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# 1. Executive summary

**1.1. Project and Evaluation Objectives**

This project focuses on empowering Kyrgyzstani youth from different ethnic, gender and social backgrounds in the regions of Osh, Jalal-Abad, Chui and Batken to have a voice heard in local, national and international policy levels and to act as agents of change within their communities to foster understanding about the ‘other’ and bring new insights to gender roles, norms and issues. To reach these objectives and results, the participatory video (PV) methodology is the foundation of the project.

In order to reach as widely as possible throughout the country, the project covers four ‘oblasts’ (regions), geographically covering both Northern and Southern regions. By targeting 16 schools total, 128 Kyrgyzstani girls and boys are directly involved in the project and through the Participatory Video (PV) method’s feedback loops with other students in their school it reaches at least 500 girls and boys. FTI and GPPAC donated the video equipment to the schools at the beginning of the project.

The overall objectives of the evaluation are:

* To document project achievements towards the initial project proposal and the project activities, the occurrence of the expected results and impact and their progress towards sustainability.
* To document the lessons learned from the project, as well as recommendations that can be used by project partners and direct stakeholders for strategic directions for Kyrgyzstan, possibly for Central Asia and/or even beyond.

**1.2. Scope and design of the Evaluation**

The subject of the evaluation is the project *“Cameras in Hand: Transformation and Empowerment of Kyrgyzstani Girls and Boys”*, financially supported by UN PBF.

The evaluator will review and summarise the available evidence of the quality, accountability and impact of the project activities. The evaluation consists of both desk and field study. The evaluation addresses all the outcome and output indicators in the project’s logframe, as well as specific questions agreed with the donor and GPPAC from the Terms of Reference (annex I), which related to the project’s Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability, Relevance and Efficiency.

The initial data collection for the evaluation commenced in early July 2019 and the evaluation was finalized in November 2019.

*A note to this version of the evaluation report (note by Paul Kosterink, Evaluator at GPPAC):*

*A draft version of this final evaluation report was submitted by the external evaluator to GPPAC and FTI by mid November 2019. The draft version of the external evaluator’s report was edited by Paul Kosterink (‘Coordinator Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning’ of GPPAC). The below sections mostly required improving lay-out and minor text editing in order to increase overall readability. The editing of the text itself in terms of contents was done to an absolute minimum level. Where this occurred - so text was edited or added, which deviated from the text by the external evaluator - the text is put in italics, and a clear note is made that editing was done by Paul Kosterink of GPPAC, based on comments provided previously by involved project staff from GPPAC and FTI. The original draft report from Symon Lord is available upon request from GPPAC.*

***Response of evaluator: The External Evaluator does not accept the amendments to the original layout of the evaluation which were made in the version submitted to him on 17:01.2020 by GPPAC. These amendments can be summarized as:***

* *Deletion of the section: ‘*Summary of main lessons learned and recommendations’ from the Executive Summary, which should be a stand alone summary of the entire report.
* Abridging the main section on ‘Recommendation and Lessons Learned’ to only include a few of the Recommendations and Lessons Learned.
* Deletion of the Evaluator’s response to the Feedback of GPPAC staff to the each section on ‘Recommendation and Lessons Learned’.
* Removal of the complete *section: ‘*Summary of main lessons learned and recommendations’ to the last section of the Annex.

This Evaluator considers that all Recommendations/Lessons Learned are of interest to and potentially of much benefit to project stakeholders, and should be presented in the most appropriate way.

A Mixed methods approach was taken to the evaluation, which can be summarized as:

* Direct observation of final project conference, including interviews with relevant project staff and beneficiaries.
* Desktop review based on documents list supplied by GPPAC and FTI.
* Key informants interviews with project stakeholders in person and on Skype.
* Informal discussion groups with specific groups of project stakeholders in each region of the project around project evaluation questions.
* Careful study of all films.
* Careful study of project social media.
* A three days data collection visit to GPPAC in the Hague, which included two presentations by the consultant of findings and recommendations to date followed by feedback, and interviews with key informants and with relevant GPPAC staff.
* Triangulation of evidence from all above sources.

**1.3. Summary of main findings**

**Effectiveness.**

This evaluation found that the project had been implemented extremely effectively, and can be said to have largely achieved it’s following two outcomes:

* Outcome 1: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to formulate common messages to decision-makers in their local constituencies, on the national level and international level, in order to make their vision of a peaceful future heard in policy making decisions.
* Outcome 2: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation within and among their communities and peers to improve their understanding and attitude towards the “other” and develop new insights on gender norms and issues.

Project design was found to be very suitable to this type of project, and general project implementation had been timely and thorough due to efficient management and Monitoring & Evaluation processes, which included effective cooperation between GPPAC, and effective work by FTI at central and local levels. In particular, this ensured that project implementation was timely and thorough, factors that this evaluation concluded contributed significantly to maximising project effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

The schools selected to take part in the project to host initiative groups were very cooperative and supportive towards the initiative groups of two teachers and eight children formed during the project, who were found to have a balance of 50/50 urban/rural and 50/50 gender, and inclusion of 30% ethnic minorities.

The groups are found to have been very well selected, as the majority of those chosen stayed throughout the project, and - as a result of a series of effective trainings, mentoring by regional coordinators and their teachers and regular meetings several times a week - have mastered the necessary skills to make competent participatory videos. Each group made at least two successful videos on a variety of social themes relevant to their communities.

The Feedback sessions with decision makers at the local, national and international levels were found to have been extremely well organized and innovative. Youth in Kyrgyzstan had previously not had a voice among government decision-makers, who took the meetings seriously. The ‘feedback sessions’ were successful primarily in terms of awareness raising on important social issues, and in some cases at the local level led to concrete changes, which effectively resolved the problems raised.

The communications plan for the project consisted of Facebook, Twitter and Instagram groups set up for the project to which initiative groups contributed, postings by GPPAC and FTI throughout their networks which ensured that the messages of the initiative groups reached audiences beyond their immediate communities.

Each initiative group produced a sustainability plan at the final project conference, and as of October are already meeting and implementing these plans.

**Impact.**

* All initiative group members are empowered to formulate common messages to decision makers at local, national and international levels, as well as to the community through social media. As such, they can be agents of change in their communities.
* Initiative group members have become tolerant towards individuals from ‘other’ ethnic and social groups and on gender issues.
* All initiative group members have self-confidence, management skills, and team-work skills.
* Initiative group members have a solid basis in the skills necessary for making Participatory Videos, namely, skills for conflict analysis, research, storyboarding, scenario, acting, camera work, production and editing.

**Sustainability.**

* Initiative groups now have the developed capacity to produce PVs and to train new members.
* Initiative groups have all the equipment they need for filming, which is owned by the hosting schools.
* Initiative groups have the expertise and local connections to conduct feedback sessions.
* Initiative groups have the desire to continue their activities.
* Sustainability of the groups will depend on how effectively they implement their sustainability plans, and ideally the recommendations from this evaluation.

**Summary of main lessons learned and recommendations**

**For similar future projects:**

* Consider Including comparison groups in the project’s M&E plan as in an Impact evaluation.
* Consider online training and testing for the subject matter taught during the project.
* Consider virtual training with trainers to follow up on the formal trainings.
* Consider extra trainings in Internet search skills, fundraising and budgeting.
* Consider a PV handbook in Russian to be given to all initiative group members.
* Consider including sessions on sharing lessons learned to the regional exchange conferences.
* Feedback sessions with decision-makers at the local level should distinguish between ‘awareness raising’ and effecting change on a specific issue for their objectives. It is recommended that each initiative group understands the difference, and conducts one feedback sessions with decision-makers at the local level dedicated to each. Distinguish between awareness raising and effecting change at local level.
* Consider including a budget entry specifically dedicated to financing activities to effecting change at the local level to support based on the decisions of feedback sessions at the local level.
* Consider TV broadcasts of the feedback sessions as part of future design. This would probably be easier on local and regional tv.
* Consider conducting feedback sessions on gender for a male audience.
* For the national feedback sessions, consider identifying an area of national policy that could be changed, and specifically advocate for this change at the national feedback session.
* Articles and presentations about international trip.

**For the initiative groups, now:**

* Those groups members who have left school should be considered to be ‘Alumni’ to keep in touch and support.
* Additional groups can be set up at project schools that are trained by the existing group.
* Each initiative group should set up its own social media page.
* Initiative groups should conduct feedback sessions at the local level with local media and development sector representatives in order to network and, and possibly get useful feedback.
* Initiative groups could consider local authority orders for PVs on specific themes.
* Initiative groups could consider raising funds by filming in the private sector.
* Initiative groups might like to consider extra training in Internet search skills, fundraising and budgeting.
* Initiative groups might like to continue joining international websites on PV. For this, they would need English versions of all their films.

|  |
| --- |
| Note from External Evaluator: For me, this ‘Summary of main lessons learned and recommendations’ should be included in the Executive Summary, which should be an abridged version of the entire report. |

# 2. Evaluation Design

## 2.1. Background to the project

This project focuses on empowering Kyrgyzstani youth from different ethnic, gender and social backgrounds in the regions of Osh, Jalal-Abad, Chui and Batken to have a voice heard in local, national and international policy levels and to act as agents of change within their communities to foster understanding about the ‘other’ and bring new insights to gender roles, norms and issues. To reach these objectives and results, the participatory video (PV) methodology is the foundation of the project.

The project is coordinated by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), a network of conflict prevention CSOs (Civil Society Organisations). The implementing partner is GPPAC’s Regional Secretariat for Central Asia, Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI). The other partners in the project are the Middle East Nonviolence and Democracy (MEND), the member of GPPAC from Palestine (MENA region), and Real-Time, the originator of the Participatory Video methodology.

The project has two main objectives:

* Outcome 1: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to formulate common messages to decision makers in their local constituencies, on the national level and international level, in order to make their vision of a peaceful future heard in policy making decisions.
* Outcome 2: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation within and among their communities and peers to improve their understanding and attitude towards the “other” and develop new insights on gender norms and issues.

The following activities were conducted as part of the project:

* Selection of 16 schools and children-participants (128; 8 in each school, 14 – 17 y.o.).
* Training of trainers in participatory video (PV) methodology by MEND and Real Time.
* Conflict analysis trainings for children and teachers (128 children, 32 teachers).
* Training sessions in PV for 32 teachers and 128 children.
* Baseline survey.
* The professional video equipment has been purchased and donated to schools.
* In all 16 target schools, participants prepared movie ideas and scripts.
* Local implementing staff of FTI underwent a 2-day training session on video editing. All 128 pupil participants and 32 teachers received a similar mini-training.
* The best movie ideas were chosen in each of the groups of participants in an inclusive and democratic way. Altogether, 32 short movies about the major social problems important for youth have been filmed and shown to the local communities during the feedback sessions.
* Experience exchange meetings between the children from different schools.
* The internal mid-term review of the project was conducted in October 2018. It included visits to schools and informal discussions with teachers, pupils, and staff about the project, its sustainability, and communal impact.
* Two movies have been selected for the feedback sessions on the national level with the high-level government officials which took place in July 2019.
* The international advocacy visit of Kyrgyzstani youth to the Netherlands and Belgium took place in June 2019. Altogether, 8 movies out of 32 have been selected to be shown on the international level. 8 children (15 to 17 years of age) involved in the creation of these movies took part in the international advocacy visit.
* The participating children had undergone the project’s training in media literacy and social media campaigning. The movies were promoted online both nationally and internationally.
* A short publication capturing the experience with the PV methodology and the final movie were done by the end of the project.

## 2.2. Objectives of Evaluation

* The evaluation’s first goal is to document project achievements towards the initial project proposal and the project activities, the occurrence of the expected results and impact and their progress towards sustainability.
* The other goal of the evaluation is to document the lessons learned from the project, as well as recommendations that can be used by project partners and direct stakeholders for strategic directions for Kyrgyzstan, possibly for Central Asia and/or even beyond.

The evaluation is a final evaluation, required by the donor (UN PBF) to be executed towards the end of the project. The evaluation is commissioned and coordinated by the project coordinators GPPAC and FTI.

The evaluation and its recommendations will be a useful tool of information for the project partners and the direct stakeholders of the project. The evaluation will inform the UN PBF to what extent the project goals have been achieved, as well as provide directions for future support in the conflict prevention and peacebuilding field in Kyrgyzstan and possibly beyond.

The accountability purpose of the evaluation is:

1. *to assess how relevant the project was, towards the direct stakeholders of the project*;
2. *to assess the logframe matrix, whether activities contributed to the achievement of results and project goals and what the overall impact of the project was*.

The learning purpose of the evaluation is:

1. *to harvest the outcomes of the project, in order to use for learning from the project and follow-up*
2. *to assess which elements of the project were most successful towards conflict prevention, and which critical factors, or criteria can be formulated at the general level, possibly applicable to the whole Central Asian region.*

The evaluation makes recommendations on how the project could be continued, particularly what are the potentially most promising directions for continuation or follow-up of the project.

## 2.3. Subject and focus (scope)

The subject of the evaluation is the project *“Cameras in Hand: Transformation and Empowerment of Kyrgyzstani Girls and Boys”*, financially supported by UN PBF.

The evaluator will review and summarise the available evidence of the quality, accountability and impact of the project activities. The evaluation will consist of both desk and field studies. The initial data collection for the evaluation commenced in early July 2019 and the draft version of the evaluation was submitted to GPPAC by mid November 2019.

Concerning the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria the following focus and limitations are noted, and in line with the Terms of Reference for this evaluation (annex I):

* **‘Effectiveness’.** The evaluation assesses whether the project objectives have been achieved, and how and to what extent they have contributed to conflict prevention and the empowerment of Kyrgyzstani girls and boys (as further specified in the two project objectives).
* **‘Impact’** is the focus of the evaluation. It will be addressed at the project level, through analysing the project’s achievements and comparing these against broader peacebuilding needs and priorities in the country.
* **‘Sustainability**’. The evaluation provides information to what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after the project has ended and by whom. The evaluation will provide information for the project partners and the direct stakeholders of the project, the involved national actors, and civil society which approaches prove to be (most) successful, as well as strategic directions for the near future, such as recommendations for follow-up.
* **‘Relevance’** is not the focus of the evaluation. The reasoning here is that the Project partners have sufficient information from the mid-term review and on-going monitoring that the project was relevant. Therefore, there is no need to analyse this further in detail. The findings on relevance from the mid-term review and on-going monitoring will be included in the final evaluation report. Additionally, the relevance could be addressed and to some extent assessed further through interviews with relevant stakeholders for the other prioritised evaluation criteria below so it explains why the project remains relevant.
* **‘Efficiency’** is not the focus of the evaluation. It will only have to be addressed in a more general manner, by analysing the project’s overall results in relation to the overall expenses and main budget lines. One possible angle is to include a reflection on possible spill-over effects, such as links to other projects and programmes of involved stakeholders, and follow-up at the community levels.

## 2.4. Main evaluation questions

**Effectiveness:**

1. To what extent has the project achieved its expected results (both at the outputs and outcomes levels)?

2. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the expected results?

3. In which regions/communities were the results the most effective and which lessons learned can be drawn from that for the future?

4. How effectively has the project addressed the youth and gender objectives?

**Impact:**

1. How many women, men, girls and boys can be said to be (a.) direct beneficiaries from the project. (b.) indirect beneficiaries?

2. What impact has the project had on (a.) the girls, (b.) boys (c.) the teachers in the Initiative Groups?

3. What impact did the project have on parents of initiative group members?

4. What impact did the project have on the communities in which the Initiative Group children live?

5. Which positive and/or negative effects/impact in terms of gender can possibly be attributed to the project?

6. Which positive and/or negative effects/impact did the project have on policies at the local, national and international levels? How has the project contributed to the Program of the Kyrgyz government ‘Development of the youth policy for 2017-2020’?

**Sustainability:**

1. What are the current capacities of the Initiative Groups?

2. What are the factors that will help to ensure sustainability of the project?

3. What factors could negatively impact on the sustainability of the project?

4. To what extent will the benefits of the project likely to continue after the project’s end?

5. What measures are currently in place to ensure the sustainability of the project?

6. If applicable, what needs to be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability?

7. How has the project built the capacity of FTI, and what impact will this new capacity have in the future?

8. Did the project build local capacity in participatory video and more broadly in youth empowerment and conflict prevention?

9. To what extent can the project be considered “catalytic,” either in galvanizing further financial investments from outside parties, or encouraging subsequent processes after the end of the project?

10. What are the lessons learned from this project that can be taken into account for similar projects in Kyrgyzstan, and possibly for similar projects in other Central Asian countries or even outside the Central Asian region?

**Efficiency:** (NB: limited scope)

1. Have the budget funds been used efficiently?

2. Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?

3. How effective was the project in terms of enhancing the partners’ work?

4. What synergies did the project have with other projects or initiatives? What outcomes has this produced?

**Relevance:** (NB: limited scope)

1. To what extent are the project objectives still valid for Kyrgyzstan, the partner organizations and the beneficiaries?

2. Did the project remain relevant throughout its duration?

3. For UN PBF the following sub-questions is addressed:

1. What was the relevance of the proposed “of change,” and did the assumptions identified during project design hold true?
2. Was the project relevant in terms of the broader peacebuilding strategy for the country, including, for example: national peacebuilding plans, UN strategic frameworks, and identified peacebuilding gaps?
3. Was the project more or less relevant for different communities and groups? (For example: was the project more relevant to Kyrgyz boys than to females, or to ethnic minorities or school teachers?)
4. How did the programme ensure its relevance by including key stakeholders in project design?

## 2.5. Evaluation approach and methods

A Mixed methods approach was taken to the evaluation, which can be summarized as:

* Direct observation of final project conference, including interviews with relevant project staff and beneficiaries.
* Desktop review of project documents listed in the Annex.
* Viewing of the 32 short films;
* Viewing of social media developed during the project;
* Key informants’ interviews with project stakeholders in person and on Skype.
* Informal discussion groups with teachers and children from initiative groups, and some initiative group children’s parents from all of the project regions.
* A three days data collection visit to GPPAC in the Hague , which included key informant interviews with relevant GPPAC staff and two presentations by the consultant of findings and recommendations to date, followed by feedback by project management members and involved GPPAC staff.
* Triangulation of evidence from all above sources.

An Inception Report was produced after the Consultant attending the final project conference on 16 July, initial interviews with project stakeholders and study of basic project documentation. Interviews and discussion groups were conducted with the support of a national consultant who prepared written transcripts of all conversations.

# 3. Evaluation findings

## 3.1. Effectiveness

**3.1.1. To what extent has the project achieved its expected results?**

**(both at the outputs and outcomes levels)?**

This evaluation found that in order to understand the results of the project at the outcomes and outputs levels, as well as address the specific evaluation questions, it is necessary to first of all have an overview of the project execution in section (A) below “Findings on Design, Management and Execution of the Project”. Section (A) elaborates on how the different parts of the project are linked together, as well as understand issues related to implementation.

In section (B) “Findings at Project Outcomes and Outputs levels”, covering specific project outcomes and outputs and evaluation questions, reference can then be made - where applicable - to issues discussed in section (A).

### (A) Findings on Design, Management and Execution of the Project

**A.1. Project design.**

The project design can be broken down into the following activities:

* Baseline survey about children’s perceptions.
* Selection of Schools.
* Recruitment of initiative groups.
* A variety of training events in subject matter relevant to the project, including ToTs to relevant project stakeholders.
* Development of the capacity of initiative groups in PV through mentoring.
* The initiative groups produce two PVs each.
* Both PVs are shown at Feedback sessions with decision makers and other interested persons and discussed. In cases where this is feasible, this leads to a concrete action plan to be implemented.
* Feedback sessions are held for a female audience on gender issues relevant to them.
* Feedback/Exchange sessions are conducted in which all four groups from each project region participate.
* A feedback session is conducted with decision-makers at the national level.
* An international trip in which some group participants conduct feedback sessions involving their PVs and take part in a number of educational activities.
* A final project conference is held in which the achievements of the project are highlighted and sustainability plans for the initiative groups are prepared.

**Commentary**

This evaluation found the project’s design to be very effective, with logical stages that interlinked and complemented each other. For instance the trainings were followed by mentoring of the children in the initiative groups by the groups’ teachers and regional coordinators that effectively developed the groups’ capacity over time. The project design can also be judged to have been geared to achieving the project’s goal to develop the skills necessary to make participatory videos and achieve the project’s main objectives, which this evaluation judges to have been achieved in the sense that the main project objectives were achieved, as will become clear.

The project design was completed by a team from GPPAC, FTI and MEND, the latter organisation being also specialists with extensive experience in PV training. The design was based on similar PV projects, which had been for university age initiative groups. Thus, the current project can be said to be extremely innovative in Central Asia.

It should also be noted that the fact that GPPAC and MEND were so strongly involved in the project’s design, meant that the project’s management team was fully inducted into the project’s activities and objectives, having planned them, and thus had a strong sense of ownership and commitment. This strong sense of ownership and commitment for this evaluator seems to have been a central factor in the effective implementation that has also contributed to impact and sustainability.

**A.2. Project management and M&E**

The evaluation identified the following four components of management for this project:

1. The Steering Committee.
2. GPPAC - FTI relations.
3. Internal GPPAC relations.
4. Internal FTI relations.

These are examined here:

1. **The Steering Committee.** The Steering Committee consisted of the main members of project management and the directors of GPPAC and FTI: 2 GPPAC staff (Project Coordinator and Executive Director) and 2 FTI staff (Project Manager and President) and had an online coordination meeting every quarter of the project, so that six meetings were completed in all. Meeting minutes show that agendas were prepared very carefully which covered all important aspects of the project, including financial questions. For each activity the following points were discussed and recorded in meeting minutes: Output / deliverables; Progress marker; Comments; Agreed Action points.
2. **GPPAC - FTI relations.** The evaluation found that close and very positive contact was maintained through Skype and email between the Project Coordinator in GPPAC and Project manager in FTI that helped to ensure the smooth running of the project. Monitoring visits were also paid to the project in Kyrgyzstan by the GPPAC Project Coordinator to complete semi-annual reports for UN PBF and the Mid Term Review (MTR).
3. **Internal GPPAC relations.** The evaluation found that the four GPPAC staff working on the project: The Project Coordinator, M&E representative, Communications Officer and Finance Officer had an extremely close and positive working relationship.
4. **Internal FTI relations.** The evaluation found that Project Manager and all regional Coordinators were extremely competent and that relations between them were positive and constructive. Coordinators and assistant Coordinators in each of the project regions visited each initiative group once a week during the course of the project.

The M&E/reporting system for the project can be summarized as consisting of:

1. Baseline Study: Research Perceptions amongst children in the framework of the project ‘Cameras in the Hands of Children’. This survey was carried out amongst approximately 256 children including all initiative group participants and control group. It surveyed opinions on: Gender tolerance; Self confidence of girls in decision-making; Political activeness; Perception of others; Team qualities; Use of social media. It was used during the project to inform activities. The evaluation found it to be well prepared. It is however very long, and was not used for a mid term or end-term comparison of changes in behaviours according to the project indicators. During the Summer months it would have been difficult to speak with all the children surveyed at the beginning of 2018.
2. FTI completed reports in Russian on all project activities, and quarterly reports which were used as sources of information for the semi-annual reports. Those reports read during this evaluation were found to be of the highest quality, and even included lessons learned to inform future project activities.
3. Semi-annual reports were completed in English by GPPAC with the support of FTI according to UN PBF standards. The evaluation found them to be very comprehensive in showing project progress according to all indicators to date.
4. Steering Committee reports. These were found by the evaluation to be extremely comprehensive, and summarized progress on all activities very well as noted in the previous section.
5. An internal Mid-Term Review was completed that concluded that progress was on track, but recommended that: 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).

**Commentary**

This evaluation found that the project had an extremely effective management and M&E framework that ensured that no major delays of project activities occurred that could have meant that time was wasted when initiative groups could have been operating, and as such, building their capacity. Likewise, the effective management at the regional level ensured that activities were implemented well, which significantly contributed to the impact of activities, and the potential for the longer-term sustainability of the initiative groups.

**A.3. Communications**.

A communications strategy was developed for the project, which was completed at the beginning of the second quarter of implementation.

The objectives of the communications strategy were:

1. To regularly inform all interested parties about the activities of the project and receive feedback.
2. To ensure that the public, decision-makers, politicians and local self-government that the needs and interests of Youth are heard.
3. To acquaint Youth with positive examples of civil activism, motivate them to develop and accept the principles of FTI.

The Strategy set out that:

* The project will have a main Facebook page, a page on Instagram, a page on Twitter and a Youtube channel. Hashtag information was also included.
* Each post on social media should have a tag of UN PBF and partner GPPAC.
* Interesting cases, news, success stories should be sent to the donor with the video and photo attachments. Changes can be made in consultation between the PR manager of GPPAC and the donor.
* All key events are to be filmed, and should include at least two interviews with participants where they talk about changes and what they have learned.
* Each monitoring visit should have photos and a short article that can be used for informational purposes.

28 separate communications activities were set out to be implemented during the course of the project, and for each, details were included on: Audience; Communication objectives and how to achieve them; Means of communication; Basic message; Instruments, actions/steps. What to do and how often; Responsible person; Indicator of achievement.

**Commentary**

The evaluation found the communications plan to be very comprehensive and addresses the main external communications needs. It was not possible within the scope of this evaluation to check on every aspect of the implementation of every activity within the plan. However, those which were checked were found to be of the highest quality. For example, the project Facebook group was found to be very organized with several hundred members and numerous postings relating to the project at least several times a week. The group is still in operation now (November 2019).

**A.4. Selection of schools.**

Sixteen project schools were selected from a list of fifty supplied by the Ministry of Education. The fifty schools were selected based on the following criteria:

* They had a history of ethnic conflict.
* They had not benefited from earlier NGO projects.
* They had expressed a willingness to host the initiative groups.

It should be noted that the project required a 50/50 division of urban/rural in it’s choice of schools.

**Commentary**

The evaluation concludes that the schools were well chosen as in each case the school management was always, and continues to be very supportive of the initiative groups. Rooms were always made available, and school authorities were supportive of all activities, and will continue to host the initiative groups, which will aid the sustainability of the groups.

**A.5. Selection of initiative group participants.**

The formation of the initiative groups took place in the first two months of the project, and consisted of the following three stages:

1. Advertising of the recruitment for the groups at the schools. Posters explaining what the initiative groups were, what qualities would be needed by a person to join, and what skills a person would gain from participation in an initiative group.
2. Conducting of games to assess suitability. Some of these games were written some spoken, and included speaking in front of the camera.
3. Conducting interviews with candidates.

The groups had the strict criteria of being 50/50 division of boys-girls, and having at least 30% of ethnic minorities. The pupil’s academic grades were also not taken into account during selection, so that pupils of all traditional academic levels had a chance to join.

Interest in joining the groups in the schools was found to be high, and some of the higher scoring pupils who were not accepted were put on a reserve list, and some later joined in cases where there were dropouts.

**Commentary**

The recruitment to the initiative groups at the schools generated a lot of interest, and one school even had fifty applicants. Some people said that they had been partly attracted by the innovative nature of the project, which was significantly different from a traditional way of learning.

The fact that the majority of those accepted into the initiative groups stayed, and took part in completing successful film projects and feedback sessions testifies to the effectiveness of the recruitment process, which for this evaluator has contributed to the impact and sustainability of the project.

**A.6. Trainings.**

The following trainings were implemented during the course of the project:

1. Training in PV to coordinators (ToT). 8 days.
2. Training in gender, conflictology and tolerance to initiative group participants and teachers. By coordinators. 2 days.
3. Training in PV for teachers and initiative group participants. 2 days.
4. Training in video editing to project staff and by project staff to project participants and teachers, and online support in editing. Two days formal training.
5. Social media training to initiative group participants. 2 days.

These trainings are examined below, in paragraphs following the same bullet point numbers.

1. **Training in PV to coordinators (training of trainers - ToT). 8 days.**

This training was implemented by a representative of Real Time - the originator of the PV methodology - and two consultants from MEND to: key FTI management, all regional coordinators, all regional assistant coordinators and the GPPAC Project Coordinator.

The training was interactive, and included a variety of games and exercises.

The contents of the training included:

* Storyboarding.
* Scenario.
* Camera use.
* Production.
* Acting.
* Training of Trainers (‘ToT’) in the course subject matter.

An interpreter was used to translate from English into Russian and all participants successfully completed the training. Handbooks with materials were developed by the trainees in Russian for the children and teachers and distributed in every project school.

**Commentary.**

The project coordinators in each region did go on to successfully put into practice and train groups in the course subject matter, which means that this training can be considered to have successfully trained trainers for conducting much of the training during the rest of the project

1. **Training in gender, conflictology and tolerance to initiative group participants and teachers. By coordinators. April. 2 days.**

One training in gender, conflictology and tolerance was given in each of the project regions to all members of the four initiative groups in that region. The methodology used during the training events was implemented by the coordinators in each region and by the project manager and was interactive and involved a lot of group work.

**Commentary**

The fact that the trainees went on to use what had been taught on the course in preparing scenarios for their PV projects testifies to the success of the trainings. The teaching materials were developed by FTI based on their previous experience of peacebuilding projects, with the help of some of the tools developed within the GPPAC network. The materials and tools checked during this evaluation were found to be very modern, effective, and at the right level for the needs of the initiative group participants.

1. **Training in PV for teachers and initiative group participants. 2 days.**

Each initiative group received two days of training implemented by the project coordinators for their region. The objectives of the training were:

* Team building for PV.
* PV methodology.
* Using a video camera.

**Commentary**

The analysis given in previous paragraph 2 above, for the gender, **conflictology and tolerance** training, also applies here.

1. **Training in video editing to project staff and by project staff to project participants and teachers, and online support in editing.**

Teachers and initiative group members received tuition in editing and were given links to sixteen lessons in basic training to be completed during the project.

**Commentary**

Editing is a life skill, so obviously, nothing more than the basics can be taught in two days. For this reason, the fact that participants were given an online course in Russian to follow in order to develop their skills was an excellent idea. The fact that the initiative groups made at least two successful PVs, with some support from outside editors, confirms that the tuition given, followed by the completion of the online courses in the basics of editing was successful.

1. **Social media training to initiative group participants. 2 days**

Training in social media was provided to all initiative group members in early 2019. The main aim of the training was to conduct social media campaigns. Some of the issues covered included distinguishing between true and false information on social media and how not to offend when making postings.

**Commentary**

The fact that training was given in social media is good, as obviously this will be of great use to the children in the future, and they became aware of basic rules to observe when making postings. The fact that a successful Facebook group was created for the project, in which initiative group members posted their films, articles and comments confirms that the lessons of the trainings were absorbed by the initiative groups, and then put into practice.

**A.7. Development and activities of initiative groups.**

Following their trainings, the initiative groups met regularly several times a week in classrooms at their school, which were available. The teachers managed the groups, but project coordinators for each region also visited the groups once a week, and as such played an important role in mentoring the groups, as well as ensuring that they did not fall behind in their activities. In the end, all groups successfully made two PVs, and successfully conducted several feedback sessions.

During the course of the project, the activities implemented by the groups in order to achieve project objectives can be summarized as:

* Conflict analysis
* Storyboarding.
* Scenario development.
* Production management.
* Editing. They did receive support here from an outside editor, as the skill of editing is not developed quickly.
* Preparing for and conducting feedback sessions.
* Posts on social media.

**Commentary**

It can be concluded that the capacity of the initiative groups was developed continuously throughout the project. This process started with the initial trainings, and was followed up by continuous mentoring by the regional coordinators and teachers in each group

The fact that the children in each group were so committed and mostly remained in the groups can be seen as a validation of the success of the filtration process of the recruitment process.

It should also be noted that participation in the initiative groups did not negatively effect their school work. In fact, project staff interviewed even testified that participation in the group by some pupils who previously had low grades, seemed to do better in their studies, having developed a good work/study ethos from their initiative group.

**A.8. Feedback sessions.**

All initiative groups were involved in the successful completion of at least several feedback sessions, which are outlined for the 4 different types of feedback sessions below:

1. Feedback sessions with Decision-makers.

2. Gender feedback sessions.

3. Regional Exchange Feedback Sessions.

4. National feedback session.

**1. Feedback sessions with Decision-makers.**

‘Feedback Sessions’ in which the majority of the audience were ‘decision-makers’ at the local level consisted of the showing of each of the participatory videos completed by the initiative groups. For each session, the most relevant individuals in public service, and in some cases the private sector most likely to be interested in the theme of the film were invited. This was followed by an organized discussion, based around pre-planned questions of the themes raised by the PVs, and then completion of a plan about what actions could be taken to resolve any identified problematic issues. This happened for each film, so there were 32 such feedback sessions altogether.

In at least five cases the films led to concrete actions being taken, though it was noted that chances of success were at least to a degree determined by money being available in local government budgets for action to be taken. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to cover all cases. However, one example is that a film about the dangers of no lighting at night in a village led to lighting being installed in that village. Another prominent example is of a film about youth gangs fighting led to local officials meeting members of the local gangs and persuading them to stop fighting.

**Commentary**

Feedbacks sessions like these had never been conducted in Kyrgyzstan previously, and the fact that they happened at all is in itself a great achievement. This evaluation considers that the sessions can be considered to have been a success. The local authorities took the sessions seriously, took an active part in them, and at the end of each session, an agreement was made that the local authorities would consider what actions to take.

This evaluation concludes that some themes, such as youth gangs fighting at the local level and the lack of lighting in a village as a security threat to women walking home are geared to having a potential immediate answer. Other films on themes such as the children of migrants, or girls’ limited access to higher education are more global in scope, and so do not offer an immediate possible solution. Also, in the cases where direct action was taken to deal with an issue at the local level, money was potentially available in the local budget.

**2. Gender feedback sessions.**

In each region, female participants and teachers from all four groups together with female school peers took part in feedback sessions in which PVs with gender themes were shown and then discussed according to pre-planned questions.

**Commentary**

Participants interviewed stated that interesting discussions ensued on gender-related issues.

**3. Regional Exchange Feedback Sessions.**

In each region the four initiative groups met and conducted a feedback session with the other groups that lasted all day in April 2019. Each group showed one of it’s PVs and conducted its own feedback session in the same way it had with the decision-makers. The sessions were also the first time that the four groups from each region got to meet each other and exchange ideas.

**Commentary**

These regional exchange sessions were a useful way for the groups from each region to get to know each other, and share best practices. Afterwards, through being connected on the project’s Facebook, Twitter, Instagram accounts, and Whats-app groups, the groups in each region were able to continue to support each other.

**4. National feedback session.**

The national feedback session took place in May of 2019 after the initiative groups had already gained significant experience of civil activism and advocacy through their successful feedback sessions at the local level. The audience consisted of around sixty participants, including government representatives from a range of departments and ministries at the national level.

Two films were selected by a special commission set up by the project for discussion on the themes of girls’ access to higher education and the impact of labour migration to Russia on the children of migrant parents as the themes have national as well as local themes. The initiative group members who made the PVs selected for showing attended. Three other films were shown, including one on the theme of corruption.

Individuals who participated in the session stated that the national decision-makers were complimentary of the films and took an active interest in the film’s themes. They also expressed admiration for the discussion abilities of the initiative group participants, in particular their confidence to discuss issues at such a high level. It was agreed that the themes discussed would be taken into consideration by attendees in planning policy.

**Commentary**

The fact that FTI managed to successfully organize this event and successfully complete it is an achievement in it’s own right. The fact that the children were prepared and confident enough to participate at this level, and were complimented by national government officials can also be seen as a major success of the project in it’s own right.

**A.9. International trip.**

A trip to The Hague, Utrecht, Amsterdam and Brussels was organized for eight participants and several key members of FTI staff. Eight films had been selected to be shown from the project in mini feedback sessions, and each of the invited project participants was from a group whose film had been selected. The trip took place in June 2019, and consisted of the following agenda:

1. Training in advocacy and lobbying.
2. Workshop on using Participatory Video (PV) methodology in peacebuilding for peacebuilding organizations; the participants included staff from PAX and UNOY.
3. Expert meeting with international decision-makers (4 representatives of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representative of the Hague Municipality) on Youth activism and inclusion of civil society in peacebuilding in Kyrgyzstan.
4. Meeting with UNOY (United Network of Young Peacebuilders).
5. Visit to the International School in The Hague.
6. Meeting with the GPPAC Staff at the GPPAC Office in The Hague.
7. Meeting with European Commission DG DEVCO Kyrgyzstan Officer.
8. Lunch Meeting with European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) and EPLO members Search For Common Ground, Safer World and World Vision.
9. Meeting at the Embassy of Kyrgyz Republic.
10. European Development Days.

Prior to the trip, the delegation from Kyrgyzstan was given questions to answer from their trip and at the end of each day discussed what they had learned. Later some participants gave a presentation on what they had learned at the final project conference. Eight films were selected by a special commission.

The decision by project staff to shift the location for international advocacy to Europe from New York (as had initially been envisaged) was approved during the project steering committee meeting in the beginning of 2019 and confirmed with UN PBSO. It was based on factors such as the availability of decision-makers, potential advocacy opportunities, timing, logistics, cost-efficiency etc.

**Commentary**

All participants from Kyrgyzstan stated that they had learned a lot about peacebuilding and the operation of international organizations. The feedback sessions, which were conducted went well, and those present were impressed both by the quality of the films, and by the ability of the initiative group participants to debate. Participants wrote about what they had learned on the project’s social media, and a presentation on the lessons learned from it at the final project conference. In this way, the lessons from the trip were shared with all project participants.

**A.10. Final project conference.**

The one-day final project conference took place in mid-July 2019 at a hotel in Osh and involved all the initiative groups of the project.

It had the following objectives:

* Summarize the results of the project.
* Develop recommendations and plans for the sustainability of the sixteen initiative groups.
* Exchange of experience between the project groups of all regions.

The audience of the conference included a wide range of Osh Oblast and local government officials, including some from the Department of Education, Youth Committee of Osh, Ministry of Internal Affairs and department of inter-ethnic relations.

The conference started with a summary of the project's achievements by the Project Manager. This was followed by presentations of one PV from each region and a discussion of its content in the form of a mini-feedback session. The initiative groups from each region then worked in groups to develop a sustainability plan for their region, which they presented in the second half of the day.

The event was also used for networking between the groups from the different regions who had previously only had contact via the project's Facebook group.

**Commentary**

The evaluator participated during the entire agenda of the conference. The evaluation found the conference to have been an excellent way to 'wrap up' the project. The presentations by participants from each of the regions demonstrated that they had developed an excellent 'team spirit' and worked very well together.

The sustainability plans showed that all groups intended to continue to operate from September, taking in new members in cases where current members would leave their school. The plans from each region indicated that each group intended to complete new PVs before the end of the year, followed by more feedback sessions with local decision-makers.

The fact that participants from different regions got to know each other means that they will be able to exchange ideas related to PV in the future, and as such support the sustainability of each other.

**A.11. Final Activities during Final Project Evaluation**

**Groups meeting from mid-September 2019, start of the new school term.**

The initiative groups started to continue their activities in mid-September and have discussed and finalized their sustainability plans. They are reportedly already in the process of preparing new PVs to be finished and shown at feedback sessions before the end of the year.

At least five initiative groups completed new PV on the environment, which they worked on over the Summer for the International Day of Peace on September 21.

Two talk shows were shown on national television in October 2019.

**Final project movie.**

A short final movie was completed in October 2019 that highlighted several of the success stories of the project.

It has been viewed by the evaluator and found to be of a high standard.

**Handbook on PV made on experience in Kyrgyzstan and Palestine.**

A handbook on the experience of PV in Kyrgyzstan and Palestine has been completed by Lucia Nusseibeh, Tugelbay Ormokeyev, Erkin Kochkarov, Yakhyo Kadyrov, Kateryna Gryniuk. It was published in November 2019.

### (B) Findings on Expected Results for Outcomes and Outputs levels

Where necessary, the relevant part of the project is referred to from above.

**B.1. Outcome 1**

**Outcome 1: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to formulate common messages to decision-makers in their local constituencies, on the national level and international level, in order to make their vision of a peaceful future heard in policy making decisions.**

* The findings section shows that the girls and boys from the project have indeed become empowered to formulate common messages to their local constituencies, on the national level and international level. This can be seen both in the successful completion of the PVs, which contain a message, and then the successful conduction of the feedback sessions at the local, national and international levels.
* This outcome can be said to have been achieved as a result of the combination of an effective project design, followed by the initiative groups completing successfully all the stages outlined in the previous section, with the support of project management in The Hague, in the Osh office and at the regional level ensuring that activities were largely implemented on time.

**Outcome Indicator 1.a: Young Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different ethnic and social backgrounds demonstrate knowledge and appreciation (attitude) regarding concerns of “the other” despite their differences.**

* The initiative had a make up of at least 30% ethnic minorities, ie non-Kyrgyz. This meant that in addition to Kyrgyz members, there were ethnic Uzbeks, Tajiks, Russians and Dungans in the initiative groups. The fact that the initiative Group participants successfully worked together towards a common goal without any antagonisms along ethnic or social lines, testifies that the training events they had received had worked, and they had genuinely become more tolerant towards people who previously they may have considered to be ‘the other’. Notably, some of the initiative group participants stated that they felt that they had actually become much more tolerant towards the ‘other’ as a result of having passed through the process of the project. One of the films made specifically dealt with the issue of tensions around the Kyrgyz-Tajik border, and the need for more inter-ethnic tolerance.
* Initiative group participants interviewed have testified to having become more tolerant to other ethnicities as a result of conflict resolution trainings, and working with other nationalities in their group on the successful completion of films.

**Outcome 1.c: Increased feeling of political inclusion from girls and boys from different ethnic and social backgrounds.**

* The fact that 30% of the initiative group participants were from ethnic minorities, and they successfully took part in dialogue on issues of public concern with government decision-makers at the local, national and international levels testifies that the ethnic minorities who took part in the project most definitely experienced an increased feeling of political inclusion.

**Output 1.1. Youth capacity built in peacebuilding, participatory video and social media advocacy.**

* The fact that the initiative groups successfully completed training in peacebuilding and in PV, and then went on to successfully complete two PVs on peacebuilding-related themes testifies that youth’s capacity in peacebuilding and participatory video was built in this project.
* The initiative group participants successfully completed training in social media and have been making posts related to social problems, and commenting on other people’s posts on the group since early 2019 in a productive way. This suggests that youth’s capacity certainly has been built in social media advocacy.

**Output Indicator 1.1.2 – Number of youth (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity and community) involved in film production and social media dissemination, number of videos produced and subsequent increased feelings of inclusion and agency.**

* As discussed in the first section of the Findings, 128 young people, around 30% of whom were from ethnic minorities were successfully involved in film production, social media dissemination and produced two PVs. Some groups even produced extra PVs independently of the project. In view of these achievements, and based on interviews with initiative group participants, this evaluation would conclude that the youth in the project also had increased feelings of inclusion and agency.

**Output 1.2 Feedback loop sessions with local decision makers and national and international engagement with policy makers.**

All of these feedback sessions took place during the project and are discussed in a previous section of the Findings.

**Output Indicator 1.2.1 – Engagement on local level:**

**Number Kyrgyzstani youth (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity and community) involved in person and digitally in “number” of feedback sessions with local decision makers.**

* As recorded in the first section of Findings, 128 youth from Kyrgyzstan, approximately 50/50 male/female, from a variety of ethnicities and communities, around 50/50 urban rural from the age group 15-18 were involved in person in two feedback sessions with local decision-makers. The feedback sessions were shown on the project’s social media, notably the project’s Facebook group.

**Output Indicator 1.2.2 – Engagement on National level.**

**Number Kyrgyzstani youth (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity and community) involved in person and digitally in “number” of feedback sessions with national decision makers.**

* As recorded in the first section of Findings, a group of youth from Kyrgyzstan, approximately 50/50 male/female, from a variety of ethnicities and communities, around 50/50 urban/rural from the age group 15-18 were involved in person in a feedback session with national level decision-makers in Summer 2019. The feedback sessions were shown on the project’s social media, notably the project’s Facebook group.

**Output Indicator 1.2.3 – Engagement on International level. Number Kyrgyzstani youth (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity and community) involved in person and digitally in “number” of feedback sessions with international decision makers.**

* As recorded in the first section of Findings, a group of eight youth from Kyrgyzstan, 50/50 male/female, from a variety of ethnicities and communities, around 50/50 urban/rural from the age group 15-18 were involved in person in a feedback session with an international audience that included decision-makers in Summer 2019 in The Hague, Utrecht, Amsterdam and in Brussels. The participants of the international advocacy visit and the project staff continued follow-up communication with the international decision-makers digitally: via WhatsApp, social media and email exchanges

**Output 1.3: Social media outreach campaigns.**

**Output Indicator 1.2.3 Number of social media campaigns around youth’s short films, number of social media messages and responses generated, and description of reactions (breakdown of types of actors) on social media.**

* The project has groups on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram that have been very active since early 2019. Postings have been constant from that time and have continued up until the present. This evaluation considers that the project’s social media presence has had constant postings, followed by online discussions since the social media presence was established. Postings have included films produced by the groups, articles and simply updates on what groups are doing.

**B.2. Outcome 2**

**Outcome 2: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation within and among their communities and peers to improve their understanding and attitude towards the “other” and develop new insights on gender norms and issues.**

* This evaluation concludes that having completed the stages of the project outlined in the first section of Findings, the youth of the project, who are from different backgrounds can be considered to be: empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation within and among their communities and peers to improve their understanding and attitude towards the “other” and develop new insights on gender norms and issues.
* The main reasons for this have been discussed in the first section of this evaluation, but can be summarized here: Both boys and girls testified that the boys in the groups became more open-minded on gender issues, whilst all became more open-minded on the issue of tolerating ‘others’. For instance, it was noted by project staff that some boys originally thought that girls would not be effective as camera operators, but then changed their minds when the girls became very accomplished as camera operators.
* Some parents were originally reluctant to let their daughters join the groups, but were persuaded by FTI staff. Later they saw the benefits from the project and now think their daughters should pursue higher education. Most of those interviewed when asked, stated that they had become more understanding regards ‘other’ people from different backgrounds. Furthermore, it can be said that participation in the project has made the initiative group members more self confident with competent advocacy and discussion skills, which can be used within and among their communities.
* These changes can be said to have come about due to the initiative group participants going through all of the stages of the project as described in the first section of these Findings. The main relevant points here can be summarized as training in gender and tolerance, working towards common goals in a mixed gender/ethnicity groups, participating in making gender related films, and discussing gender/ethnic relations related films.

**Outcome Indicator 2a: Youth and communities from different gender, ethnic and social backgrounds demonstrate knowledge and appreciation (attitude) regarding concerns and interests of “the other” despite their differences.**

* Youth and communities from different gender, ethnic and social backgrounds have definitely demonstrated knowledge and appreciation (attitude) regarding concerns and interests of “the other” despite their differences. This was testified to during interviews with initiative group participants.

**Outcome Indicator 2b:** **Youth peers and communities demonstrate intake of new insights regarding girls concerns and gender perspectives.**

* It was beyond the scope of this evaluation to study the impact of the project on youth peers and the wider community in depth. However, the gender related PVs that were seen by school peers and members of the wider community who attended, such as decision-makers were well received and debated. Also, it is reported by initiative group participants that some family members did become more enlightened on gender issues, such as girls’ access to higher education as a result of watching gender-related PVs, and seeing the positive development of the female initiative group participants. This evaluation would therefore suggest that at least some youth peers and communities demonstrate intake of new insights regarding girls concerns and gender perspectives.

**Outcome Indicator 2c: Young Kyrgyzstani (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity and community) gain self-confidence and self-awareness to work together as actors of change in their communities.**

* This evaluation would conclude that the initiative group participants did gain self-confidence and self-awareness to work together as actors of change in their communities. As discussed previously in this section, initiative group members interviewed stated when asked that they now felt more confident, and this particularly came out during their successful participation in the various feedback sessions and at the final project conference.

**Output 2.1: feedback sessions with classmates and youth from other Schools.**

**Output indicator 2.1.1: Number of feedback sessions with girls only within each Oblast and number of films per Oblast relating to girls’ issues from different backgrounds and ethnic grounds.**

* Feedback sessions for the female members of the initiative groups and some female peers were conducted in all regions of the project. The gender-related films produced were made by girls from different ethnicities and backgrounds, though the themes of the films did not specifically focus on this.

**Output Indicator 2.1.2: Number of feedback sessions with peers and description of reaction of peers to the showing of the short videos. Description of social media reactions from youth.**

* Reportedly, some feedback sessions with peers were conducted, though these were not the main focus of this project. Members of the initiative groups did take an active interest to postings on the project Facebook group, and took a constructive part in commenting on postings.

**Output 2.2 Participatory feedback loop sessions with communities.**

* Feedback sessions with the community that had been considered were combined with those with decision-makers, in that any member of the wider community who had a potential interest in a film was invited. The feedback sessions with decision-makers were very successful, and have been covered in the section on Effectiveness.

**Output Indicator 2.2.2: Description of films which the communities voted (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity and community) that will reach national and international policy makers.**

* Below is a list of the films shown during the international trip. The names of the children who went on the international trip involved in making the films, and the name of the region were the films were made are also included:

1. The Number of Child Labor Should be zero!

Melisbek Azimov (Osh region) - child labour <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iB6Tsy1wxlU&feature=youtu.be>

1. The Presence of Parents is Crucial for Children! Latifa Emilbek kyzy (Osh region) - issues of migrants’ children  <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SCs7bn8D8fk&feature=youtu.be>
2. The Impact of Violence in Kyrgyzstan Bekzat Dyikanov (Jalal-Abad region) - divisions in society / fights between boys <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G4soyT3ESsc&t=2s>
3. All the Doors Should Be Open to Women! Guliza Akhmatalieva (Jalal-Abad region) -  gender inequality / access of women to education, choice of profession etc. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1PnWH_20_XE&feature=youtu.be>
4. A Dream About Peace On the Border of Kyrgyzstan. Azizbek Arapbek uulu (Batken region) - border tensions.  <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dZ8azERuANw&t=43s>
5. The Rights for Every Girl   
   Dilnoza Dosmuratova (Batken region) - gender inequality / gender-based violence <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ny8C8zua2fA>
6. The Impact of Pollution Elvira Ruslanova (Chui region) – environmental issues <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pue_6exo_io&feature=youtu.be>
7. Dreams Must Come True! Iusuf Susuza (Chui region) - dreams of children about the future they want vs expectations of parents. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n-barLqykEs&feature=youtu.be>

**The five films shown at the national level feedback session were:**

1. The Rights for Every Girl (Batken region)- gender inequality / gender-based violence <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ny8C8zua2fA>
2. The Presence of Parents is Crucial for Children! (Osh region) - issues of migrants’ children  <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SCs7bn8D8fk&feature=youtu.be>
3. Dreams Must Come True!  (Chui region) - dreams of children about the future they want vs expectations of parents. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n-barLqykEs&feature=youtu.be>
4. The Number of Child Labor Should be zero (Osh region) - child labour <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iB6Tsy1wxlU&feature=youtu.be>
5. Corruption is a threat to the development of youth (Jalal-Abad region) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z8QcmQ-Ab\_w

**3.1.2. What were major factors influencing (non-)achievement of results?**

The main factors that ensured the achievement of expected results are listed below:

* The effectiveness of the project design.
* The effectiveness of the training, in particular the ToTs component of the initial general training in PV set up a strong base for the rest of the project.
* The excellent management and M&E for the project, which ensured that project activities were implemented in a timely manner, and to a high standard.
* The effective recruitment of initiative group members that ensure that most participants stayed, and that all worked in a committed way.
* It was arguably too ambitious to expect that the PVs could effect change at the national or international level, though in some cases the feedback sessions did achieve concrete change at the local level.
* The fact that some of the PVs addressed concrete problems at the local level, rather than raising awareness on a general issue seems to have meant that concrete action was likely to be taken. The availability of money or not also seems to have played a role in determining whether a feedback session at the local level led to concrete change or not.

**3.1.3. Where were results most effective and what were lessons learned?**

* In terms of the quality of PVs made, there do not appear to have been any difference in terms of quality. Some feedback sessions at the local level seem to have been more successful in effecting concrete change, but this seems to have been affected more by the nature of the film, ie was it asking for a solution to a specific local problem, rather than drawing attention to a more a nationwide issue. Issues were also found to be easier to address when money was potentially available for this purpose. The particular region /community in which a film was made does not seem to have been a determining factor in ensuring the quality of a film, or that the film led to any concrete change. The lesson learned from this is addressed in the list of Recommendations/Lessons Learned, and are that initiative groups might like to make at least one PV geared to finding a solution at the local level

**3.1.4. How effectively has the project addressed youth & gender objectives?**

* This evaluation would judge that the project has been very effective in terms of realizing youth and gender objectives. These issues have already been addressed at relevant points in the ‘Effectiveness‘ section 3.1.1.

## 3.2. Impact

**3.2.1. Who were direct and indirect beneficiaries from the project?**

**Direct Beneficiaries.**

The following can be considered to be direct beneficiaries of the project:

* A total of 128 children, that is: eight in each initiative group, thirty-two in each region, and 128 in all four of the project regions. The exact proportion of girls to boys varied during the project, as some group participants dropped out, and new ones joined, but project staff reported a slight female majority of around 52%. This would seem to be confirmed by this project evaluator’s observations during the final project conference.
* Around forty-two adults, that is: thirty-two teachers, two from each of the sixteen initiative groups; Four project coordinators and four assistant project coordinators; Two FTI managers, that is the country manager and project manager.

**Commentary**

* Obviously all of the teachers and children in the initiative groups can be considered to be direct beneficiaries of the project. The project coordinators and other FTI staff who attended the trainings and had their capacity expanded by participation can also considered to be direct beneficiaries.

**Indirect Beneficiaries.**

It is always very difficult to give an exact figure for the number of people who have benefited indirectly from the project. However, having analysed project data, this evaluator would estimate that the total number of indirect beneficiaries from the project is at least several thousand that would include:

* Probably over two hundred parents of initiative group members.
* Probably several hundred siblings of initiative group members.
* The extended family of initiative group members, which could conceivably reach to over a thousand.
* School management in each of the project schools that could reach to over a hundred people.
* The school peers of initiative group members that could number over a thousand.
* All attendees of the feedback sessions, which would include local government administrators with different specialization and members of the local police. This could number over several hundred if it kept in mind that some feedback sessions had around a hundred attendees.

**Commentary**

* If we keep in mind that the several thousand indirect project beneficiaries may well have discussed new insights they have received from the project with friends, colleagues and/or family members then it could be said that the project’s impact is even wider than that suggested by the indirect beneficiaries listed above.

**3.2.2. What was the impact on girls, boys, teachers in the Initiative Groups?**

**Behavioural change.**

* This evaluation concluded based on interviews with initiative group members that all members of the initiative groups had changed significantly in terms of having developed peacebuilding-skills, noticeably tolerant attitudes on issues of gender and people who can be classed as ‘the other’, in particular ethnic minorities. This issue is addressed at greater length earlier in this evaluation.

**Competent basic work/life ‘soft’ skills.**

The initiative group members can be said to have acquired the following work/life ‘soft’ skills:

* More self-confident.
* Problem-solving through discussion.
* Teamwork skills.
* Management skills.
* Civil activism skills. For example, they are aware of the processes involved in effecting change through local, national and international government structures at different levels, and confident that with the right type of approach they can effect change.
* They are no doubt more aware of social, economic and political issues at local, national, and in the case of some at the international level.

**Competent basic work/life ‘hard skills.**

The initiative group members can be said to have acquired the following work/life ‘hard’ skills:

* All have developed basic competent life skills, filmmaking skills, including acting skills.
* Presentation skills.
* Social media skills.
* Teaching/training/mentoring skills.

In a few cases it may be possible to argue that one skill could be ‘hard’ or ‘soft’, but in most cases the difference is clear.

**Commentary**

It should be noted that all of the above skills listed have the potential to serve them well in the future in terms of professional development, and in terms of their potential to contribute to the development of Kyrgyzstan in both the civil society, government and private sectors.

**3.2.3. What was the impact on parents of initiative group members?**

* In some cases there were parents who did not want to let their daughters take part in the project, but were persuaded to do so by FTI. Later, in all cases the parents changed their minds and testified that their daughters should be allowed to freely choose what path to take in their lives. As such, these parents became more open-minded on gender issues.
* There were also parents who took part in the feedback sessions with decision-makers and in some cases participated in the discussions. All parents will have discussed with their children their progress in the groups and it is possible that some of them will have become more enlightened on issues such as attitudes towards ‘the other’, such as ethnic minorities.

**3.2.4. What was the impact on communities of the Initiative Groups?**

The impact on the wider community by the project is difficult to assess without a comprehensive survey, which is beyond the scope of this evaluation.

However, it should be noted that some initiative group members said that some of their school peers had become interested in joining the project as a result of watching the PVs made and talking with group members. This tends to suggest that some peers would be interested in experiencing the changes and learning the skills that can be learned in the initiative groups.

It should also be noted that members of the wider community did attend the feedback sessions, and may well have been influenced by the discussion related to the peacebuilding theme of a film being shown.

**3.2.5. What were the effects and impact in terms of gender?**

The gender dimension to the project is discussed in the Effectiveness section 3.1.1. above.

However, some of the major changes that happened that relate to gender can be summarized as:

* The girls in the group are more confident than before, particularly that they can pursue the ambitions that they choose in their lives.
* The boys in the groups became more open minded on the capabilities to work, for example doing roles such as camera operator, which previously has been seen more as a man’s job.
* Some parents became much more open in allowing their daughters to choose their career paths.
* Five PVs were made on gender-related issues, which illustrates the important role of gender in the project.
* Both girls and female teachers participating in the initiative groups have developed a solid base in a variety of both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ skills that can be of benefit to them for the rest of their lives. These skills would include leadership and teamwork skills.
* The evaluation did not find any negative points on the gender issue.

**3.2.6. What were the effects and impact on policies at different levels?**

**How has the project contributed to the Program of the Kyrgyz government ‘Development of the youth policy for 2017-2020’?**

* In terms of policy cannot be said to have had an impact at local, national or international level, although it did raise awareness on a number of important social issues at all levels, and lead to concrete change on specific issues at the local level.
* The evaluation did not notice any negative policies brought about by the project at any level.
* As far as this evaluation is aware, the project is in line with the contents of the Program of the Kyrgyz government ‘Development of the youth policy for 2017-2020’, so is likely to have contributed some parts of the policy. Consultation of government policy documents was, however, beyond the scope of this evaluation.
* As far as this evaluation is aware, the project is in line with the contents of the Program of the Kyrgyz government ‘Development of the youth policy for 2017-2020’, so is likely to have contributed increasing the impact of the implementation of the policy. Consultation of government policy documents was, however, beyond the scope of this evaluation.

**Commentary**

This evaluation concluded that it may be very ambitious for this type of project to specifically try to influence policy, though it is not to be ruled out if for example a particular PV was part of a wider campaign. On the other hand, raising awareness and catalysing action on a specific issue are very realistic and were achieved by the project.

## 3.3. Sustainability

**3.3.1. What are current capacities of the Initiative Groups?**

The current capacities of the initiative groups can be summarized as:

* They are competent in all basic elements of PV.
* They also have all the necessary equipment for filming available at the schools.
* Whilst they know the basics of editing, to become an accomplished editor takes a long time. In most cases, it is likely that the groups with the assistance of an experienced editor, and/or an editing manual, are competent enough to edit a short film.
* They have enough capacity in social media usage to be able to prepare and manage their own social media groups.
* They have basic skills in effecting civic activism, and the necessary connections to be able to run feedback sessions again.
* They have a sustainability plan and are already meeting.
* They have the competence to be able to train new members.
* Skills developed regularly over a year and a half.
* They have the desire to continue.
* FTI expressed commitment they will stay in touch with the initiative groups, and will be prepared to provide help as much as is possible.

**3.3.2. What are factors that will help to ensure project sustainability?**

The factors that will help to ensure sustainability of the project that relate to capacity developed to date can be summarized as:

* The effective implementation of the sustainability plans of the initiative groups, developed at the final project conference, which will depend on their will and determination to continue. This evaluation finds no reason to doubt that this will and can take place.
* The support of school authorities would also play a part in the continuation of the groups. There appears to be no reason to doubt that this will continue.
* Continuing support from ‘alumni’ who have left the group. There appears to be no reason to doubt that this will continue.
* The cooperation of decision-makers will be crucial if the initiative groups are to conduct for local or even national feedback sessions. The regional coordinators interviewed said that the decision-makers who have taken part in feedback sessions to date, will probably be happy to take part in them again.

This evaluation also concludes that the following recommendations if implemented can help to ensure sustainability:

* Conduct feedback sessions that include representatives of the local media and the NGO/development community that could assist them in some way, either, for example with ‘know how’, for instance some kind of trainings or networking.

**3.3.3. What factors could negatively impact the project’s sustainability?**

The factors that potentially could negatively impact on the sustainability of the project can be summarized as:

* Inability to raise sufficient funds to cover basic operational funds.
* Inability to get the support of potentially supportive organizations with technical expertise/networking potential.
* Lack of support of school authorities.
* Lack of support from decision-makers.
* Lack of determination of the part of the initiative groups.
* Lack of FTI support if required.
* Lack of cooperation of school authorities.
* Lack of putting sustainability plan into practice.

It should be pointed out here, that this evaluation concludes that the above listed factors are only hypothetical, and evidence does not suggest that they will play a determining role, at least in the near future. The reasons for this are outlined in the answer to question 3.3.2 of this section.

**3.3.4. To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue?**

* In view of the fact that the initiative groups have sustainability plans, are already meeting, this evaluation considers that if some of the analysis from the evaluation is taken into consideration, in particular Recommendations/Lessons learned, then there is no reason why the initiative groups cannot continue indefinitely.

**3.3.5. What measures ensure the project’s sustainability?**

* The main measures currently in place are the sustainability plans of the initiative groups for the next year, which are currently being implemented by the groups.

**3.3.6. What needs to be done/improved to ensure sustainability?**

* This question is addressed in the section on Recommendations/Lessons Learned.

**3.3.7. How has the project built the capacity of FTI?**

The capacity of FTI can be considered to have been built in the following ways:

* Improved M&E, coordination, planning and management skills.
* Training and mentoring skills.
* Knowledge of feedback sessions. Organizing and running.
* All areas of PV skills.
* More social media ‘savvy’.

**3.3.8. Did the project build local capacity in PV and in youth empowerment and conflict prevention?**

* Yes. These issues are addressed in the section on Effectiveness.

**3.3.9. To what extent can the project be considered “catalytic”?**

To what extent can the project be considered “catalytic” either in galvanizing further financial investments from outside parties, or encouraging subsequent processes after the end of the project?

* To the knowledge of this evaluation, the project has not yet been “catalytic,” in galvanizing further financial investments from outside parties to date.
* The initiative groups have continued to function after the end of the project, and are currently implementing their sustainability plans.

*Note by editor Paul Kosterink: As feedback to the draft version of this final evaluation report by evaluator Symon Lord, the project implementing organisations GPPAC and FTI added the following information (in italics) to further answer this evaluation question to what extent the project can be considered “catalytic”.*

*The catalytic effects of the project are elaborated in detail in the project progress reports, with the following summarised quotes from the respective reports marked in boxes:*

*Semi-annual report June 2018:*

*Local government bodies and departments of the Ministry of Education and Science show great interest in disseminating the project experience to more schools.*

*Project participants in a secondary school in the Batken region, inspired by the project, took the initiative to conduct a conflict analysis training for their peers. Local, district, and regional government bodies (including departments of the Ministry of Education) started to collaborate more closely and assist target schools.*

*Informational campaigns increase the interest of decision-makers in the project. Local government administrations express willingness to share the experience of working with the PV methodology in other schools through the experience-sharing seminars and meetings.*

*The administration of target schools has provided separate classrooms for activities conducted in the framework of the project. Some schools have provided iron safes for secure storage of equipment.*

*Annual Report November 2018:*

*In the school from Andarak village, Batken region, the participants, with the assistance of local activists, found funds from sponsors to repair a room in order to make a video studio.*

*Local government bodies and departments of the Ministry of Education and Science show great interest in disseminating the project experience to more schools.*

*Local government administrations express willingness to share the experience of working with the PV methodology in other schools through the experience-sharing seminars and meetings.*

*Upon the requests from Saferworld, the participants from the Osh region have helped the project “Developing Cooperation and Partnership in Communities of the Kyrgyz Republic” in producing a video report of the motivational meeting for youth.*

*FTI staff conducted training in video making for youth and women from new settlements around Bishkek in cooperation with UNFPA within GPI project. As a result, a group of women (over 40 y.o.) has made the best movies and won prizes.*

*Semi-annual report June 2019:*

*Youth form a school in Osh region after the feedback session received proposals from the regional education department to hold a joint presentation tour in other schools about the prevention of early marriages. In total, the initiative group held 4 presentation meetings with more than 400 young participants.*

*The video from the school №27 of Osh city on the topic “school racket” also was chosen by the city education department for presentation in 4 schools of the city, with participation of more than 500 students and teachers, as well as representatives of the police department.*

*In Batken region, the participants, with the assistance of local activists, managed to get sponsorship to repair a room in order to make a video studio. The efforts of the participants were supported financially, and young people are now able to continue developing their skills in making videos which have a high impact on the communities.*

*The youth from the school in the village of Maevka, Chui region, brought up the problem of the pupils’ safety during night hours. They showed in the video the difficulties of children who need to return home late after classes walking in dark streets with no lights in winter days, which causes security threats. Following the accepted recommendations during the feedback sessions, students together with the school administration gathered information about the streets where there is poor lighting, no lighting, or where the lamps should have been replaced. The data were presented to parents’ committee, which prepared 24 applications for the local government, asking to solve the problem of night-time lighting. After a week, lighting was installed on the main streets of the village, near the school. The young people, together with the school administration, met with representatives of the local government to discuss the results of the work.*

*Final Report November 2019:*

*Local government bodies and departments of the Ministry of Education and Science took steps to disseminate the PV methodology to more schools through the experience-sharing activities.*

*Project participants constantly take initiative in spreading the methodology and its peacebuilding effects beyond the scope of the project. Recently, a team from Jalal-Abad entered the regional film competition with two new videos about school racketeering and suicide. They won the first prize. The skills they gained in the project helped to portray the problems faced by youth very accurately in an interesting video of high-quality. The videos will be presented during the meetings on these topics.*

*Project participants prepared a 10-minute video together with their teachers for the Day of Kyrgyzstan Language and won the first prize. The other project participants also took part in local and international film competitions with the movies about corruption, preservation of environment and many others. The children cooperate with organizations such as Peace Corps, Saferworld, and others by creating videos to support the wider spread of information about their peacebuilding activities.*

*More generally, GPPAC has been leveraging the success of this project to potential donors to receive further support for peacebuilding activities of the network.*

*School administrations provided separate classrooms for project activities and safes to securely store equipment; one school got funds to repair a room and make a video studio. Feedback sessions created additional opportunities to attract financial contributions*

*According to the school principal in Jalal-Abad region, the school had previously attempted to participate in the competition with a plan to build a sports field, to no luck. Following the project, the principal presented local authorities with its results and recommendations from feedback sessions to create leisure spaces for rural youth. As an effect of participation in the project, the school received a grant of 5 million KGS to construct the sport facilities.*

*The feedback session in the Batken region about disabled children’s access to education led to the idea of a rehabilitation center. Local authorities promised to allocate 1 million KGS if the Department for Development co-finances the center in an informal setting. The director of the “Our Voice” Foundation promised to provide wheelchairs. The project participants and staff are working on ensuring the implementation of these ideas.*

**3.3.10 What are the lessons learned for similar projects?**

What are the lessons learned from this project that can be taken into account for similar projects in Kyrgyzstan, and possibly for similar projects in other Central Asian countries or even outside the Central Asian region?

* This issue is dealt with in a fair amount of depth in the Recommendations/Lessons Learned section.

## 3.4. Efficiency

(NB: limited scope)

**3.4.1. Have the budget funds been used efficiently?**

This can be analysed for the overall project expenses and at the budget ‘levels’ of 5,000 to 36,000 USD; so for the main budget items as project staff, involved project partners, hired experts, purchase of equipment and the main project events. Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why? More broadly, a reflection should be included to what extent the project provided “value for money?”

* As far as this evaluation is aware, budget funds have been used efficiently.

**3.4.2. Was the project managed as planned?**

Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?

* As far as this evaluation has established, the project was managed as planned, and implementation even went surprisingly smoothly.

**3.4.3. How effective was the project in enhancing the partners’ work?**

* This question is addressed in question 7 of the previous section on the capacity of FTI that has been built during the project.

**3.4.4. What synergies did the project have and with what outcomes?**

What synergies did the project have with other projects and initiatives? What outcomes has this produced?

The project had successful synergies with several other projects/initiatives, which are listed as following:

1. Initiative groups from the Osh region have helped to safer World’s project ‘Developing Cooperation and Partnership in Communities of the Kyrgyz Republic’, by producing a video report of a motivational meeting for youth.  
   The fact that Safer World invited the children to contribute to their project can be viewed as recognition of the quality of the children’s work in PV and advocacy. It also gave the initiative group participants an opportunity to further develop their PV skills.
2. FTI staff conducted training in video making for youth and women from new settlements around Bishkek in cooperation with UNFPA within a GPI project.   
   As a result of this training, a group of women (over 40 y.o.) made some quality films, which won prizes.
3. In Jalal-Abad Region, some initiative group participants cooperated with Peace Corps volunteers in producing a short film about gender equality.  
   A feedback session was held with local decision-makers, after which it was decided to hold a seminar/training session entitled ‘Mother and Daughter’. To date there is the idea for a similar session on ‘Father and Son’.

## 3.5. Relevance

(NB: limited scope)

**3.5.1. To what extent are the project objectives still valid?**

To what extent are the project objectives still valid for Kyrgyzstan, the partner organizations and the beneficiaries?

* The project objectives can still be considered to be valid for future similar projects in Kyrgyzstan.
* For the partner organizations and beneficiaries can be considered to be achieved as of now. Obviously, the initiative groups will need to keep working, and would be advised to consider some of the Recommendations/Lessons Learned from this evaluation, in order to become sustainable.

**3.5.2. Did the project remain relevant throughout its duration?**

* Yes. Very much so.

**3.5.3. For UN PBF the following sub-questions should be addressed:**

(**a) What was the relevance of the proposed “of change,” and did the assumptions identified during project design hold true?**

The ‘Theory of Change’ for the project is as follows:

Power “with”: By bringing together youth from different backgrounds and genders to co-produce short videos in a participatory manner, by having to democratically reach decisions together on the roles of each, and topics of the films, their understanding for the other will increase, they will be aware of and be more likely to understand and accept the diversity of perspectives within their group.

**Commentary**

The evaluation considers that this assumption can be considered to have ‘held true’ during the project, as having gone through the stages as set out above, they can be said to have understood and accepted the diversity of perspectives within their group, as has been analyzed in previous sections.

Power “within”: By being the decision makers in the whole production and social media dissemination strategies of the film, young girls and boys from all backgrounds will gain self- confidence, self-awareness and ability to work with others across ethnic, gender and social divides.

**Commentary**

The evaluation considers that young girls and boys from all backgrounds definitely gained self- confidence, self-awareness and the ability to work with others across ethnic, gender and social divides as a result of the filmmaking process. However, the Facebook group was administered by the FTI PR Head, although initiative group members could make posts and comment on posts. For this reason, the evaluation would consider that the social media activities of beneficiaries did not play a major role in achieving the objective in question.

Power “to”: By being aware of the possibilities for including youth voices in local, national and international, by developing capacities in social media advocacy and peacebuilding, young girls and boys from all backgrounds will realize that they can effect change.

**Commentary**

This evaluation would consider that this objective has been achieved as there were a number of cases when feedback sessions led to change at the local level. It should be noted, though that social media advocacy played a lesser role in achieving this than the other factors listed above.

**(b) Was the project relevant in terms of the broader peacebuilding strategy for the country, including, for example: national peacebuilding plans, UN strategic frameworks, and identified peacebuilding gaps?**

As far as this evaluation is aware, the project was relevant in terms of the broader peacebuilding strategy for the country, including, for example: national peacebuilding plans, UN strategic frameworks, and identified peacebuilding gaps

**(c) Was the project more or less relevant for different communities and groups? (For example: was the project more relevant to Kyrgyz boys than to females, or to ethnic minorities or school teachers?)**

The project appears to have been equally valid for boys and girls, all ethnic minorities and teachers.

**(d) How did the programme ensure its relevance by including key stakeholders in project design?**

The fact that FTI who had ‘on the ground’ knowledge of all issue related to the project helped to ensure that the project was as relevant as possible.

# 

# 4. Recommendations and Lessons learned

*Note by editor Paul Kosterink. Original text in this Appendix is by external evaluator Symon Lord, including GPPAC/FTI comments added in the boxes in italics.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***General feedback from the project staff to this chapter on Recommendations and Lessons Learned:***  *The majority of recommendations were discussed during the visit of the external evaluator to the Hague during which the project team has mentioned that some of them:*  *- contradict the nature of the project;*  *- are not executable in frames of a similar project due to the limited time frame or it is not clear how to operationalize them (the mechanism is not clear; if this activity is implemented, it is not clear what should be removed instead etc.)*  *- have been already implemented in this project;*  *- have already been discussed by the Project Steering Committee and were considered as not useful for implementation due to certain reasons - feasibility, irrelevance in the context of Kyrgyzstan etc.*  *This feedback has not been [yet] incorporated into the text of the recommendations. Thus, "ideal ideas" have not been distinguished from realistic ones based on the relevance of these ideas.*  *Below is a more detailed feedback of the project staff to each of the recommendations, including transcriptions of the recorded discussion with the project staff on October 8.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from External evaluator:*** *I would point out that the Recommendations and Lessons Learned set out below are not binding, and in the view of this Evaluator are all potentially of use and interest to UN PBF and the relevant stakeholders listed in the audience for each individual Recommendation.* |

**4.1 Terminology in project documents.**

* It is recommended to use the phrase ‘Citizen of Kyrgyzstan’ in project documentation rather than the phrase ‘Kyrgyzstani’, as the person being talked about may be of an ethnicity other than Kyrgyz.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *Кыргызстанец or Kyrgyzstani it is not about nationality, it is about citizenship like ‘American’. This term is acceptable and used by the majority of the population and officials in the country.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***I still think that the term ‘Citizen of Kyrgyzstan’ could be considered in a project in which ethnic identity is a big issue. Non-Kyrgyz nationalities might consider it to be more respectful and considerate to them. |

**4.2 Monitoring & Evaluation.**

**4.2.1 Comparison Groups.**

* Consider having the type of Comparison Groups of ‘Quasi-Experimental’ design that are you used in ‘Impact Evaluations in order to get an idea of the ‘Behavioural Change’ that the project has brought about. This evaluation identified the following Outcome Indicators that relate specifically to ‘Behavioural Change’ that could potentially be addressed by such a Comparison Group:

1. Outcome Indicator 1 a: Young Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different ethnic and social backgrounds demonstrate knowledge and appreciation (attitude) regarding concerns of “the other” despite their differences.
2. Outcome 1.c: Increased feeling of political inclusion from girls and boys from different ethnic and social backgrounds.
3. Outcome 2: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation within and among their communities and peers to improve their understanding and attitude towards the “other” and develop new insights on gender norms and issues.
4. Outcome Indicator 2a: Youth and communities from different gender, ethnic and social backgrounds demonstrate knowledge and appreciation (attitude) regarding concerns and interests of “the other” despite their differences.
5. Outcome Indicator 2 b: Youth peers and communities demonstrate intake of new insights regarding girls concerns and gender perspectives.
6. Outcome Indicator 2.c: Young Kyrgyzstani (disaggregated by gender, age, ethnicity and community) gain self-confidence and self-awareness to work together as actors of change in their communities.

* The Comparison Groups can be included in the project’s M&E plan and it’s questionnaire for them should be put together by project M&E staff, and should address all aspects of ‘Behavioural Change’ the project wishes to influence.
* It is suggested that one Comparison Group contains the following cross-section of people:
* Initiative group participants of all ethnicities and both genders in balance.
* Some peers of ethnicities at school and both genders in balance, some parents of initiative group members.
* Some teachers.
* Some neighbours of initiative group participants.
* If there was at least one Comparison Group in each project region, then this could also help to give an idea of any regional differences in ‘Behavioural Change’ brought about by the project.
* The assignment should ideally be implemented by a suitably qualified local consultant who is not involved in the project’s implementation and does not know interviewees personally. The local consultant would records answers at the beginning of the project and then asks the same questions to exactly the same people in each group at the end of the project. It is recommended that the individual implementing the survey asks interviewees to be very honest and to not feel obliged to give any particular answer.
* Evaluations of future projects can then assess the effectiveness of such comparison groups in establishing ‘Behavioural Change’, caused by the project, and any lessons learned can be used to inform future similar Comparison Groups in future projects.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *Creating a comparison group within the timeframe (18 months) of the project is not feasible. The projects are based on immediate response and are hence limited by PBF. This method would be more suitable for long-term projects. FTI and GPPAC did discuss using this methodology at the beginning of the project. However, representatives of the formal educational system did not welcome its implementation.*  *Additional Feedback GPPAC: the recommendation refers to external evaluator rather than to project staff or UN PBF - "The assignment should ideally be implemented by a suitably qualified local consultant who is not involved in the project’s implementation.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***The baseline study provided a lot of information that was useful for informing the project, however, was not geared to addressing project impact in a way that could be measured. This Evaluator still maintains that UN PBF may find it useful to consider the type of Comparison Groups outlined above, even as a pilot in order to get an idea of project impact according to specific indicators. It should be pointed out that comparison groups of this nature are a fairly common was of attempting to measure project impact. |

**4.3 Training.**

**4.3.1 Online ‘testing’ for initiative group participants.**

* It is recommended that future similar projects use ‘online learning’ to complement the formal tuition, mentoring and ‘learning on the job’ provided by the project under evaluation. ‘Online learning’ is increasingly common in the modern world, and so is a very good habit for the Initiative Group participants to develop.
* Online tests, for example with multiple-choice questions, could be designed for the project on the essential points of: Gender; Tolerance; Conflict analysis;Storyboarding, Scenario, Camera Work, Production, Editing.
* It should be underlined that the ‘online tests’ would be used to help and encourage the participants, not test them in an exam like environment. The tests should be designed in such a way that if a participant does not pass the first time, he/she can keep going until he/she does.
* The initiative group participants should be encouraged to support each other in preparation for these online ‘tests’, which would also facilitate team building and build self-confidence. WhatsApp could serve as a forum in which the issue of the ‘online tests’ are discussed.
* If some group participants have limited access to the Internet, then it can be seen as a responsibility of the whole group to ensure that that individual is helped to have access, and that everyone receives the support necessary.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *The testing of knowledge is not an objective. The online tests sound very similar to Kyrgyz formal education assessment tools. This might kill the spirit of the volunteers, their personal interests, and most importantly, the inspiration of the students. This is hence very risky recommendations. The youth work on this as a part of a process and it should never be linked to assessments and scores.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *The ‘testing’ of knowledge is not the objective of the Recommendation here. The objective of the Recommendation is to provide initiative group members with additional tools to help them consolidate their knowledge. The External Evaluator considers that the Recommendation is certainly worth discussion by the initiative groups and for inclusion in the design of future similar projects.* |

**4.3.2 Virtual trainings for project coordinators for FTI coordinators and management.**

* It is recommended that following the eight days of training in PV and ToTs, ‘virtual’ training sessions could be held for project management and regional coordinators with the same trainers that conducted the ‘in-person’ trainings in order to consolidate what has been learned and provide support as identified as necessary. Such ‘virtual’ trainings could be conducted for instance monthly, or bi-monthly as identified as necessary.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *This seemed unnecessary during the project as the project staff, including Clive who developed the PV methodology, were ready to provide any support. Moreover, such trainings would be bring with it large financial costs as the daily rates of official trainers providing such trainings are very high. Factoring in such trainings would be unnecessary and would be ineffective in terms of financial costs.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This Recommendation was actually suggested by* Lucy Nusseibeh, who was one of the PV trainers in the initial stages of the project, and this External Evaluator considers could potentially benefit similar future projects. As such, it is worth at least consideration by relevant project stakeholders. |

**4.3.3 Online training.**

* Future project planners might like to consider further ‘online’ courses, such as the sixteen online tutorials used to compliment the basic introductory training to editing, which are on Youtube. Such online lessons could be used, for example, on Scenario, Conflict, Gender, Tolerance, Camera work, Production.
* It could be possible for course planners/trainers to compliment these courses with comprehension questions.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***Online training in editing was not foreseen by the project plan, but was adopted by initiative group coordinators, and used to develop editing skills during the project. It can thus be considered a successful ‘Lesson Learned’ and included in future project design, not only for editing, but potentially other areas of learning relevant to the project. |

**4.3.4 Training in Internet search skills and joining Internet support groups on technical issues.**

* It is suggested that training is considered in Internet search skills, in particular in how to find answers to any issues related to technical questions online, for example through forums dedicated to particular subjects, such as camera operation and editing.
* In the modern world, the majority of problems that might arise in the process of making a PV can be resolved through online searches, so this skill would be particularly useful to the groups beyond the end of the project.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *Clarification is needed to whether this relates to the project findings. This recommendation makes it sound as if the students do not know how to search the internet. From our experience there were some active students who did this and more to improve their professional skills. However, in the frame of the project, we did not aim to have professional editing to avoid perfectionism. It would be detrimental to a process of PV.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *I am not sure that aiming to have as high a standard of editing as possible would not be detrimental to PV. This external Evaluator still maintains that some formal tuition on how to troubleshoot on editing issues online would be beneficial to the project. In particular, the initiative groups received some support from experienced editor during the projects, but guidance on how to resolve editing issues without this kind of help would not go amiss.* |

**4.3.5 Training in fundraising.**

* Project designers might like to consider training on fundraising to be included in the curriculum of similar future projects. Fundraising skills could include, for example how to approach potential donors and how to raise funds online.
* Funds acquired could be used for instance to fund ‘master classes’ on subjects of interest to the group’s development, or any necessary operational costs.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:***  *Fundraising trainings have indeed not been a part of the training given to the students. However, coordinators would advise students on fundraising trainings and courses they could join. One mass fundraising training would be hard to organise. Moreover, when it comes to fundraising itself there are many aspects of it that need to be figured out. Who would own the fundraised money? The school administration, teachers, students will claim rights for those funds. At the same time, it is impossible for the pupils to create organizations which would have any kind of legal status. Also, school would not be able to create a fund for the project as they would be checked by legal and tax bodies. All in all, fundraising is a big risk and hence it did not become a part of the project and is not recommended for future similar projects.*  *Furthermore, the recommendation for students to fundraise would not be feasible due to the short time frame of this project or a similar project.*  *This could be an idea for a different project, long-term project. It would comprise of two parts: 1) Capacity building with a focus on methodology;*  *2) Fundraising, realisation of initiatives and sustainability (3-4 years)*  *FTI did it in a different project with a duration of 4 years (f.e. during the forum-theater project).* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***  *These are all valid points. However, this External Evaluator maintains that it would be useful for the initiative groups to discuss all the above, particularly in view of the fact that from October of 2019, they have been operating without the support of the project. Useful activities such as future regional exchange conferences would need to be funded. It should be clear by now if further funds would be necessary for their sustainability, and if so, research and means of handling the funds would need to be conducted. Some training in fundraising, and discussions with individuals involved in fundraising could obviously be helpful here. If it was decided that the initiative groups would not need further funds, then this could mean the end of the issue. However, any consulting from outside sources could clearly be of help here.* |

**4.3.6 PV training handbook in Russian.**

* It is recommended that a ‘user-friendly’ handbook on PV is provided to all course participants, which could include comprehension questions. It is suggested that participants are encouraged to actively use the manual, and discuss contents with fellow members of the group.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *Such a handbook already exists and was used during the project.*  *Additionally, the project team prepared a publication “Participatory Video in Peacebuilding: Lessons Learnt from Occupied Palestinian Territories and Kyrgyzstan” whih is available in English and Russian languages and is distributed, among other, in schools participating in the project.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *It is still recommended to have a comprehension section in these types of books to highlight the main points, and could be gone through by the initiative group members, together with the coordinators. “Participatory Video in Peacebuilding: Lessons Learnt from Occupied Palestinian Territories and Kyrgyzstan” was completed at the end of the project. I am glad to hear it is distributed to the project schools.* |

Not at the time of evaluation. Can be set out and formalized in future project documentation.

**4.4 Development of initiative groups over Summer break.**

* It is strongly recommended that initiative groups are given a task to complete over the Summer break during the first year of the project. The task could be, for example, to write an essay on a theme that would help them to maintain and even to expand on what they have learned to date. Themes for an essays could be, for example:
* What have you learned on the project?
* How have you changed as a result of the project?
* How should the group develop in the future?
* Some of the best essays could later be shared on the project’s social media.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *The question of the tasks for the summer break during the first year was discussed and thought through. It was decided to give children the following task: to this about the ideas of the topics which they would like to raise in their communities and to work on storyboards which they used upon returning back to school.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *Good. However, This was not stated outright in the project plan, so can be viewed as a Lesson Learned. Tasks such as the ones recommended above can also be considered.* |

**4.5 Regional exchange conferences.**

* It is suggested that the regional exchange conferences, in which all four initiative groups take part consider including the following activities:
* Presentations and or/interaction discussion groups on lessons learned/best practices, for instance on technical issues, feedback sessions and ‘Behavioural Change’.
* Networking and creation of a regional WhatsApp group.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *Such exchange visits have been organized on the level of the region for all the project participants and for girls only. Additionally, during the trainings on the level of the region project participants presented and discussed their movies as at feedback sessions; discussed lessons learned. After such meetings, WhatsApp groups were created for children to interact with their peers from other schools.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *I was not aware that Lessons Learned were also discussed at the regional exchange conferences. If so, then this can be considered a Lesson Learned and included in future plans for regional exchange conferences.* |

**4.6 Feedback sessions.**

**4.6.1 Feedback sessions with decision-makers for ‘Awareness Raising’ and effecting concrete change at the local level.**

It is recommended that future similar project distinguish between two types of feedback sessions with decision-makers. These are:

1. Feedback sessions ‘Awareness Raising’ on a specific issue of local concern.

* This would mean that the feedback session with decision-makers was geared to discussing the issues raised by the PV in order to raise awareness on the issue. This could be the case with themes such as migration to Russia and its impact on children, or girls access to higher education, which are very broad in scope, and as such, are not really themes that are possible to ‘solve’.

1. Effecting change on a concrete issue at the local level.

* This would mean that a problem is identified at the local level for which a solution is possible if the right kind of support from authorities is forthcoming. Issues of this nature could be, for instance, lack of lighting, a dangerous road or pollution of a local area of land or water.
* It is recommended that this type of activity is described as being change on a local *issue* rather than *policy,* which is much broader.
* It is recommended that initiative groups in future project make films for both of the above two categories.
* In the case of effecting change at the local level, initiative groups should be prepared to take concrete action in following up that agreed action is taken, or even be prepared to take an active role in ensuring that the desired change happens.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff during the meeting in the Hague:*** *Making a distinction more explicit and raising awareness among participants of such a distinction is a relevant recommendation. However, instead of recommending children that they make films for both of the above two categories, the project staff suggests that it is important to allow children to choose for themselves what they want and consider more relevant - raising awareness or changing concrete issue or both.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This External Evaluator still maintains that for similar future projects and for the current initiative groups, the above distinction is made clear and that initiative groups do both. This will help them to understand and put into practice the issues of ‘raising awareness on social issues’ and of ‘advocating for change’, both of which are important and useful skills.* *It should also be noted that initiative group members and regional project coordinators expressed an interest in the above Recommendations.* |

**4.6.2 Money in the project budget for activities to effect change at the local level.**

* It is strongly recommended that in future similar projects, a budget entry to help fund actions to effect change at the local level is considered.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:***  *The logic behind the project is different. The objective is to amplify the voices of the students. If money would be put aside from the start of the project, the students would participate knowing already that these issues will be solved with the money they will get. The point instead is for the students to bring forward the issues that concern them and then lobby for their solution and for funding. There already exist many projects that work with small grants, and this could be much easier solution than the approach of the “Cameras in Hands” project which works with children without giving them money. The uniqueness and added value of this particular project stems from the fact that money is not necessary to raise awareness on these issues and provide solutions. The project shows young people such a possibility.*  *This recommendation contains a risk for changing the main objective of the project, which is the process and peacebuilding. In such a relatively short project the main focus should remain on the PV process.*  *This recommendation is not relevant as it is not in line with the project’s theory of change, outcomes and ideas. This recommendation breaks the project approaches. The project goals were not to solve issues. If the goal was solving issues then the students would simply be given the money and asked to solve these issues.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This External Evaluator still considers that this Recommendation is worth considering by all project stakeholders as the tow tasks outlined above are both valid skills, and extremely useful for the initiative group members to acquire.* |

**4.6.3 Reporting and follow up on feedback sessions.**

* It is strongly recommended that the project management in each project region maintain a matrix to record all of the feedback sessions in the project in their region. It is recommended that for each feedback session, the matrix includes the following sections: Date.
  + - * Theme of discussion.
      * Film shown.
      * Summary of what was discussed.
      * What action it was decided to take, and who is responsible for which action.
      * Who and when there should be follow up.
      * What was the outcome.
* The matrix should be maintained by the project management in each region, and shared with FTI and GPPAC management for incorporation into M&E reports.
* Such a matrix should help to maximize the impact of the feedbacks sessions, and thus the general Impact of the project. Initiative group participants should feel that they are not only included in political processes, but helping to effect concrete change.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *The recommendation was supported by project staff.* |

**4.6.4 Tv broadcast of videos and feedback discussion.**

* It is suggested an adapted version of feedback sessions from the project in each region could be broadcast on tv at either the local, regional or even national level. Such a broadcast may be best geared towards ‘Awareness Raising’, but, although more ambitious, effecting some kind of concrete change is not to be ruled out.
* Such a broadcast would be an excellent chance for initiative group members to get television experience, and even to effect a broader change than would be possible at a usual feedback session with decision-makers.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *This has been already implemented within this project: children presented their movies during two TV-shows broadcasted on National Television in October 2019.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *It is good that this happened towards the end of the project, however, it was not envisaged in project plans. This External Evaluator would certainly encourage it to be included in the plans of similar future projects. Broadcast of work on regional tv shows could also be a project target.* |

**4.7 Gender themes for a male audience.**

* It is recommended that future projects might like to conduct feedback sessions on gender for a male audience. The audience could consist of boys from the school of the initiative, men from the wide community, decision-makers and teachers.
* Some gender thinkers consider that, for example, on the issue of SGBV, more counseling work should be done with the male abuser, rather than the female victim in order for lasting change to take place. The rationale for a feedback session of this nature would be ‘Awareness Raising’ about gender issues, which ideally would also lead to some kind of ‘Behavioural Change’ amongst the male audience.
* Obviously, such a gathering would require careful planning, and could be regarded as experimental initially. Lessons could be learned from a first such session, which could then be used to replicate other such feedback session elsewhere.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *Girls often do not feel comfortable discussing these issues in front of a male audience, we organized sessions for only girls in order to give them space to discuss gender issues. The idea of feedback sessions for boys only was discussed during the Project Steering Committee Meeting and was found not relevant because while girls may feel more comfortable to discuss gender issues among girls only, for boys it does not matter whether they are among boys only or with girls as well. Common feedback sessions / regional exchanges for both girls and boys were conducted within the project.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This External Evaluator noticed that initiative group members were enthusiastic about this Recommendation during data collection, and is still worth discussion by the current initiative groups, and piloting in similar future projects.* |

Point taken, but I still think it is possible to consider as a pilot activity in future similar projects.

**4.8 National feedback session.**

* It is recommended that FTI might like to consider identifying a specific area of national policy to contribute to, for instance part of youth policy, gender policy, migration policy, or education policy.
* Suitable PVs produced by the initiative groups could then be chosen for showing to the national decision-maker audience, and the agenda discussed could also be prepared with a view to proposing a specific area of policy to change.
* The decision of what to attempt to change would be based on study of the relevant national policy document.
* For a change in policy to occur, it is likely that a suitable ‘follow up’ strategy is planned and implemented.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *There were specific changes coming out from the national feedback session: for example, the changes in the human resources of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in order to improve the quality of working with youth. This change has been aimed for and followed-up.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This External Evaluator still maintains that the approach to effecting policy change at the national level recommended above can be considered for similar future projects. Obviously effecting change at the national level is very different from effecting change on specific issues at the local level. If applied, it would also be very educational for all initiative group participants involved.* |

**4.9 International feedback session.**

**4.9.1 Articles about the international trip.**

* It is strongly suggested that all participants on the international trip write an article about their experience with an emphasis on lessons they learned that could be of benefit to other project participants.
* The articles can be submitted for checking by project management, and then shared on the project’s Facebook page, so that other project participants can benefit from the experience of those who went on the international trip.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback provided by GPPAC staff during the meeting in the Hague:*** *The children have provided feedback which was published in the social media; moreover, the experience and lessons learned during the international feedback session has been shared during the national closing event and in the communities of the participants.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This External Evaluation still recommends that articles in the way recommended above completed by trip participants can be included in future similar project plans.* |

**4.9.2 A film about the international trip.**

* Future similar projects might like to consider making a short film about international trip with an emphasis on highlighting lessons.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *This has been already implemented to the extent which was possible: children have filmed the feedback of the international decision-makers during the trip in order to bring it back to their communities.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***Point taken. However, this External Evaluator would recommend that a short film with a clear scenario could be made about the international trip that can then be shared on social media. |

**4.10 Sustainability.**

**4.10.1 Initiative group ‘Alumni’.**

* It is strongly suggested that initiative group participants who leave their school, maintain their contact with the groups, and as such effectively become ‘Alumni’ for their group. ‘Alumni’ of the groups can assist the teachers in helping to develop the capacity of the new participants, and provide help as appropriate with developing the PVs, organizing feedback sessions, and any other tasks.
* The fact that the ‘Alumni’ are already part of the WhatsApp group for the project should make this role for ‘Alumni’ easier.
* It is recommended that this role for initiative group ‘Alumni’ is presented as a desired responsibility in future the project plan for future similar projects.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *This recommendation is already being implemented. Former participants stay connected via WhatsApp and in most cases are actively and gladly supporting the current PV work. There is also experience with this through other projects. Moreover, former participants are often invited to other projects as well and help organise activities.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *Glad to hear it. This External Evaluator suggested this idea to initiative group participants and regional project coordinators during data collection, and noticed that it was well received. It is still strongly recommended that ‘Alumni’ do play the role described above, in the current initiative groups, and that the idea is included in similar future project plans.* |

**4.10.2 Extra groups at schools.**

* Schools hosting initiative groups might like to consider creating additional initiative groups, which can be mentored by the existing groups, as happened recently at a project school in Osh. It is possible that a teacher from an established group could join the new group and new teachers join both groups.
* It might be worthwhile for FTI, GPPAC and UN PBF to study the success of this new initiative group in Osh in order to learn lessons to inform future similar projects. The ‘Alumni’ form the previous section may be able to help with the development of potential new groups.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *This recommendation is ought to be clarified. What would the goal be of creating an alternative group? If is is about recruiting new members - this is already an ongoing process and has already been taken into account. Most of the youth group already have new group members by the end of the project.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This Recommendation is suggested as it has already been implemented in one project school, and could give the chance to other school children to benefit from the project.* |

**4.10.3 Social media page for Initiative groups.**

* It is strongly recommended that each initiative group develops and maintains their own pages on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram in addition to being part of the main project Facebook page.
* It would be necessary for each group to have an Admin, clear rules for operation and a strategy. Initiative groups would obviously join, as would alumni, in addition to friends, peers, family members and acquaintances who would then comprise the audience/community.
* Postings in such a group could include postings on:
  + - * Activities and plans.
      * Lessons learned.
      * PVs and other videos, such as those about feedback sessions, including discussions about the issues they raise.
* Such social media groups would no doubt also help the initiative groups to find potential partners and or/funders.
* It is suggested that the FTI head of communications for the project may be able to help here.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback of the project staff:***  *Children have a possibility to communicate with each other every day anyways and the project staff is not sure whether such social media groups will be maintained, especially taking into account that maintaining a social media page requires a lot of time and effort. Students study at least 6-7 hours a day and do a lot of other tasks. In the second half of the project the students were overloaded with different tasks, from school work to project tasks, and more.*  *This recommendation might be more suitable if put forward to the school rather than FTI or GPPAC or UN PBF. The school can then decide if they would want to run such social media pages and have time for this.*  *There are risks attached to having the children being in charge of their own social media, a lot of thought has to be put into which of the children will be in charge of the pages.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This External Evaluator still maintains that the Recommendation set out above is worth implementing. Maintaining a social media page would not maintain a huge amount of effort, would develop useful skills for initiative group participants, and be empowering for them. It should also be pointed out that initiative group participants and regional project coordinators were very enthusiastic about the idea when discussed during data collection.* |

**4.10.4 Sessions with media and development sector audience.**

* It is recommended that the initiative groups consider conducting feedback sessions similar to those with decision-makers with local media and development/humanitarian sector representatives.
* The objectives of the film could be to get feedback on the films in addition to conducting discussions on the films, possibly leading to some kind of local action, but also networking.
* Contacts made at such feedback sessions could lead on to be sources of orders or technical support, for instance in the form of ‘master classes’, or mentoring on issues such as camera work or editing. Contacts from such feedback sessions could also potentially help with broadcast.
* Alumni should be able to help with the organization of this type of feedback session, and it is suggested that the current initiative groups conduct such feedback sessions using their already made PVs.
* This exercise could also be seen as being a useful form of capacity building for initiative group members.
* It is advised that such feedback sessions be written into plans of similar future projects.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF. Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback of the project staff:*** *Even organising feedback sessions for discussion of each of the 2 movies in each community can be very difficult and very time-consuming task, and organising another one will likely not fit in the time frame of the project. Moreover, organising an extra feedback session will be difficult to implement as students first of all have to attend school and their time after lessons is not unlimited*. |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *It isn’t clear why it would be so difficult to organize the sessions described above. The initiative groups already have the expertize to organize similar events, and in the small communities in which the initiative groups operate media and development people would know each other. It should also be noted that during data collection for this evaluation, initiative group members and regional coordinators were very enthusiastic about the idea.* |

**4.10.5 Local authority orders for PVs.**

* It is suggested that initiative groups might like to consider direct cooperation with local decision-makers on making PVs on themes of local importance, such as road safety, a specific environmental problem, or domestic violence.
* If an initiative group decided to make this decision, then the local authorities may well be prepared to assist with any necessary financial cost.

Audience: Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:***  *Both the positive and negative aspects of having some type of income generating activities were discussed. The negative aspects prevailed, namely:*   * *This suggestion contradicts the very idea and the nature of the project and the PV methodology in course of which the members of participating groups should come up with the ideas of topics themselves without influence from outside (thus, during the MTR it was stressed that the adults did not have any influence on the choice of the topics, due attention was paid to this aspect);* * *Local authorities continue to support the project, but if orders are made by them it is very likely that schools will not agree to follow this through.*   *Plus see feedback to the recommendation about fundraising training.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***It should be noted that this recommendation actually came from regional coordinators. This External Evaluator still maintains that the Recommendation is worth considering as a pilot in similar future projects, and for use by the current initiative groups. |

**4.10.6 Filming in private sector for funds**.

* It is suggested that the initiative groups consider using their filming skills in the private sector for raising any necessary funds. This could be done, for instance, by filming private events, such as parties or weddings on a much lower budget than would be possible by a professional camera operator.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:***  *Similar to the previous recommendations, the negative aspects prevail. Also if students attract financial support, it needs to be discussed with the schools first, however, they will most likely not support the idea.*  *Moreover, with this, as well as the previous recommendation, it is likely that straints will be put on the behavioral changes and the peacebuilding effects of the project. The PV methodology focuses on the process rather than the end product (the videos). Both recommendations risk undermining the nature of the project. The cameras are in the hands of children, it is the project participants, not the local authorities or the private sector ordering their services for making videos.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***  *During data collection, two girls from one initiative groups reported doing just this, and when the suggestion was discussed with other initiative groups, the response to it was positive. The External Evaluator certainly considers that the Recommendation is worth considering by the current initiative groups as a means of fundraising.* |

**4.10.7 Lessons in budgeting.**

* The initiative groups might like to consider getting lessons in budgeting in order to know how to handle any finances they receive. It would be necessary to appoint someone, most likely one of the teachers in the group as treasurer with someone else, maybe school management as oversight.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *In addition to the above mentioned, the Ministry of Education and the school administrations are currently experiencing a crisis. Different fundraising activities (including charity activities) are currently being investigated for corruption.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *Point taken, but this External Evaluator still thinks that this Recommendation should not be considered in combination with the Recommendations on fundraising for inclusion in future projects and by the current initiative groups.* |

**4.11 Similar projects in other Central Asian countries.**

* It is recommended that if similar projects are to be conducted in other Central Asian countries, then it may be advisable to emphasize the acquiring by Youth of life skills that can contribute to a country’s development and the positive role that beneficiaries play in government service in project documentation and communications materials. Kyrgyzstan is relatively speaking the most democratic country in Central Asia, and NGOs are able to operate there relatively freely. This less the case in all other Central Asian countries, where the activities of civil society organizations can be viewed with suspicion.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *This recommendation might be checked with the representatives of the other Central Asian countries. It is not clear whether the above mentioned audience is the most appropriate one for the presented recommendation.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***The ToRs did mention that one of the objectives of the evaluation is to learn lessons that could be used in similar projects in the Central Asia region, so I think this is worth a mention, and may well be of interest to UN PBF and GPPAC for future programming in the region. |

**4.12 Versions of the participatory videos in English and other languages.**

* It is strongly recommended that versions of the participatory videos are made in English that then have the possibility to be shared on international participatory video sites. If a group has a version of it’s PV available in English, this could also potentially help to attract the attention of English language donors.
* It is suggested that initiative groups consider the possibility of producing versions of their films in languages other than Russian and Kyrgyz, but in other languages, particularly of ethnic groups of the region, such as Uzbek and Tajik.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback provided by GPPAC staff during the meeting in the Hague:***  *The suggestion has been implemented within the project. All the videos which were considered relevant for the international audience were translated into English, the subtitles were added, and they were spread via the international communications channels. In the local context, wherever relevant and possible, movies also had subtitles in relevant languages.*  *Also, it is worth taking into account that the capacities of both project staff and project participants were overstretched, and in this situation, translating those movies which were not considered relevant for certain audiences will not be helpful.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:*** *This External Evaluator would still recommend that for future similar future projects and for the current initiative groups, versions of the PVs in Kyrgyz, Russian, English, Tajik and Uzbek be made as standard practice. This approach would show respect to all ethnicities in the project post-conflict communities, and make them as accessible as possible. It should also be pointed out that the videos are very short, and to make versions of them in different languages is not complicated. It would also develop a useful editing skill for initiative group participants.* |

**4.13 Join international websites on PV**.

* It is suggested that the initiative groups consider joining international websites on PV, as this would be a way of exposing their work to an international audience and receive feedback.
* Could help with networking, eg fundraising.

Audience: GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, Initiative groups.

|  |
| --- |
| ***Feedback from the project staff:*** *There is language issue when it comes to joining such international websites as the majority of students do not speak English.* |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Response from evaluator:***  *This is true on the whole, however, some initiative group members are studying English, and at least one of the regional coordinators knows fluent English. With sufficient preparation, I am confident that the initiative groups would be able to enter their work into international PV websites. The quality of their PV work is good enough, and would give them access to an international audience. I certainly consider that at a minimum, this Recommendation should be discussed by the existing initiative groups, and considered for future similar projects.* |
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## Annex I - Terms of Reference for final evaluation of UN PBF project ‘Cameras in Hand’

***“Cameras in Hand: Transformation and Empowerment of Kyrgyzstani Girls and Boys”***

*Deadline for responding to this Tender: Sunday 26 May 2019 (CET 23:59)*

|  |
| --- |
| **Background**  This project focuses on empowering Kyrgyzstani youth from different ethnic, gender and social backgrounds in the regions of Osh, Jalal-Abad, Chui and Batken to have a voice heard in local, national and international policy levels and to act as agents of change within their communities to foster understanding about the ‘other’ and bring new insights to gender roles, norms and issues. To reach these objectives and results, the participatory video (PV) methodology is the foundation of the project.  The project is coordinated by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), a network of conflict prevention CSOs. The implementing partner is GPPAC’s Regional Secretariat for Central Asia, Foundation for Tolerance International (FTI). The other partners in the project are the Middle East Nonviolence and Democracy (MEND), the member of GPPAC from Palestine (MENA region), and Real-Time, the originator of the participatory video methodology.  The project has two main objectives:   * Outcome 1: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to formulate common messages to decision makers in their local constituencies, on the national level and international level, in order to make their vision of a peaceful future heard in policy making decisions. * Outcome 2: Kyrgyzstani girls and boys from different backgrounds are empowered to create spaces for dialogue and reconciliation within and among their communities and peers to improve their understanding and attitude towards the “other” and develop new insights on gender norms and issues.   The following activities have been conducted and are still planned in the project:   * Selection of 16 schools and children-participants (128; 8 in each school, 14 – 17 y.o.). * Training of trainers in participatory video (PV) methodology by MEND and Real Time. * Conflict analysis trainings for children and teachers (128 children, 32 teachers). * Training sessions in PV for 32 teachers and 128 children. * Baseline survey. * The professional video equipment has been purchased and donated to schools. * In all 16 target schools, participants prepared movie ideas and scripts. * Local implementing staff of FTI underwent a 2-day training session on video editing. All 128 pupil participants and 32 teachers received a similar mini-training. * The best movie ideas were chosen in each of the groups of participants in an inclusive and democratic way. Altogether, 32 short movies about the major social problems important for youth have been filmed and shown to the local communities during the feedback sessions. * Experience exchange meetings between the children from different schools. * The internal mid-term review of the project was conducted in October 2018. It included visits to schools and informal discussions with teachers, pupils, and staff about the project, its sustainability, and communal impact. * Two movies have been selected for the feedback sessions on the national level with the high-level government officials which are planned for the end of May 2019. * The international advocacy visit of Kyrgyzstani youth to the Netherlands and to Belgium is planned for June 2019. Altogether, 8 movies out of 32 have been selected to be shown on the international level. 8 children (15 to 17 years of age) involved in creation of these movies will take part in the international advocacy visit. * The participating children have undergone the training in the media literacy and social media campaigning. The movies are promoted online both nationally and internationally. * A short publication capturing the experience with the PV methodology and the final movie are planned by the end of the project. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Purposes**  The accountability purpose of the evaluation is:   1. *to assess how relevant the project was, towards the direct stakeholders of the project*; 2. *to assess the logframe matrix, whether activities contributed to the achievement of results and project goals and what the overall impact of the project was*.   The learning purpose of the evaluation is:   1. *to harvest the outcomes of the project, in order to use for learning from the project and follow-up* 2. *to assess which elements of the project were most successful towards conflict prevention, and which critical factors, or criteria can be formulated at the general level, possibly applicable to the whole Central Asian region.*   The evaluation makes recommendations on whether the project should be continued, and what are the potentially most promising directions for continuation or follow-up of the project. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Objectives**  The evaluation is a final evaluation, required by the donor (UN PBF) to be executed towards the end of the project. The evaluation is commissioned and coordinated by the project coordinators GPPAC and FTI. It should take place during the last months of the project, May-June 2019, once all main activities have taken place. There will be a national closing event as a final project activity - that is most likely to take place in the end of June 2019 - that should be utilised as one of the field study visits in the final evaluation.  The evaluation and its recommendations will be a useful tool of information for the project partners and the direct stakeholders of the project. The evaluation will inform the UN PBF to what extent the project goals have been achieved, as well as provide directions for future support in the conflict prevention and peacebuilding field in Kyrgyzstan and possibly beyond.  The evaluation’s first goal is to document project achievements towards the initial project proposal and the project activities, the occurrence of the expected results and impact and their progress towards sustainability. The other goal of the evaluation is to document the lessons learned from the project, as well as recommendations that can be used by project partners and direct stakeholders for strategic directions for Kyrgyzstan, possibly for Central Asia and/or even beyond. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Subject and focus (scope)**  The subject of the evaluation is the project *“Cameras in Hand: Transformation and Empowerment of Kyrgyzstani Girls and Boys”*, financially supported by UN PBF.  The evaluator will review and summarise the available evidence of the quality, accountability and impact of the project activities. The evaluation will consist of both desk and field study and will take place in May - June 2019 and final reporting including commenting is done before the end of the project (31 July 2019). The Kyrgyz school system ends in May. The final event of the Project is scheduled for the end of June 2019 or beginning of July 2019. The Project ends on 31 July 2019. The evaluation report itself has to be finalised during July 2019.  Concerning the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria the following focus and limitations are foreseen:   * **‘Relevance’** will not be the focus of the evaluation. The reasoning here is that the Project partners have sufficient information from the mid-term review and on-going monitoring that the project was relevant. Therefore, there is no need to analyse this further in detail. The findings on relevance from the mid-term review and on-going monitoring will be included in the final evaluation report. Additionally, the relevance could be addressed and to some extent assessed further through interviews with relevant stakeholders for the other prioritised evaluation criteria below so it explains why the project remains relevant. * **‘Effectiveness’** The evaluation will assess whether the project objectives have been achieved, and how and to what extent they have contributed to conflict prevention and the empowerment of Kyrgyzstani girls and boys (as further specified in the two project objectives). * **‘Efficiency’** will not be the focus of the evaluation. It will only have to be addressed in a more general manner, by analysing the project’s overall results in relation to the overall expenses and main budget lines. One possible angle is to include a reflection on possible spill-over effects, such as links to other projects and programmes of involved stakeholders, and follow-up at the community levels. * **‘Impact’** will be the focus of the evaluation. It will be addressed at the project level, through analysing the project’s achievements and comparing these against broader peacebuilding needs and priorities in the country. * **‘Sustainability**’ The evaluation will provide information to what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after the project has ended and by whom. The evaluation will provide information for the project partners and the direct stakeholders of the project, the involved national actors, and civil society which approaches prove to be (most) successful, as well as strategic directions for the near future, such as recommendations for follow-up. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Main evaluation questions**  In case project partners and UNPBSO agree with the scope of the evaluation, then we will specify the evaluation questions further. Provisionally, the main evaluation questions are formulated as following, under each of the five OECD/DAC criteria :  Relevance: (NB: limited scope)   * To what extent are the project objectives still valid for Kyrgyzstan, the partner organizations and the beneficiaries? * Did the project remain relevant throughout its duration? * For UN PBF the following sub-questions should be addressed:   + (a) What was the relevance of the proposed “theory of change,” and did the assumptions identified during project design hold true?   + (b) Was the project relevant in terms of the broader peacebuilding strategy for the country, including, for example: national peacebuilding plans, UN strategic frameworks, and identified peacebuilding gaps?   + (c) Was the project more or less relevant for different communities and groups? (For example: was the project more relevant to Kyrgyz boys than to females?)   + (d) How did the programme ensure its relevance by including key stakeholders in project design?   Effectiveness: (NB: 4-6 evaluation questions)   * To what extent has the project achieved its expected results (both at the outputs and outcomes levels)? (reference is made to the project document) * What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the expected results? (Also consider any which were possibly beyond the control of the project) * In which regions/communities the results were the most effective and which lessons learned can be drawn from that for the future? * One specific evaluation question addressing the youth and gender objectives (to be developed)   Efficiency: (NB: limited scope)   * Have the budget funds been used efficiently? This can be analysed for the overall project expenses and at the budget ‘levels’ of 5,000 to 36,000 USD; so for the main budget items as project staff, involved project partners, hired experts, purchase of equipment and the main project events. Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why? More broadly, a reflection should be included to what extent the project provided “value for money?”. * Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why? How effective was the project in terms of enhancing the partners’ work? * Were there any possible spillover effects and/or synergies with other initiatives. Sub-questions can be: (a) were there spillover effects to other projects and programmes of involved stakeholders, and/or follow-up at the community levels? (b) To what extent did the project actively coordinate and leverage potential synergies with other initiatives in the region?   Impact: (NB: 5-7 evaluation questions)   * How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from the project (immediate impact)? * What exactly has already changed in the lives of girls and boys (immediate impact)? Or: which impact did the project have on the participating children and schools?  (NB: include an evaluation question for the children’s parents as well? - to be decided still) * Which positive and/or negative effects/impact in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? * Which positive and/or negative effects/impact did the project have on the participating communities? * Which positive and/or negative effects/impact did the project have on the local and national policies? How were project results connected towards the larger peacebuilding priorities of Kyrgyzstan?   Sustainability: (NB: 5-7 evaluation questions)   * In general, what were the measures taken to ensure the sustainability of the project? * To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the end of the project? * What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project? * If applicable, what needs to be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability? * Did the project enhance the support mechanisms of partners? * Did the project build local capacity in participatory video and more broadly in youth empowerment and conflict prevention? * To what extent can the project be considered “catalytic,” either in galvanizing further financial investments from outside parties, or encouraging subsequent processes after the end of the project? * What are the lessons learned from this project that can be taken into account for similar projects in Kyrgyzstan, and possibly for similar projects in other Central Asian countries or even outside the Central Asian region? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation approach and methods**  The evaluation will begin with an inception phase of reviewing documents provided by GPPAC and FTI (desk study) and a subsequent inception report, including the formulation of the exact evaluation questions and a feasible activity plan and budget to achieve the objectives of the final evaluation. This is followed by a period of research, including field study and the preparation of a draft report. The final report will consider remarks to the draft report.  A combination of primary data collection and secondary data review is expected during the evaluation. Primary data shall be collected through a variety of methods, including field observations, key stakeholder interviews (staff of GPPAC, the implementing partner FTI and the other partners in the project, project participants and the other direct beneficiaries) and focus group discussions. A baseline survey was held among pupils that should be part of the final evaluation analysis. Secondary data shall be collected from statistics and other relevant data at various levels of aggregation.  The guidance for the evaluation is specified in [to be confirmed; possibly the [ADA guidelines](https://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada/evaluation/) could be used]. The OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards are to be applied and compliance needs to be comprehensible in the evaluation. The OECD/DAC document is downloadable here: [[link](http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/dcdndep/44798177.pdf)].  The main documents available from the project are mostly in English and Russian languages, some are also in Kyrgyz language. The underlying reports of the main documents, such as events reports, local progress reports and survey results are all in Kyrgyz and/or Russian. Evaluation reports are to be written in English.  The indicative number of working days foreseen is 15. The following indicative division of work days for the respective steps/tasks of the final evaluation are foreseen:   * 0,5 days briefing * 2 days document review * 1 day inception report * 1 day mission preparation * 5 days research, including 2-4 field trips: Bishkek and probably 2-3 (all?) of the 4 localities of the project (one of these site meetings will be during and around the final closing events of the project expected to be in June-July 2019) * 3 days report drafting * 2 days report finalization * 0,5 days debriefing   Costs for international and local travel, accommodation and per diems, as well as possible translation services have to be covered by the evaluator and should therefore be included in the evaluator’s offer. There is a total maximum available budget for the sub-contracted evaluator of 15,000 USD. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Timetable**   * Tendering and offers: May   Tenderers provide an offer with an outline of the proposed evaluation methodology (max. 3 pages), CV(s) of expert(s) proposed for the assignment, statement on availability of the proposed expert(s) during the planned evaluation period, information on fee rate in USD, calculation of number of work days, as well as information on travel costs.   * Briefing in Bishkek:   Half-day meeting with FTI and GPPAC (NB: GPPAC may have to join online): May-June.   * Document review (desk study):   Project proposal, narrative reports, baseline survey, activity reports, training materials, project publications, OECD/DAC Guidelines for Evaluation, Guidance for evaluations.   * Inception report:   The evaluator will produce an inception report which will be shared with GPPAC and FTI before starting the research. The format for the report will be provided by the time of the start of the evaluation.   * Field study:   The evaluator(s) will undertake field missions in June to the most relevant project sites.   * Report drafting:   The evaluator will draft a report in English, which should contain at most 20 pages without annexes. The draft report will be provided within 10 days after the last field study (potentially, at closing event) and before 15 July 2019. Comments will be provided by GPPAC and FTI by 31 July.   * Report finalization:   The evaluator will finalize the report according to the comments received by GPPAC and FTI. The final version should not require any additional editing. The final report has to be ready by 15 August 2019.   * Debriefing in Bishkek or The Hague or an online meeting:   Half-day meeting with GPPAC, FTI, UN PBF, possibly other project partners. August/September 2019. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation team**  *NB: Usually this type of final evaluation that is rather small in size and scope will be done by 1 evaluator, possibly seconded by a 2nd ‘junior’ evaluator.*  Criteria for the evaluator(s):   * Preferably from Central Asia. * Experience in development cooperation field, specifically in conflict prevention and peacebuilding field; and/or in community development related to youth and gender. * Fluency in Russian, Kyrgyz, and English. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reports**  The evaluator will produce three reports (inception report, draft report, final report). The reports will be in English and between 15 and 20 pages in length (excluding annexes). The guidance for the report is here: [link to be provided].  The draft evaluation report and final report need to be structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions. The quality of the reports will be assessed according to the evaluation quality criteria of the OECD/DAC:   * Were the terms of reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report? * Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear summary? * Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions? * Are cross-cutting issues (e.g. poverty, gender, environment) indicated in the report separately? * Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (the project’s logframe)? * Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings clearly stated in the report, and are they derivable from the latter? * Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt? * Is it comprehensible how the evaluator has achieved their findings? * Are the recommendations and lessons learnt realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to? * Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report? * Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted? * Were the most important documents taken into consideration, and is the content of the latter reflected in the report? * Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form? * Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations? * Can the report be distributed in the delivered form? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Coordination/Responsibility**  The evaluator should work in close cooperation with GPPAC and FTI during the preparatory and implementation phase.  GPPAC will be in charge of the contracting and this Terms of Reference for the final evaluation (Mr Paul Kosterink; Coordinator Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation of GPPAC) and for the initial cooperation regarding the exchange of relevant project documentation and data (Ms Kateryna Gryniuk; UN PBF Project Coordinator of GPPAC). More detailed documentation and data, as well as logistical support will be provided by FTI, by the UN PBF Project Coordinator, Mr Erkin Kochkarov. Logistical support can include assistance in arranging interviews and visits. The UN PBF Project Coordinators of GPPAC and FTI are available for specific information at the content level. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Annexes to this ToR**   * Project proposal, including budget and planning tables. * Logical Framework. * Mid-term Review report of the Project.   The annexes will be provided to interested parties upon request.  Responding to this tender (see “Timetable”) latest ***by Sunday 26 May 2019*** (CET 23:59) in an email to: Paul Kosterink <[p.kosterink@gppac.net](mailto:p.kosterink@gppac.net)> and Kateryna Gryniuk <[k.gryniuk@gppac.net](mailto:k.gryniuk@gppac.net)>  NB: This Terms of Reference is based on ADA guidance: <https://www.entwicklung.at/en/ada/evaluation/> |

## 

## Annex II - Project logframe

The Logframe can be found in the Project Document which is available by the following link:

<http://mptf.undp.org/document/download/19615>

**Annex III - Timeline of the Final Evaluation**

* + - 1. Preparation of evaluation proposal based on ToRs, project plan and MTR.June to early July.
      2. Pre-assignment preparation June to July.
      3. Arrival in Bishkek. Observation of Initiative groups preparations for final project conference and interviews with Bishkek FTI staff and some Initiative Group Participants. 12 July.
      4. 4 separate Interviews with: Project Manager in the implementing partner (FTI), group participants, teachers, local government representatives and observation of final project conference. 15 July (with local Consultant).
      5. End of project conference. Direct observations and 8 separate interviews with initiative group participants, teachers and local government representatives. 16 July (with local Consultant).
      6. Transcriptions of 12 interviews and brief report on final project conference prepared by local Consultant. Collection of project reports, baseline survey, and relevant project documentation from FTI Osh office and GPPAC, the Hague. Preparation of Inception Report. 18 July- 29 July.
      7. Study of project documents and writing up of report based on primary and secondary sources to date by Consultant. 29 July on-going to end of assignment; deadline end of September.
      8. Data collection visits proposed with project stakeholders in all regions of the project in: 19 August Batken; 20 August Osh; 21 August Jalal-Abad;
      9. Transcriptions of all interviews prepared by local Consultant, and sent to Evaluator when ready.
      10. 26 August Consultant flies back to UK.
      11. 27 August UK to end of assignment Consultant continues writing up evaluation, using ALL data collected during the evaluation. Deadline: End of September.
      12. Skype interviews planned with relevant GPPAC staff, relevant MEND Staff, any other project stakeholders identified as necessary to talk to in order to double check information, or fill any identified gaps. These interviews are not likely to start until late September at the earliest.
      13. Also trip to Hague details. Skype calls. Interviews. Kateryna. Paul and Deniz, Darynell.
      14. Consultant gives a presentation on the evaluation and discusses evaluation in the Hague with GPPAC on 8 October. Interviews conducted during this visit with relevant GPPAC staff.
      15. Evaluation completed and finalized in November.

## Annex IV - Key Informant Interviews

* + - 1. Erkin Kochkarov, Project Manager, FTI. 15.07.2019.
      2. Initiative group participants, both teachers and children from all project regions. 15.07.2019.
      3. Nurali Paiziev, Project coordinator Batken Region, initiative group teachers and children, parents and some decision-makers from local feedback sessions.19.08.2019
      4. Farukh Mirsaitov, Project coordinator Osh Region, initiative group teachers and children, parents and some decision-makers from local feedback sessions. 20.08.2019.
      5. Shaksanam Akmatalieva, Project coordinator Jalalabad Region, initiative group teachers and children, parents and some decision-makers from local feedback sessions. 21.08.2019.
      6. Zarina Uzbekova, Project Coordinator Chui Oblast on Skype. 29.09.2019.
      7. Tugolbay Ormokeyev, current Project Coordinator Chui Oblast Skype. 01.10.2019.
      8. Lucy Nusseibeh, Chair/Founder, MEND. Skype. 04.10.2019.
      9. Kateryna Gryniuk, Project Coordinator Youth Empowerment in Kyrgyzstan, GPPAC. 15.08.2019 and between 07-09.10.2019.
      10. Kees Kolsteeg, Finance Manager, GPPAC. 09.10.2019.
      11. Deniz Düzenli, Communications Adviser, GPPAC. 09.10.2019.
      12. Darynell Rodriguez Torres, Executive Director, GPPAC. 09.10.2019.

## Annex V - Documents consulted

1. Project document.
2. 3 semi-annual reports.
3. 3 media reports, 1 work plan (as of November 2018).
4. 1 mid-term review report.
5. Communications strategy of FTI.
6. Scenario of the final movie.
7. Concept notes: for choosing participants for international feedback session, for national feedback session, concept of presentations at schools, selection in schools, conducting feedback sessions at local and national levels, programs of local feedback sessions.
8. Around 21 out of 32 reports from the local feedback sessions;
9. Report from the national feedback session, program of the national feedback session;
10. Information for schools and the local self-government about the project;
11. Some outcomes in Russian written by FTI staff, quotations of children, stories of change;
12. Agreements signed with the schools about the transfer of the equipment - example
13. Agreements signed with the parents of participants allowing their children's participation in the project, filming and taking pictures of them - example;
14. Letter of support for the project from the Ministry of Education of Kyrgyzstan to schools;
15. Report about the final conference, program of the conference
16. Local project pictures - made during the trainings, feedback sessions, filming process etc.
17. Training materials developed by FTI on PV process, instructions for using the camera, instructions for conducting exercises in PV for teachers and children; training materials on conflict analysis, tolerance etc. (about 15 documents);
18. Reports from the trainings (around 11 docs);
19. Training materials from the social media training
20. Reports from the rest of 32 local feedback sessions (around 12);
21. Training materials (PV training materials - initial by Real Time);
22. Local reports of the project coordinators used by FTI to prepare inputs into the semi-annual reports (which in turn were written by GPPAC based on the inputs from FTI and other partners);
23. Minutes from the quarterly Project Steering Committee meetings;
24. Questionnaire for baseline survey (is in the folder since May, but I do not know whether Paul shared the folder with the evaluator);
25. Success stories filmed during the summer 2018 translated into English (like the story of Melis - available in the social networks, so the evaluator might have already seen them).

## Annex VI - Used Acronyms

1. GPPAC – Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict.
2. FTI - Foundation for Tolerance International.
3. PV – Participatory Video.
4. MEND – Middle East Non-Violence and Democracy.
5. UN PBF – United Nations Peacebuilding Fund.