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**PBF PROJECT progress report**

**COUNTRY:** Kyrgyzstan

**TYPE OF REPORT: semi-annual, annual OR FINAL:**

**YEAR of report:** November 15, 2020

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** PBF Secretariat support to Joint Steering Committee and PRF projects  **Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:**  **00108374** | |
| **If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:**  Country Trust Fund  Regional Trust Fund  **Name of Recipient Fund:** | **Type and name of recipient organizations:**  **RCO Through UNDP (Convening Agency)** |
| **Date of first transfer:** 11/01/2018  **Project end date:** 10/01/2021  **Is the current project end date within 6 months?** | |
| **Check if the project falls under one or more PBF priority windows:**  Gender promotion initiative  Youth promotion initiative  Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions  Cross-border or regional project | |
| **Total PBF approved project budget (by recipient organization):**  **Recipient Organization Amount**  RCO through UNDP $ 551653.00        $        $        $  Total: $ 551653.00  Approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget: 90%  \*ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE\*  **Gender-responsive Budgeting:**  Indicate dollar amount from the project document to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women’s empowerment: $55.000 USD  Amount expended to date on activities focussed on gender equality or women’s empowerment: $41 064.30 | |
| **Project Gender Marker:**  **Project Risk Marker:**  **Project PBF focus area:** | |
| **Report preparation:**  Project report prepared by: PBF Secretariat  Project report approved by: RCO  Did PBF Secretariat review the report: | |

***NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:***

* *Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general /common language.*
* *Report on what has been achieved in the reporting period, not what the project aims to do.*
* *Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*
* *Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*
* *Please include any COVID-19 related considerations, adjustments and results and respond to section IV.*

**PART 1: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS**

Briefly outline the **status of the project** in terms of implementation cycle, including whether preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (i.e. contracting of partners, staff recruitment, etc.) (1500 character limit):

The project works with all PBF funded projects in Kyrgyzstan. It`s main goal is to support the work of the two co-chairs of the Joint Steering Committee, one from the government side, one from the UN side, who in turn provide strategic oversight and guidance to all PRF/IRF projects implemented in the country. The role of the PBF Secretariat remains important for coordination and overall coherence between various projects implemented by RUNOs and NUNOs. PBF Secretariat is in its 3rd (last) year of implementation. According to the original project document, its end date is January 11, 2021. However, PBF Secretariat`s no-cost extension request is being discussed and processed by PBF in New-York. The reason for the no-cost extension is to be consistent with the remaining three PRF projects in the country, who already extended their end date through beginning of June 2021. PBF Secretariat`s accompaniment to PRF projects final stages of implementation is necessary. In the meantime, PBF Secretariat continues its work of coordination, monitoring of the PBF funded projects, supporting JSC co-chairs and providing support to the newly arrived International PDA. In addition to its regular functions related to providing support to project, PBF Secretariat has been playing a key role in the process of preparing for the re-eligibility application to PBF. The final report of the strategic review exercise commissioned by PBF and co-conducted with the RCO has been finalized in July 2020. UNRC submitted it formally to PBF along with accompanying documents such as conflict and peace analysis, report from the regional consultation on UN peacebuilding architecture review led by an eminent person, ex-president of the Kyrgyz Republic.

Please indicate any significant project-related events anticipated in the next six months, i.e. national dialogues, youth congresses, film screenings, etc. (1000 character limit):

The current priority for PBF Secretariat has been to support JSC co-chairs in preparing for the re-eligibility application.

For the re-eligibility process:

Kyrgyzstan’s eligibility to receive funding from the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) expired at the end of 2019. The Kyrgyz government has expressed its strong interest in a new round of eligibility structured around new needs and priorities in the country. In line with this, the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) and the Resident Coordinator`s Office in Kyrgyzstan co-conducted a strategic review exercise to assess the peacebuilding related needs and challenges in Kyrgyzstan and identify whether the PBF remained well suited to support the response to these challenges. As part of the strategic review exercise a two-day workshop was organized which brought together participants from Kyrgyz state agencies, civil society, academia, local authorities, and other development partners. The overall aim of this workshop was to enrich findings of the strategic review and reflect on the ongoing implementation of the PBF portfolio with the view of Kyrgyzstan’s application for re-eligibility for PBF funding.

In addition to this, the UN Resident Coordinator`s Office (RCO) of the Kyrgyz Republic in consultation with the UN PBF has launched a number of consultative processes to ensure national ownership and collaborative identification of the country’s five-year peacebuilding priorities. Consultative processes included national partner meetings, Joint Steering Committee (JSC) meetings, and strategic workshop mentioned above. The consultations are important to build shared ownership with national stakeholders, to foster a common understanding of the causes and risk factors for conflict, and to identify prevention measures to ensure sustainable peace in the country.

All elements for the PBF re-eligibility application are in place – conflict and peace analysis, strategic review of the previous PBF portfolio, approximate peacebuilding directions – which inform key conceptual ideas around the PBF framework focused on strengthening/building infrastructure for peace (horizontal social cohesion, vertical social cohesion, and cross-border programming). The key objective of the PBF Secretariat now is to support UN RCO and UNCT in preparing the re-eligibility package, which includes preparation of the Strategic Framework of the PBF engagement in the country for the next 5 years, including Theory of Changes of key outcome(s) and sub-outcomes (outputs/projects) and prepare the full re-eligibility request supported by country`s senior leadership. The ambitious plan is to submit the re-eligibility package in 2020.

FOR PROJECTS WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF COMPLETION: summarize **the main structural, institutional or societal level change the project has contributed to**. This is not anecdotal evidence or a list of individual outputs, but a description of progress made toward the main purpose of the project. (1500 character limit):

n/a

In a few sentences, explain whether the project has had a positive **human impact**. May include anecdotal stories about the project’s positive effect on the people’s lives. Include direct quotes where possible or weblinks to strategic communications pieces. (2000 character limit):

The nature of PBF Secretariat`s work is very specific. It currently supports the work of 8 RUNOs and 2 NUNOs in the Kyrgyz Republic who in turn engage more directly with national partners from the state and civil society and beneficiaries. Overall, there is an appreciation of the work that PBF Secretariat does, especially related to the tasks that go beyond PBF Secretariat`s regular responsibilities, for example, the conflict and peace analysis promotion, regional consultation on UN peacebuilding architecture review, the Kyrgyz-Uzbek needs assessment, the localized analysis, learning and adaptation strategy and broader engagement with the government, international development partners, including the PeaceNexus Foundation who provides technical support under a partnership agreement with the UN.

**PART II: RESULT PROGRESS BY PROJECT OUTCOME**

*Describe overall progress under each Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration). Do not list individual activities. If the project is starting to make/has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context.*

* *“On track” refers to the timely completion of outputs as indicated in the workplan.*
* *“On track with peacebuilding results” refers to higher-level changes in the conflict or peace factors that the project is meant to contribute to. These effects are more likely in mature projects than in newer ones.*

*If your project has more than four outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.*

**Outcome 1:** Effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and communication on the achievement of the Priority Plan results and the projects that support it.

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

**Progress summary:** *(3000 character limit)*

By mid-November 2020, PBF portfolio consists of only 5 active projects: 4 PRF projects on PVE (and PBF Secretariat), and 1 GPI project that started in November 2019. Three YPI projects ended over the last 6 months. PBF Secretariat has provided support to all closing projects to ensure the final evaluations and other processes related to their operational and financial closures are done in accordance with PBF rules and regulations. For other, ongoing projects PBF Secretariat provided guidance and support with no-cost extensions and project amendments caused by COVID-19. The evaluation of the cross-border project between Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan implemented by 10 RUNOs from 2 countries has been finalized and its report has been accepted. At the same time, PBF Secretariat is supporting an ongoing needs assessment for the cross-border project between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, which is conducted in partnership with the PeaceNexus foundation, national institutes of strategic studies and UNCTs in both countries.

One of PBF Secretariat`s major achievements in the previous reporting period included organization of the two important events. One of them was the Central Asian regional consultation on UN peacebuilding architecture review that took place on March 10-11 in Bishkek. The global review has finished and SG`s report has been launched over the summer. PBF Secretariat has shared the regional Central Asia report with UNRCs in the region to kickstart and/or continue engaging with respective governments on peacebuilding affairs based on findings from this report.

The implementation of the Learning and Adaptation strategy was put on hold due to COVID related re-programming. As PVE projects are reaching its final stages of implementation, PBF Secretariat plans to conduct a review of the implementation of the learning and adaptation strategy, what worked and what didn’t, and develop recommendations for the future. The Strategic review report recommends employing the learning and adaptation strategy portfolio-wide. The planned review of the implementation of the learning and adaptation will inform the decision for future utilization of this approach.

One of the main tasks for the PBF Secretariat over the last 6 months has been to finalize the Kyrgyz-Uzbek cross-border needs assessment, which consists of several stages. Desk review has been completed by research groups in both countries. It has been reviewed and commented by national research institutes, PeaceNexus and UN RCO. Research groups have conducted expert interviews with national stakeholders in both countries. Analysis of interviews will be included into the country-specific chapters of the report. Research group in Kyrgyzstan has completed a field research. National consultant and research group from the NISS have visited three regions in the south: Osh, Batken, Jalal-Abad. Currently, national consultant with the support from the NISS is in the process of drafting an analytical report based on field work. In Uzbekistan, ISMI (Institute of strategic studies) is hesitant regarding the field research in view of quarantine issues. The team in Uzbekistan is considering different options, including outsourcing the collection of data at community level. Once both country-specific sections of the report will be fully ready after comments from needs assessment actors, national consultants will start to work on the joint section of the report. It`s envisaged that the Kyrgyz-Uzbek cross-border project proposal is submitted together with Kyrgyzstan`s re-eligibility package.

**Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured under this Outcome:** *(1000 character limit)*

**Outcome 2: Continuation of Outcome 1.**

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

**Progress summary:** *(3000 character limit)*

The planned midline study has not been conducted due to first COVID related issues: lockdown, quarantine, sickness of multiple partners, beneficiaries and even consultants who were responsible for conducting the mid-line study and second due to the revolution in Kyrgyzstan that took place on October 5th with ousting the President. The current plan is to modify the methodology and turn it into an endline survey which will have elements of retrospective baseline to establish not only endline data but also baseline data utilizing various “recall” methods that will be shared in greater depth separately. Through the endline/baseline study, RUNOs will collect initial measurements for all indicators related to the PPP and the three PVE Outcome projects through which the PPP is implemented. The consulting firm is suggesting several methodological options for overcoming the problem of the lack of baseline indicators and assess the impact of interventions in the future, including at the end of the project. At the design and data collection stage to use recall methods. The essence of this technique/method can be captured in following: respondents (in an individual survey or in group discussions and interviews) are asked to “recall” the situation \ condition \ practice at different time periods - for example before and after interventions. Despite the popularity of this technique, there are significant limitations: these limitations are not only caused by memory gaps/distortions of respondents, but can also be caused by deliberately distorted answers due to certain interests of the respondents. The reliability of the data obtained through this technique depends on the subject of study. In the case of your project, a large proportion of indicators are sensitive to degrees of the interests of respondents. Another recommended approach – that can be used at the stage of statistical data processing - Comparison of predisposition points or pseudo-randomization (propensity score matching), which is used in cases when baseline data are not available. This approach is used in order to conduct a comparison, that is made on the consistency of estimates in samples of respondents from pilot and control communities.

**Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured under this Outcome:** *(1000 character limit)*

**Outcome 3:**

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

**Progress summary:** *(3000 character limit)*

**Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured under this Outcome:** *(1000 character limit)*

**Outcome 4:**

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

**Progress summary:** *(3000 character limit)*

**Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured under this Outcome:** *(1000 character limit)*

**PART III: CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Monitoring:** Please list monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period (1000 character limit)  *Due to COVID imposed restrictions it was possible to conduct monitoring of only online events. To execute a decision from one the JSC meetings in 2020, the PBF Secretariat, with support from temporary PDA, developed ToR for oversight group. The ToR will be presented at the next JSC meeting together with the tentative schedule for the new projects under the next PBF eligibility cycle.*  *Reports from RUNOs and NUNOs are collected and cleared by PBF Secretariat. During this reporting periods, PBF Secretariat didn’t have many substantial comments to RUNOs and NUNOs reports as they were well developed.*    *Coordination meetings between three PVE Outcome projects that support PPP implementation and the YPI projects were not conducted during reporting period due to slow mode of activities. These meetings will resume from this month.* | Do outcome indicators have baselines?  Has the project launched perception surveys or other community-based data collection? |
| **Evaluation:** Has an evaluation been conducted during the reporting period? | Evaluation budget (response required): n/a  If project will end in next six months, describe the evaluation preparations *(1500 character limit)*: The project will be requesting no-cost extension |
| **Catalytic effects (financial):** Indicate name of funding agent and amount of additional non-PBF funding support that has been leveraged by the project. | Name of funder: Amount: |
| **Other:** Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations? *(1500 character limit)* | The PBF Secretariat Manager position is vacant since September 25, 2020. The previous manager received a new post of National PDA at the RCO. However, he will continue fully supporting the work of PBF Secretariat together with the new international PDA, who started working from September 1, 2020 until the post of PBF Secretariat is filled. |

**PART IV: COVID-19**

*Please respond to these questions if the project underwent any monetary or non-monetary adjustments due to the COVID-19 pandemic.*

1. Monetary adjustments: Please indicate the total amount in USD of adjustments due to COVID-19:

$ n/a

1. Non-monetary adjustments: Please indicate any adjustments to the project which did not have any financial implications:

      PBF Secretariat is in its 3rd (last) year of implementation. According to the original project document, its end date is January 11, 2021. However, PBF Secretariat`s no-cost extension request is being discussed and processed by PBF in New-York. The reason for the no-cost extension is to be consistent with the remaining three PRF projects in the country, who already extended their end date through beginning of June 2021 due to COVID related delays in implementation. PBF Secretariat`s accompaniment to PRF projects` final stages of implementation is necessary.

1. Please select all categories which describe the adjustments made to the project (*and include details in general sections of this report*):

Reinforce crisis management capacities and communications

Ensure inclusive and equitable response and recovery

Strengthen inter-community social cohesion and border management

Counter hate speech and stigmatization and address trauma

Support the SG’s call for a global ceasefire

Other (please describe):

If relevant, please share a COVID-19 success story of this project (*i.e. how adjustments of this project made a difference and contributed to a positive response to the pandemic/prevented tensions or violence related to the pandemic etc.*)

**PART V: INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

*Using the* ***Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments****- provide an update on the achievement of* ***key indicators*** *at both the outcome and output level in the table below (if your project has more indicators than provided in the table, select the most relevant ones with most relevant progress to highlight). Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation.* Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (300 characters max per entry)

|  | **Performance Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **End of project Indicator Target** | **Indicator Milestone** | **Current indicator progress** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1**  Effective coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation and communication on the achievement of the Priority Plan results and the projects that support it. | Indicator 1.1  **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| Indicator 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.1  Secretariat develops, in consultation with JSC members, reports required by donor and submits them in timely manner | Indicator 1.1.1  JSC Annual Report submitted within 7 days of the deadline  Baseline: 0  Target: 3 | **0** | **3** | **2** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| Indicator 1.1.2  Quality of JSC Annual Reports rated “acceptable” by PBSO review team  Baseline: 0  Target: Rated acceptable for all 3 reports | **0** | **3** | **2** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| Output 1.2  Established coordination mechanisms that contribute to achieving PPP outcomes and timely communication of relevant information. | Indicator 1.2.1  Key partners (e.g. RUNOs as well as non-UN stakeholders) satisfied with level and timeliness of PBSO communication and coordination  Baseline: 0  Target: TBD | **0** | **Tbd** | **Tbd** | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| Indicator 1.2.2  % of coordination activities conducted vs planned  Indicator 1. 2.3  The level of satisfaction with Secretariat’s job among JSC and RUNOs  Baseline: N/A  Target: 80% | **0** | **85%** | **Tbd** | **n/a** | We changed this indicator to reflect % of coordination actitivites conducted VERSUS planned. Previous version of the indicator was as follows:  "% of coordination activities conducted as planned"  Indicator 1.2.3 was REMOVED because it`s repetetive with Indicator 1.2.1 |
| Output 1.3  Monitoring and evaluation: M&E system that provides information about achieving PPP outcomes at all levels (national and local) for strategic decision making in the area of peacebuilding is established. | Indicator 1.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3.2  Baseline/end-line studies conducted |  | 1 endline study |  | in the previous report |  |
| Output 1.4  Enhanced capacity of the JSC members and key stakeholders to monitor and better guide the implementation of PPP. | Indicator 1.4.1  # of field visit reports with recommendations prepared by the Oversight Group and presented to the JSC. | **0** | **2** | **On track with delays** | Oversight groups will be formed soon and the 1st OG visits were planned for this autumn. However due to COVID these visits have not happened yet |  |
| Indicator 1.4.2  # of trainings conducted (on gender responsive peacebuilding, HRBA, DS) | **0** | **6** | **2** |  | **n/a** |
| **Outcome 2** | Indicator 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.1 | Indicator 2.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.2 | Indicator 2.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.3 | Indicator 2.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 2.4 | Indicator 2.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 3** | Indicator 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.1 | Indicator 3.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.2 | Indicator 3.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.3 | Indicator 3.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 3.4 | Indicator 3.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 4** | Indicator 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.1 | Indicator 4.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.2 | Indicator 4.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.3 | Indicator 4.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 4.4 | Indicator 4.4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |