projects helped to increase trust between multiethnic communities and authorities. Both local population and authorities have shown that, through joint action, problems can be solved on the local level. Advocacy work and legal assistance additionally bolstered the level of trust between community and authorities. The multi-agency PRF baseline study (conducted by the Secretariat in May 2015) showed that trust and confidence level, both towards authorities and between ethnicities is already significantly higher in UNHCR target communities. |
| *Were there catalytic effects from the project in the period reported, including additional funding commitments or unleashing/ unblocking of any peace relevant processes?*  *(250 words max.)* | UNHCR's approach of community-based peacebuilding is already recognized as a best practice among UN PRF agencies and government authorities. While central government structures are highly volatile, structures in villages and small cities tend to be more stable. Here capacity building, paired with financial support for peacebuilding initiatives, individual legal aid and advocacy efforts, is most effective and will have a lasting effect. All peacebuilding initiatives receive co-funding from local or regional budgets to ensure sustainability and ownership. In fact, UNHCR contributes on average only 50% to the total budget of peacebuilding initiatives.  UNHCR cooperates with other RUNOs such as UNICEF, UNDP, WFP and OHCHR with joint project implementation and advocacy work. In addition, (I)NGO partners, esp. the Aga Khan Foundation who will start to implement its own peacebuilding/social cohesion project in 2015, cooperates very closely with UNHCR Kyrgyzstan. A planned tour for ambassadors to Southern Kyrgyzstan is anticipated to result in funding for additional peacebuilding measures. |
| *If progress has been slow or inadequate, provide main reasons and what is being done to address them.*  *(250 words max.)* | Project progress is satisfactory, indeed all target indicators have been already overachieved. |
| *What are the main activities/expected results for the rest of the year?*  *(250 words max.)* | Implementation of 58 peacebuilding initiatives (total 2015), resolution of 90 individual cases (total 2015), activities to strengthen feedback mechanisms on the local level, endline study and advocacy activities will be completed by the end of the year. |
| *Is there any need to adjust project strategies/ duration/budget etc.?*  *(500 words max.)* | No |
| *Are there any lessons learned from the project in the period reported?*  *(500 words max.)* | For successful project implementation, monitoring is essential. UNHCR has a sizeable presence in the south with offices in Osh and Jalalabad. In addition, very frequent field visits (weekly) ensure a trustful relationship between implementing partner, beneficiary and UNHCR.  Furthermore, the community based peacebuilding approach is very appropriate for the Kyrgyz context. In many cases, communities and authorities have a very clear understanding of their conflicts and possible solutions. UNHCR should function as a facilitator, e.g. to bring two neighboring communities together to solve a common problem, but always ensure that all stakeholders are heard properly. The role of local self-government bodies should be central in realization of peacebuilding initiatives rather than the role of NGOs and international organizations providing assistance. If this principle is not being followed, relations between people and authorities may worsen, as the authorities will be perceived to be incapable to solve the local issues, while international agencies and NGOs is more responsive for the community problems. |
| *What is the project budget expenditure to date (percentage of allocated project budget expensed by the date of the report) – preliminary figures only?*  *(250 words max.)* | 680 209 USD |
| *Any other information that the project needs to convey to PBSO (and JSC) at this stage?*  *(250 words max.)* | No |

**INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT*:*** *Using the* ***Project Results Framework as per the approved project document****- provide an update on the achievement of key indicators at both the outcome and output level in the table below. Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation in the qualitative text above.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Performance Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Current indicator progress** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** | **Adjustment of target (if any)** |
| Outcome 2  LSGs, LSGA and other oversight entities are enabled to provide effective feedback/conflict resolution mechanisms for the  population and by actively listening to the population, providing impartial feedback and taking remedial measures, thus  demonstrating their accountability. | Indicator 2.1  % increase in level of trust to local authorities that they are capable to solve  incidents/grievances/conflicts | 30% of focus group respondents point out low problem solving capacity of local self-government entities | 30% increase in trust in conflict solving capacity | TBD by the end of the Year |  |  |
| Output 2.1  20 LSGs have functioning feedback mechanisms  and two oversight mechanisms (Osh/Jalalabad  ombudsman’s offices) | Indicator 2.1.1  Number of LSGs with functioning feedback mechanism | 0 | 20 | Open budget and dialogue meetings held in 20 locations |  |  |
| Output 2.2  20 LSGA bodies have ability to carry out  monitoring and analysis | Indicator 2.2.1  Number of LSGs that are able to carry out monitoring and analysis | 0 | 20 | TBD |  |  |
| Output 2.3.  At least 20 conflict resolution initiatives are  successful in opening dialogues between polarized  communities. | Indicator 2.3.1  Number of successfully implemented conflict resolution/peacebuilding initiatives | 0 | 20 | 74 |  |  |

1. Please note that where there are multiple agencies, only one consolidated project report should be submitted. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Approved budget is the amount transferred to Recipient Organisations. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Funds committed are defined as the commitments made through legal contracts for services and works according to the financial regulations and procedures of the Recipient Organisations. Provide preliminary data only.

   4 Actual payments (contracts, services, works) made on commitments.

   5 PBF focus areas are:

   *1: Support the implementation of peace agreements and political dialogue (Priority Area 1)*:

   (1.1) SSR, (1.2) RoL; (1.3) DDR; (1.4) Political Dialogue;

   *2: Promote coexistence and peaceful resolution of conflicts (Priority Area 2)*:

   (2.1) National reconciliation; (2.1) Democratic Governance; (2.3) Management of natural resources;

   *3:Revitalise the economy and generate immediate peace dividends (Priority Area 3)*;

   (3.1) Short-term employment generation; (3.2) Sustainable livelihoods

   *4) (Re)-establish essential administrative services (Priority Area 4)*

   (4.1) Public administration; (4.2) Public service delivery (including infrastructure). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)