PBF November 2025 Project Progress Report

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Thank you for taking the time to complete the PBF Progress report. For projects with more than one recipient, please consult among co-recipients prior to filling out the form to ensure collaboration on the responses. If you have any questions or require technical assistance in filling out the form, please send an email to gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org

Click Next below to start

» Report Submission

Type of report *

○ Semi-annual

● Annual

○ Final

○ Other

Date of submission of report *

2025-11-15

Name and title of person submitting the report *

Anastasia Perevalova, M&E Specialist

E-mail of person submitting the report *

anastasia.perevalova@undp.org

Name and title of person who approved the report *

Gulzhigit Ermatov, Project Manager

Have all fund recipients for this project contributed to the report? *

◉ Yes

○ No

Did PBF Secretariat or RCO focal point review the report? *

You should normally ensure that the PBF Secretariat or the PBF focal point have an opportunity to review.

◉ Yes

○ No

○ Not Applicable

» Project Information and Geographical Scope

Is this a cross-border project? *

○ Yes   ◉ No

Please select the geographical region in which the project is implemented

○ Asia and the Pacific   ○ Central & Southern Africa   ○ East Africa

● Europe and Central Asia   ○ Global   ○ Latin America and the Caribean

○ Middle East and North Africa   ○ West Africa

Country of project implementation *

○ Albania   ○ Bosnia and Herzegovina   ○ Kosovo (As per UNSCR 1244)

● Kyrgyzstan   ○ Moldova   ○ Montenegro

○ North Macedonia   ○ Serbia   ○ Tajikistan

○ Uzbekistan   ○ Other, Specify

*

Other, please specify

Project Title *

○ 00129739: Inclusive governance and shared identity for sustainable peace and development

○ 00130462: Supporting young people's peacebuilding participation in Kyrgyzstan: integrating a youth-led mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) approach

● 00134228: PBF Secretariat Support to Joint Steering Committee and PRF projects

○ 00140010: Strengthening national capacities for conflict prevention and peacebuilding

○ 00140074: Blossoming Aigul - Capacitated Women Civil Society Organizations sustaining peace in Kyrgyzstan

○ 00140782: Enabling youth-inclusive political processes and promoting the political participation of young women and men from diverse backgrounds in Kyrgyzstan

○ 00140982: Women of Ferghana Valley at the Frontlines of Climate Resilience Adaptation and Peace

○ 00141101: Strengthening capacities of institutions and border communities of Kyrgyzstan for increased cooperation with Uzbekistan

○ 00141244: Empowering Youth to Building Bridges for Social Cohesion

○ Other, Specify

*

Write the 8 digit MPTFO number and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document

EXAMPLE: 00118938: Community-based prevention of violence and social cohesion using innovation for young people in displaced and host communities

Please select the geographical region(s) in which the project is implemented *

If the project you are looking for does not appear in the following question, please make sure that you have selected the correct regions. A limited number of cross border projects span multiple geographic regions. For example, a cross border project between Niger and Chad spans both West Africa and Central & Southern Africa

- [ ] Asia and the Pacific
- [ ] Central & Southern Africa
- [ ] East Africa
- [ ] Europe and Central Asia
- [ ] Global
- [ ] Latin America and the Caribean
- [ ] Middle East and North Africa
- [ ] West Africa

Please select the title of the project for which you are submitting the report *

Write the 8 digit MPTFO numbers and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document *

EXAMPLE: 00129699/700: Supporting Cross-Border Cooperation for Increased Community Resilience and Social Cohesion in The Gambia and Senegal

Please select the countries where this project is being implemented *

Other, Please specify *

Project Start Date (Date of first transfer) *

2022-12-09

Project End Date *

2027-06-09

Has this project received an extension? *

- (•) YES, Cost Extension
- ( ) YES, No Cost Extension
- ( ) YES, Both Cost and No Cost Extensions
- ( ) NO, No Extensions

Will this project be requesting an extension? *

- ( ) YES, Cost Extension
- ( ) YES, No Cost Extension
- ( ) YES, Both Cost and No Cost Extensions
- (•) NO, No Extensions

Will this project be submitting a Fund Transfer Request (FTR) in the next six months? *

- ( ) Yes
- (•) No

If so, around which month do you expect to submit the request?   *

○ January   ○ February   ○ March

○ April   ○ May   ○ June

○ July   ○ August   ○ September

○ October   ○ November   ○ December

Is the current project end date within 6 months?   *

○ Yes

⦿ No

Is funding disbursed either into a national or regional trust fund?   *

○ Yes

⦿ No

If yes, please select which   *

○ National Trust Fund

○ Regional Trust Fund

Recipients

Is the convening agency a UN agency or a non UN entity?   *

(●) UN entity

(○) Non-UN Entity

Please select the convening agency recipient   *

(●) UNDP: United Nations Development Programme   (○) IOM: International Organization for Migration

(○) UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund

(○) OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

(○) UNWOMEN: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

(○) UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees   (○) UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund

(○) FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization   (○) WFP: World Food Programme

(○) UNHABITAT: United Nations Human Settlements Programme

(○) UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

(○) UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme   (○) ILO: International Labour Organization

(○) WHO: World Health Organization   (○) PAHO/WHO

(○) UNCDF: United Nations Capital Development Fund   (○) UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

(○) UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services

(○) UNIDO: United Nations Industrial Development Organization   (○) ITC: International Trade Centre

(○) UNDPO   (○) Other, Specify

Other, Please specify   *

Are there other recipients for this project?   *

(●) No other recipients

(○) Yes, other UN recipients only

(○) Yes, other non-UN recipients only

(○) Yes, both UN and non-UN recipients

Please select other UN recipients

Select all that apply

- [ ] UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
- [ ] IOM: International Organization for Migration
- [ ] UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund
- [ ] OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
- [ ] UNWOMEN: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
- [ ] UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
- [ ] UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund
- [ ] FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization
- [ ] WFP: World Food Programme
- [ ] UNHABITAT: United Nations Human Settlements Programme
- [ ] UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- [ ] UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme
- [ ] ILO: International Labour Organization
- [ ] WHO: World Health Organization
- [ ] PAHO/WHO
- [ ] UNCDF: United Nations Capital Development Fund
- [ ] UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- [ ] UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services
- [ ] UNIDO: United Nations Industrial Development Organization
- [ ] ITC: International Trade Centre
- [ ] UN Department of Peace Operations
- [ ] Other, Specify

Other, Please specify

Please select other non-UN recipients *

- [ ] ACTED
- [ ] Action Aid UK
- [ ] AAITG (ActionAid the Gambia)
- [ ] AEDE
- [ ] African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD)
- [ ] Agence de Coopération et de Recherche pour le Développement (ACORD)
- [ ] American Friends Service Committee (AFSC)
- [ ] Avocats Sans Frontières
- [ ] Avocats Sans Frontières Belgium
- [ ] Avocats sans frontières Canada
- [ ] Ayuda en Accion
- [ ] BIRN - Balkan Investigative Reporting Network
- [ ] BIOM -Youth Ecological Movemen
- [ ] CARE International UK
- [ ] Centre d'étude et de coopération internationale (CECI) - BF
- [ ] Christian Aid Ireland
- [ ] COIPRODEN
- [ ] Concern Worldwide
- [ ] Conexion Guatemala
- [ ] COOPI - Cooperazione Internazionale
- [ ] CORD Burundi
- [ ] CORDAID
- [ ] Corporacion Sisma Mujer
- [ ] CRS - Catholic Relief Services
- [ ] DanChurchAid
- [ ] Danish Refugee Council
- [ ] EQUITAS
- [ ] Fund for Congolese Women
- [ ] Fundacion Estudios Superior (FESU)
- [ ] Fundación Mi Sangre (FMS)
- [ ] Fundación Nacional para el Desarrollo de Honduras (FUNADEH)
- [ ] Fundación para la Libertad de Prensa (FLIP)
- [ ] Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF)
- [ ] HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation
- [ ] Humanity & Inclusion (HI)
- [ ] ICTJ (International Center for Transitional Justice)
- [ ] Instituto Holandes para Democracia Multipartidaria (NIMD)
- [ ] Integrity Watch
- [ ] International Alert
- [ ] International Rescue Committee
- [ ] Interpeace
- [ ] Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation
- [ ] Life and Peace Institute (LPI)
- [ ] MDG-EISA - Institut Electoral pour une Démocratie Durable en Afrique (EISA), bureau de Madagascar
- [ ] Mercy Corps
- [ ] MLAL - ProgettoMondo
- [ ] MSIS-TATAO
- [ ] NIMD (Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy)
- [ ] Nonviolent Peaceforce
- [ ] Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
- [ ] Nile Sustainable Development Organization - NSDO
- [ ] OCNH-Organisation des Citoyens pour une Nouvelle Haïti
- [ ] OIKOS
- [ ] ONG Adkoul - ONG Adkoul
- [ ] ONG AZHAR
- [ ] OXFAM
- [ ] Peace Direct
- [ ] Plan International
- [ ] PNG UN Country Fund
- [ ] Red de Instituciones por los Derechos de la Niñez
- [ ] ROI - Roza Otunbayeva Initiati
- [ ] Saferworld
- [ ] Sampan'Asa Momba ny Fampandrosoana (SAF/FJKM)
- [ ] Save the Children
- [ ] Search for Common Ground (SFCG)
- [ ] SIHA (Strategic Initiative for Women in the Horn of Africa)
- [ ] SismaMujer
- [ ] SOS Sahel Sudan
- [ ] Stichting Impunity Watch
- [ ] Tearfund
- [ ] The Carter Center, Inc.
- [ ] Trocaire
- [ ] War Child
- [ ] War Childhood Museum (WCM)
- [ ] World Vision International
- [ ] World Vision Myanmar
- [ ] ZOA
- [ ] blank_placeholder
- [ ] Other, Please specify

Other, Please specify *

Implementing Partners

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money **since the project's start** ?

0

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money **during this calendar period** ?

(for June reports: January-June;
for November reports: January-December (anticipated);
for final reports: full project duration)

0

Financial Reporting

» Delivery by Recipient

Please enter the total amounts in full US dollars allocated to each recipient organization
Please enter the original budget amount, amount transferred to date and estimated expenditure by recipient.

Please make sure you enter the correct amount. All values should be entered in **US Dollars**

For cross-border projects, group the amounts by agency, even if different country offices are involved. You will have the opportunity to share a more detailed budget in the next section.

Recipients	Total Project Budget (in full US $) *Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars*	Transfers to date (in full US $) *Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars*	Expenditure to date (in full US $) *Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars*	Implementation rate as a percentage of total budget *(calculated automatically)*

	*	*	*	38.09%
UNDP: United Nations Developmen t Programme	825864.4	438105.08	314600.42	
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%

	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
TOTAL	**825864.4**	**438105.08**	**314600.42**	**38.0 9%**

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **38.09%**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

(●) Correct   ( ) Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the approximate implementation rate as a % *

» Gender-responsive Budgeting

Indicate what **percentage (%)** of the budget contributes to gender equality or women's empowerment (GEWE) as per the project document? *

46.760969

The dollar amount of the budget contributing to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) based on percentage entered above and total project budget is **US $ 386182.2**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

(●) Correct   ( ) Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the *budget amount* allocated to GEWE in US Dollars *

Amount expended to date on efforts contributiong to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US $ 147110.2**. Is this correct?   *

(•) Correct   ( ) Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the *expenditure to date* on GEWE in US dollars   *

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE.   *
The templates for the budget are available here

Secretariat Budget_Annex D_NOV 2025_final-14_59_11.xlsx

Project Markers

Please select the Gender Marker Associated with this project   *

( ) Score 1 for projects that contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly (less than 30% of the total budget for GEWE)

(•) Score 2 for projects that have gender equality as a significant objective and allocate between 30 and 79% of the total project budget to GEWE

( ) Score 3 for projects that have gender equality as a principal objective and allocate at least 80% of the total project budget to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE)

Please select the Risk Marker Associated with this project   *

(•) Risk marker 0 = low risk to achieving outcomes

( ) Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes

( ) Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

Please select the PBF Focus Area associated with this project   *

○ (1.1) Security Sector Reform

○ (1.2) Rule of Law

○ (1.3) Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration

○ (1.4) Political Dialogue

○ (2.1) National reconciliation

○ (2.2) Democratic Governance

● (2.3) Conflict prevention/management

○ (3.1) Employment

○ (3.2) Equitable access to social services

○ (4.1) Strengthening of essential national state capacity

○ (4.2) Extension of state authority/Local Administration

○ (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources (including PBF Secretariats)

Is the project part of one or more PBF priority windows?   *

Select all that apply

☐ Gender promotion initiative

☐ Youth promotion initiative

☐ Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions

☐ Cross-border or regional project

☑ None

Steering Committee and Government engagement

Does the project have an active steering committee/ project board?   *

● Yes

○ No

If yes, please indicate how many times the Project Steering Committee has met over the last 6 months?

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

None. The next Joint Steering Committee on PBF projects implemented in the Kyrgyz Republic is planned for Q1 2026. The PBF Secretariat continues to liaise with working-level national counterparts to share updates on the PBF portfolio, particularly on implementation progress and achievements, seek endorsements for programmes in the pipeline, and prepare the ground for a PBF JSC meeting.

*

Please provide a brief description of any engagement that the project has had with the government over the last 6 months. Please indicate what level of government the project has been engaging with.
Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Meetings were held between the RC and national counterparts, including the new Head of the Department of Economic and Political Research of the Presidential Administration of the Kyrgyz Republic, Mr. Nurbek Tashbekov, appointed in February 2025, and the Deputy Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic, Mr. Edil Baisalov, to update them on the PBF project portfolio, results and validation of the pipeline, also preparing the ground for endorsement signatures. The PBF Secretariat provided strategic inputs to these meetings and followed up with counterparts.

The PBF Secretariat assisted in obtaining endorsements from relevant government bodies for two new PRF projects. For example:
1. It facilitated the agreement on joint plans and expectations between the project team UNICEF, UNESCO, and UNFPA and the Ministry of Culture, Information and Youth Policy, as well as the State Commission on Religious Affairs (the predecessor of the National Agency for Religious Affairs and Interethnic Relations). This led to the approval and signature by the Deputy Chairman of the Cabinet of Ministers.
2. It supported the endorsement and approval of a PRF project involving UNDP, OHCHR, and UN Women.
3. Similarly, the Secretariat liaised with the Presidential Administration to ensure the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare agreed to a six-month no-cost extension of the GPI project implemented by UN Women, FAO, and the CSO "Roza Otunbaeva Foundation."
Finally, the Secretariat engaged with both the Presidential Administration and the State Agency for Religious Affairs and Interethnic Relations to obtain approval for the cost extension of the Secretariat's own project.

The PBF Secretariat facilitated closer engagement of the the Inter-Ethnic Relations Department of the Ministry of Culture, Information and Youth Policy (a Department which moved to the reformed National Agency for Religious Affairs and Interethnic Relations under the President of the Republic in April 2025), in discussion on the sustainability of the early warning and early response (EWER) system, implemented under the completed Inclusive Governance project (UNDP, OHCHR, UNICEF).

The PBF Secretariat monitored policy developments in the wake of the adoption of a new Doctrine ("National Spirit – Global Heights") by the President in late December 2024, which would inform policymaking on national identity, social cohesion, religious affairs and interethnic relations, in particular a follow-up to the "Kyrgyz Zharany" civic identity concept and action plan (until 2026), based on an evaluation of its implementation, now being carried out by the Peace-Nexus Foundation.

PART I: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS

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 rate the implementation status of the following preliminary/preparatory activities

Contracting of partners *

○ Not Started   ○ Initiated   ○ Partially Completed

○ Completed   ● Not Applicable

Staff Recruitment *

○ Not Started   ○ Initiated   ○ Partially Completed

● Completed   ○ Not Applicable

Collection of baselines *

○ Not Started   ○ Initiated   ● Partially Completed

○ Completed   ○ Not Applicable

Identification of beneficiaries *

○ Not Started   ○ Initiated   ○ Partially Completed

● Completed   ○ Not Applicable

Provide any additional descriptive information relating to the status of the project, including whether preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (i.e. contracting of partners, staff recruitment, etc.) *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The Secretariat is composed by the Peace and Development Officer / PBF Secretariat Project Manager, working under the RC's leadership, a M&E Specialist and Administrative Associate, supporting the RC in monitoring the evolving context and progress of the peacebuilding portfolio. It is important to note that Marc Fumagalli's contract, Peace and Development Adviser, was not extended and he left the team in October 2025.

With the recruitment of the M&E Specialist, the project focused on greater alignment of the PBF portfolio with peacebuilding objectives in the Strategic Results Framework, enhanced documentation to capture outcomes and impact, collecting success stories, and enhanced data collection for a midterm review, in preparation for the final evaluation.

The M&E Specialist held meetings with RUNOs/NUNOs to inform the SRF indicators and set missing targets, enhanced M&E capacities, conducted monitoring and outcome harvesting missions. She accompanied a deep-dive external evaluation of the completed MHPSS/youth participation project by Saferworld. The Secretariat provided feedback to the external evaluation of the Blossoming Aigul project (UN Women-FAO-ROI).

Regional peacebuilding and development have evolved during the reporting period. Mostly as a result of the Fergana Peace Forum held on 15-16 October in the Fergana Valley between Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan, alongside regional, global, and civil society partners. The countries reaffirmed their commitment to dialogue and agreed to establish the Forum as a permanent platform to foster trust, strengthen cooperation on migration and border management, and advance joint initiatives on trade, connectivity, water resources, and sustainable development.

A cost extension request was approved to extend the project until 9 June 2027 to sustain PBF support until the end of the current eligibility cycle and slightly beyond, enabling continued coordination, M&E, and strategic engagement. It will support new programming, align with emerging priorities, and deeper national ownership, laying the groundwork for a potential re-eligibility request.

Describe overall progress under each Outcome made during the reporting period (*for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-December (anticipated); 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.

Is the project on track for the timely completion of outputs as indicated in the workplan? *

◯ Yes

● No

If no, please provide an explanation *

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

The implementation of the PBF Secretariat Project has been behind the planned schedule on output 2, which is on the support to the JSC for overall strategic oversight of the PBF portfolio. The reason for this was a slow and limited engagement from the main government counterparts, particularly because the working level team has changed two times, as well as the change in the senior leadership there (again in early 2025), since the launch of the PBF portfolio. It is also because peacebuilding has not been among the main thematic priorities of the new focal points, who are more versed on partnerships with development and international financial institutions (IFIs) on socio-economic matters and infrastructure investment projects.

To overcome this barrier, the RC held consultations with national counterparts in the Presidential Administration and the Cabinet of Ministers, with strategic inputs provided by the PBF Secretariat, while constantly liaising and following up at relevant working levels. The tentative date for the PBF JSC meeting is likely in 2026. Since other planned activities under Outcome 2, such as the JSC donor visit and the PBF-ownership workshop, are linked to the JSC meeting, these are also expected to take place in 2026.

The M&E workshop to present the findings of the PBF Strategic Results Framework (SRF), including progress towards SRF indicators, best practices, lessons learned, and recommendations, is also delayed to 2026. This is related to delays in review processes within the PBF Secretariat, as the Peace and Development Adviser, Marc Fumagalli, departed in October, and the M&E Specialist moved to remote working arrangements in November for personal reasons.

Follow-up on the project's commitment to disability inclusion was also not pursued during the reporting period due to delays in other activities and human resource mobility. It is anticipated in 2026.

Project progress summary   *

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Strategic action points identified by the RC included the need for exchanges of experiences, to share and incorporate lessons learned, notably among projects working on the CPS, WPS and YPS nexuses; consultation with the borderlands project to ensure coordination with the Uzbek side; organize meetings of PBF project teams to review the PBF portfolio against the SRF and ensure a continued focus on peacebuilding; anticipate a potential PBF donors visit, to showcase achievements and discuss priorities, also in light of an anticipated border agreement (concluded in March); and have a broader discussion on possible PBF support at UNCT level. This was followed by a visit by the RC to the Batken province, to assess the situation ahead of an anticipated border deal with Tajikistan and expected peace dividends, identify entry points for UN support, including possible PBF engagement, e.g., support confidence-building measures or otherwise accompany the implementation of the border deal, in anticipation of the reopening of the border, leveraging opportunities for border communities, if the government's position is open to cross-border interventions.

Promoting synergies and thematic coherence across the portfolio remained a priority. The Secretariat facilitated collaboration between new and existing projects to share best practices, particularly on youth engagement and climate, peace and security.

Thus, the Secretariat facilitated exchange of information and lessons learned between two climate- and gender-focused projects: UN Women, FAO, ROI project "Capacitated Women Civil Society Organizations Sustaining Peace in Kyrgyzstan." nearing its completion and UNDP, BIOM "Women of Ferghana Valley at the Frontlines of Climate Resilience, Adaptation and Peace", a newly launched project. "This collaboration facilitated mutual learning on best practices for women's empowerment and peacebuilding. As a result, joint thematic discussions were conducted, key insights on community engagement strategies were shared, and opportunities for future collaboration between civil society organizations were identified, strengthening the overall impact of both initiatives and ultimately inter-agency collaboration", - report the projects. In addition, a meeting was held for the new peace education (UNICEF, UNESCO, UNFPA) project to build on the evaluations and lessons learned from the previous PBF-funded youth projects.

Furthermore, to promote knowledge exchange, ongoing context and conflict sensitivity analyses, the PDA/PBF continued to convene the UNCT's Peace and Development Dialogue Group with non-UN stakeholders across the peacebuilding community through a quarterly coordination meeting of the Peacebuilding Hub.

The Secretariat advanced efforts to strengthen alignment with peacebuilding priorities and to systematically collect evidence of impact. Consultations were held with all 11 ongoing, completed, and planned projects to align activities with the PBF Strategic Results Framework (SRF). Each project's contribution (or anticipated one) to the joint peacebuilding outcomes was identified and documented. In addition, the targets for 18 (which had the baseline data) out of 24 sub-indicators were set collectively with PBF RUNOs and NUNOs. The Secretariat also conducted a midterm review of the overall portfolio, which will inform strategic decision-making, showcase best practices to demonstrate to the donors, and collect data for the final portfolio evaluation. This achievement was reinforced by the Communicating Peacebuilding Impact Workshop for RUNOs and NUNOs held in November-December (anticipated) to streamline the processes of collecting successes stories, respond to the needs of partners, and communicate the stories in a convincing manner to the PBSO standards and Peacebuilding Community of Practice best practices.

Three joint monitoring missions were conducted for three projects, using outcome harvesting methodology, identifying both gaps in peacebuilding impact in some cases and success stories in others, including examples of how climate-smart technologies led to a termination of local water-induced conflicts and fostered inter-ethnic trust and cooperation, how sustainable cross-border cooperation platforms (self-help groups) are fostering trust, and how a project facilitated greater representation of women in local self-governments. In addition to that, 1 FGDs was held to follow up on the Early Warning Early Response system's impact, and another mission to Osh was conducted to collect KIIs on youth's grant initiatives and their understanding of peacebuilding (please see the key findings in the Monitoring section).

One of the best practices identified during the monitoring activities was the work of Self-Help Groups between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. These women-led groups managed not only strengthen trust between border communities of the two countries but also sustain and multiply UN PBF's contributions. The PBF Secretariat facilitated the participation of these women at the Fergana Peace Forum to present this best practice as a transferable experience for other contexts, including Kyrgyzstan-Tajikistan cooperation. Their presentation triggered regional interest and positive feedback.

The Secretariat facilitated approval of new projects (Women in Ferghana Valley; Borderlands; Peace Education) and supported the pipeline Culture of Peace project. It provided technical support during inception phases to ensure SRF integration into baseline studies, contributed to the design of the Blossoming Aigul endline study, and supported the lessons-learned process for the UNICEF-led youth peace education initiative.

To address ineffective Natural Resource Management which was one of the most notable conflict drivers of previous conflicts, the PBF Secretariat organized a Climate, Peace, and Security workshop in partnership with the Folke Bernadotte Academy. It brought together representatives from 10 UN agencies and four civil society partners, fostering dialogue on future CPS programming opportunities. As a result, participants improved institutional capacities, exchanged experiences, identified lessons learned from CPS-focused PBF initiatives, and programmatic entry points.

*

Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured by the project to date

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The M&E Specialist conducted a joint deep-dive mission with independent evaluator Mazen Chouaib (CLIC) on the completed Saferworld project "Supporting young people's peacebuilding participation in Kyrgyzstan: integrating a youth-led MHPSS approach."

It revealed a gender imbalance, with markedly higher female participation. Women appeared more willing to engage in social programmes, while men were deterred by stigma surrounding mental health, cultural norms equating vulnerability with weakness, and time constraints linked to financial responsibilities. The predominance of female psychologists and mentors also contributed to male disengagement. Some male participants discontinued involvement due to discomfort discussing personal issues in mixed-gender settings. Male engagement did increase during public events, suggesting that alternative and gender-responsive modalities are needed. Key recommendations included adopting tailored outreach strategies, creating gender-specific support groups, integrating male-relevant topics, and involving male mentors and mental health professionals to encourage balanced participation.

The Secretariat convened a follow-up meeting with Saferworld to present these findings and ensure their integration into the design of their new project. Saferworld committed to organizing a broader consultation with implementing partners and stakeholders, including the Secretariat, to explore more inclusive youth engagement strategies with a stronger gender lens.

The M&E Specialist supported documentation of a success formula of 44 women elected in local councils, who attribute their election to the Blossoming Aigul project (UN Women, FAO, ROI), applying outcome harvesting methodology. These women already had leadership potential, but systemic barriers such as limited access to resources, public speaking experience, and political networks hindered their political participation. The introduction of a 30% gender quota in local councils, combined with targeted project support, helped remove these obstacles. Initiatives such as the GALS programme and "Women as Pillars of Peace" built skills in leadership, strategic planning and conflict prevention, while another training strengthened civic engagement and inclusive decision-making. Psychological support and peer learning networks further equipped women to campaign effectively and take on public roles with confidence.

At the CPS workshop, particular attention was paid on the gendered impacts of climate change and how to engage women-led CSOs in local communities to address climate-induced risks, via cooperation with local authorities on planning, and small grants initiatives.

The Secretariat continued to ensure that all PBF-funded projects are collecting and reporting on gender-disaggregated data and using gender analysis while developing their interventions, through the M&E meeting on SRF indicators, reviewing semi-annual reports, and technical support in developing baseline/endline reports.

Is the project 1+ year in implementation?   *

(●) Yes

(○) No

FOR PROJECTS 1+ YEAR IN IMPLEMENTATION ONLY:

Is the project demonstrating outcome-level peacebuilding results? *

Outcome-level peacebuilding results entail results achieved at the societal or structural level, including changed attitudes, behaviours or institutions.

○ Yes

● No

If yes, please provide concrete examples of such peacebuilding results *

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

....

If yes, please provide sources or references (including links) as evidence of peacebuilding results, or submit them as additional attachments.

Evidence may be quantitative or qualitative but needs to demonstrate progress against outcome indicators in the project results framework. Sources may include project surveys (such as perception surveys), monitoring reports, government documents, or other knowledge products that have been developed by the project.

....

File attachment

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

....

PART II: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

How many OUTCOMES does this project have *

       1   2   3   4   5   more than 5.

Please write out the project outcomes as they are in the project results framework found in the project document

....

Outcome 1: *

The PBF programming is strengthened and relevant to peace priorities in the country through enhanced relevance, synergies between projects, effective, quality and timely coordination, monitoring and evaluation, reporting, as well as communication.

....

Outcome 2: *

....

Outcome 3: *

....

Outcome 4: *

....

Outcome 5:   *

Outcome 6:   *

Outcome 7:   *

Outcome 8:   *

Additional Outcomes   *

If the project has more than 8 outcomes, please enumerate the remaining outcomes here

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 all **outcome** and **output** indicators in the table below.

- Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation.
- Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (500 characters max per entry)

» Outcome 1: The PBF programming is strengthened and relevant to peace priorities in the country through enhanced relevance, synergies between projects, effective, quality and timely coordination, monitoring and evaluation, reporting, as well as communication.

OC 1	Outcome Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
1.1	Annual Reports submitted within 10 days of the deadline with quality acceptable by PBSO review team.	0	5	5	9	
1.2	Baseline survey for the SRF has been carried out.	0 (0/24)	1 (24/24)	+18/24 SRF sub-indicators were baselined	+18 out of 24	Some indicators such as "Perceived prevalence of (inter-group) conflict", "Degree of ethnic and religious tolerance" and others are sensitive for data collection in the context of Kyrgyzstan. However, 2 additional sub-indicators are to be baselined through new projects' baseline studies in the coming period.

1. 3	**# workshops on conflict sensitivity, M&E standards, learning and adaptation are carried out.**	0	6	3	9 **M&E workshop for RUNOs and NUNOs in 2023; co-facilitated a localization workshop in 2024; delivered two trainings on conflict sensitivity and one focused on conflict sensitivity and programme adaptation in 2022-2023-2024, and M&E workshop to review SRF progress and set the targets in 2025, and CPS workshop for PBF RUNOs and IPs in 2025, peacebuilding impact communications workshop in Nov/Dec 2025**	
1. 4						
1. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 1 have?

      1   2   3   4   5   more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 1

Output 1.1

The coordination, monitoring and evaluation, reporting and communication of the results of the PBF portfolio arecarried out by the PBF Secretariat to allow for more effective implementation of peacebuilding interventions.

Output 1.2

The JSC supported for strategic oversight and communication of the PBF portfolio in Kyrgyzstan

Output 1.3

Output 1.4

Output 1.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 1 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

» Output 1.1: The coordination, monitoring and evaluation, reporting and communication of the results of the PBF portfolio arecarried out by the PBF Secretariat to allow for more effective implementation of peacebuilding interventions.

1.1	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.1.1	**Annual Reports submitted within 10 days of the deadline with quality acceptable by PBSO review team.**	0	5	5	9	

1.1.2	**Baseline survey for the SRF has been carried out.**	**0**	**1**	**+18/24 SRF sub-indictors baselined**	**+18/24 SRF sub-indictors baselined**	**Some indicators such as "Perceived prevalence of (inter-group) conflict", "Degree of ethnic and religious tolerance" and others are sensitive for data collection in the context of Kyrgyzstan. However, 3 additional sub-indicators are to be baselined through new projects' baseline studies in the coming period.**
1.1.3	**# workshops on conflict sensitivity, M&E standards, learning and adaptation are carried out.**	**0**	**6**	**3**	**9**	
1.1.4						
1.1.5						

» Output 1.2: The JSC supported for strategic oversight and communication of the PBF portfolio in Kyrgyzstan

1.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.2.1	**# of PBF JSC meetings**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**3**	**Staff turnover at the Presidential Administration. Planned for 2026.**
1.2.2	**# of joint monitoring visits with participation of the JSC members**	**0**	**2**	**Not started**	**Not started**	**Planned for Q1-Q2, as linked to JSC meeting.**
1.2.3	**The level of satisfaction with Secretariat's job among JSC and RUNOs**	**4.55 out of 5 (June 2025) – 11 respondents**	**4 (80%)**	**n/a**	**n/a**	**Was integrated into PBF CPS Workshop evaluation. Additionally this indicator will be measured on JSC meeting.**
1.2.4						
1.2.5						

» Output 1.3:

1.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.3.1						
1.3.2						
1.3.3						
1.3.4						
1.3.5						

» Output 1.4:

1.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.4.1						
1.4.2						
1.4.3						
1.4.4						
1.4.5						

» Output 1.5:

1.5	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
1.5.1						
1.5.2						
1.5.3						
1.5.4						
1.5.5						

» Outcome 2:

OC 2	Outcome Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
2.1						
2.2						
2.3						
2.4						
2.5						

How many outputs does outcome 2 have?
1   2   3   4   5   more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 2

Output 2.1

Output 2.2

Output 2.3

Output 2.4

Output 2.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 2 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

» Output 2.1:

2.1	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.1.1						
2.1.2						
2.1.3						
2.1.4						
2.1.5						

» Output 2.2:

2.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.2.1						
2.2.2						
2.2.3						
2.2.4						
2.2.5						

» Output 2.3:

2.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.3.1						
2.3.2						
2.3.3						
2.3.4						
2.3.5						

» Output 2.4:

2.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
2.4.1						
2.4.2						
2.4.3						
2.4.4						
2.4.5						

» Output 2.5:

2.5	Output Indicators _Describe the indicator_	Indicator Baseline _State the baseline value of the indicator_	End of Project Indicator Target _State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project_	Indicator progress for reporting period _State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period_	Indicator progress since project's start _State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project_	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) _Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant_
2.5.1						
2.5.2						
2.5.3						
2.5.4						
2.5.5						

» Outcome 3:

OC3	Outcome Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
3.1						
3.2						
3.3						
3.4						
3.5						

How many outputs does outcome 3 have?

1   2   3   4   5   more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 3

Output 3.1

Output 3.2

Output 3.3

Output 3.4

Output 3.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 3 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

....

» Output 3.1:

3.1	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.1.1						
3.1.2						
3.1.3						
3.1.4						
3.1.5						

» Output 3.2:

3.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.2.1						
3.2.2						
3.2.3						
3.2.4						
3.2.5						

» Output 3.3:

3.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.3.1						
3.3.2						
3.3.3						
3.3.4						
3.3.5						

» Output 3.4:

3.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.4.1						
3.4.2						
3.4.3						
3.4.4						
3.4.5						

» Output 3.5:

3.5	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
3.5.1						
3.5.2						
3.5.3						
3.5.4						
3.5.5						

» Outcome 4:

OC4	Outcome Indicators	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
4.1						
4.2						
4.3						
4.4						
4.5						

How many outputs does outcome 4 have?

     1   2   3   4   5   more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 4

Output 4.1

Output 4.2

Output 4.3

Output 4.4

Output 4.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 4 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

» Output 4.1:

4.1	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.1.1						
4.1.2						
4.1.3						
4.1.4						
4.1.5						

» Output 4.2:

4.2	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.2.1						
4.2.2						
4.2.3						
4.2.4						
4.2.5						

» Output 4.3:

4.3	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.3.1						
4.3.2						
4.3.3						
4.3.4						
4.3.5						

» Output 4.4:

4.4	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.4.1						
4.4.2						
4.4.3						
4.4.4						
4.4.5						

» Output 4.5:

4.5	Output Indicators *Describe the indicator*	Indicator Baseline *State the baseline value of the indicator*	End of Project Indicator Target *State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project*	Indicator progress for reporting period *State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period*	Indicator progress since project's start *State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project*	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) *Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant*
4.5.1						
4.5.2						
4.5.3						
4.5.4						
4.5.5						

If the project has more than 4 outcomes, use this space to describe progress on progress on indicators for the remaining outcomes *

PART III: Cross-Cutting Issues

Is the project planning any significant events in the next six months? (eg. national dialogues, youth congresses, film screenings, etc.)
If yes, please state how many, and for each, provide the approximate date of the event and a brief description, including its key objectives, target audience and location (if known)

Events	Event Description	Tentative Date	Location	Target Audience	Event Objectives (900 characters)
Event 1	**PBF Joint Steering Committee**	**2026**	**Bishkek**	**National counterparts, RUNOs/NUNOs**	**The objective is to jointly review progress in the implementation of PBF-funded projects and present projects in the pipeline, for feedback and validation, to ensure national ownership.**
Event 2	**Communicating peacebuilding impact workshop for RUNOs and NUNOs**	**December 2025**	**Bishkeke**	**RUNOs and NUNOs**	**To streamline the processes of collecting successes stories, respond to the needs of partners, and communicate the stories in a convincing manner to the PBSO standards and Peacebuilding Community of Practice best practices.**
Event 3					
Event 4					

Human Impact

This section is about the human impact of the project. Please state key stakeholders (including but not limited to: Civil Society Organziations, Beneficiaries, etc.) of the project, and for each, please briefly describe:

i. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implemantation
ii. The impact of the project in their lives
iii. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group
This is an optional question. You may leave it unanswered if not relevant

Human Impact	Type of stakeholder	What has been the impact of the project on their lives?	Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from the stakeholder
1			
2			
3			
4			

In addition to the stakeholder specific impact described above, please use this space to describe any additional human impact that the project has had.
Please limit your response to 4000 characters.

You can also upload upto 3 files in various formats (picture files, powerpoint, pdf, video, etc.) to illustrate the human impact of the project
OPTIONAL

File 1
OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 2
OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 3
OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

You can also add upto 3 links to online resources which illustrate the human impact of the project
OPTIONAL

Link 1
OPTIONAL

Link 2
OPTIONAL

Link 3
OPTIONAL

Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative.

How we worked: *

Please select up to 3.

- [ ] Enhanced digitization
- [ ] Innovative ways of working
- [ ] Mobilized additional resources
- [ ] Improved or initiated policy frameworks
- [x] Strengthened capacities
- [ ] Partnered with with local/grassroots Civil Society Organizations
- [ ] Expanding coalitions & galvanizing political will
- [ ] Strengthened partnerships with IFIs
- [x] Strengthened partnerships with UN Agencies

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Strengthened capacities of RUNOs and NUNOs in CPS agenda, strengthened capacities of RUNOs and NUNOs in conducting outcome harvesting missions]

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

During PDDG, RUNOs/NUNOs meetings, M&E and SRF meetings the joint action to achieve peacebuilding goals was strengthened

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Who are we working with *

- ☐ Strengthened partnerships with IFIs
- ☑ Strengthened partnerships between UN Agencies
- ☑ Partnered with local civil society organizations
- ☐ Partnered with local academia
- ☐ Partnered with sub-national entities
- ☐ Partnered with national entities
- ☑ Partnered with local volunteers

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Through new PBF-funded projects, more UN agencies started to collaborate with each other to achieve project's outcomes contributing to peacebuilding; the UN PBF facilitated lessons learned sharing among youth-focus projects and CPS-focused ones. Cooperation with local CSOs was encouraged by the PBF Secretariat during developing the project proposals: two ongoing projects are implemented in cooperation with CSOs (BIOM and ROI) and one is fully implemented by a CSO (Saferworld). In addition, regular Peacebuilding Hub meetings engage peacebuilding-focused CSOs in joint context and conflict analysis and in the coordination of action. Engaged community youth volunteers in the M&E of Fergana Peace Forum.

Leave No one Behind

Select all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative *

Mandatory

- ☐ Unemployed persons
- ☑ Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.)
- ☐ Indigenous communities
- ☐ Persons with Disabilities
- ☐ Persons affected by violence (including GBV)
- ☑ Women
- ☑ Youth
- ☐ Children
- ☐ Minorities related to sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression
- ☑ People living in and around border areas
- ☐ Persons affected by natural disasters
- ☐ Persons affected by armed conflicts
- ☐ Internally displaced persons, refugees or migrants

PART IV: Monitoring, Evaluation and Compliance

» Monitoring

Please list key monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

1. M&E workshop for RUNOs and RUNOs to confirm each project's contribution to the SRF and collectively set the targets.

2. Deep dive external evaluation mission on Saferworld's "Supporting young people's peacebuilding participation in Kyrgyzstan: integrating a youth-led mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) approach" project

3. Outcome harvesting mission for the Blossoming Aigul project (UN Women, FAO, ROI) to support the development of the project's endline report.

4. Outcome harvesting mission for the "Shared Prosperity" (FAO, UNFPA) project to follow up on the independent evaluation report and collect peacebuilding evidence after more than one year after the completion.

5. Online FGD on Early Warning and Early Response (EWER) System under the completed Inclusive Governance project (UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR)

6. Mid-tern review report on the progress against PBF SRF indicators, identifying best practices, lessons learned and recommendations.

7. KIIs with youth implementations of grant initiatives under the IDEM project (Saferworld).

8. M&E coordination of the Fergana Peace Forum (regional peacebuilding platform).

Do outcome indicators have baselines? *

If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select 'yes'

○ Yes

● No

If yes, please provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available. *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

All expected results have baselines, except for one indicator that measures the level of satisfaction with PBF Secretariat's job among the JSC and RUNOs. This exercise is planned to be held within the framework of the next PBF JSC meeting in September and feedback from RUNOs to capacity-building events organised, such as the CPS workshop.

Elaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon request) *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Reports, meetings minutes, monitoring reports, surveys.

Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys *

***Perception survey is a formal collection of information from a randomly selected sample of respondents through their responses to standardized questions. See PBF Guidance Note for more information** link*

○ Yes

● No

Please provide a brief description *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms? *

Community feedback mechanism, or community-based monitoring, is an organized system for communities of participants to monitor the local effects and impact of an intervention. Ideally, this system empowers the community to express whether their expectations are being met and to provide suggestions to decision-makers for possible (re)focusing. See PBF Guidance Note for more information. *link*

○ Yes

◉ No

Please provide a brief description *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

» Evaluation

Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? *

○ Yes

○ No

◉ Not Applicable

Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: *

Response required

0

If project will end in next six months, is your upcoming evaluation on track?

○ Yes

○ No

◉ Not Applicable

Please describe the preparations

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Contact information	Name	Organization	Job title	Email

Please mention the focal person responsible for sharing the final evaluation report with the PBF:				
....	....	....	....	....

» Catalytic Effect

Catalytic Effect (financial): Has the project mobilized additional non-PBF financial resources since the project's start? *

○ Yes

◉ No

How many funders has the project received additional non-PBF funding from **since the project started**? *

Catalytic Effect (non-financial): Has the project enabled or created a larger or longer-term peacebuilding change to occur, in addition to the direct project changes? Please refer to PBF Catalytic Effect Guidelines for more information. *

○ Yes

◉ No

If yes, please select the relevant option below: *

○ Some catalytic effect

○ Significant catalytic effect

If relevant, please describe how the project has had a (non-financial) catalytic effect, i.e. removed barriers to unblock stalled political, institutional or other peacebuilding processes at different levels in a country, and/or created the conditions to establish new processes to do so *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Sustainability

Please describe any steps that have been taken to ensure the sustainability of peacebuilding gains, including any mechanisms, platforms, networks and socio-economic initiatives supported, beyond the duration of the project *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

As the PBF Secretariat is linked to the PBF investments in the country, its existence depends on the PBF financing, which in this current eligibility cycle ends in 2026. A cost extension supports the PBF Secretariat slightly beyond this period, until June 2027.

Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations?

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Monitoring and Oversight Activities

Please describe any key event related to monitoring and oversight. Please click next if no activities have yet taken place.
Events include Steering Committee meetings, Monitoring visits, Third party monitoring, Community based monitoring, any data collection, Perception or other survey findings, evaluation reports, audit or investigations.

Monitoring and oversight activities	Name of the Event	Summary	Key Findings

Event 1	**Deep dive evaluation mission on the Saferworld's "Supporting young people's peacebuilding participation in Kyrgyzstan: integrating a youth-led mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) approach" project**	**Mission's dates: 25 – 28 February 2025** **Visited locations: Osh, Nookat, Kyzyl-Kiya, Batken, Bishkek** **The objective of the mission: to support independent evaluator Mazen Chouaib and collect the evidence of peacebuilding impact after about a year of project's completion.**	**• MHPSS interventions alone are not enough for achieving peacebuilding results. MHPSS proved to be efficient to overcome the barriers that prevent youth from participating in civic life. However, additional interventions allowing these youth to take on the active role in the society and channel these achievement into community action remained insufficient.** **• The trainings provided by Saferworld and other partners, either did not adequately integrate MHPSS with peacebuilding, or this connection was entirely lost during implementation. Neither mentors, partners, nor participants identified peacebuilding as a programme goal. This is why it is important to communicate clearly the theory of change for all IP s and beneficiaries.** **• The project revealed a gender imbalance, with significantly more female than male participants. Cultural stigmas around mental health, financial pressures, and the predominance of female mentors discouraged male engagement. Some men dropped out due to discomfort discussing personal issues in mixed-gender settings. However, their interest in public discussions suggests the need for gender-sensitive strategies, including separate support groups, targeted content, and male mentors.** **• The project was widely valued, with strong**

			demand to sustain self-support groups. However, sustainability faced challenges due to limited government support, high mentor turnover, lack of tools, and restrictive laws limiting civil society engagement. Notable success in Nookat showed that strong local leadership and collaboration can foster sustainability. In contrast, formal affiliations alone, as seen in Batken, did not ensure continuation. Project beneficiaries and stakeholders recommended stronger national and local government involvement, including institutionalizing self-support groups and organizing multi-stakeholder roundtables to explore sustainable models.

| Event 2 | Outcome harvesting mission on the Blossoming Aigul project (UN Women, FAO, ROI) | Mission Report: March 31 – April 3, 2025

Location: Batken Region, Kyrgyzstan

Objective: to support the data collection for the project's Endline report. | • 44 women were elected in local councils. Their success formula included structural change at the local level, with the introduction of 30% gender quotas, and targeted project interventions, especially those on design thinking, achieving dreams, and community consultation, in addition to natural leadership skills.
• Community engagement and consultation for the development of local socio-economic plans increased trust between community and local authorities and resulted in catalytic financial contributions from the local governments to support local development initiatives.
• Climate-smart technologies can fully eliminate local conflicts. For example, drip irrigation and water reservoirs whatsolved the conflicts over water management in one community. However, if applied in the area where water-induced conflicts were not the case in the past, it is harder to identify peacebuilding results.
• Economic cooperation (such as growing hydroponics) in multi-ethnic communities strengthens intergroup trust and tolerance.
• Some grant initiatives do not explicitly prioritize peacebuilding as a core objective and, despite their potential, fail to demonstrate tangible peacebuilding outcomes or wider community-level impact. Stronger oversight and clearer guidance are |

			recommended at the reviewing proposals stage.

| Event 3 | Outcome harvesting mission on the Shared Prosperity project (FAO, UNFPA) | **Locations Visited: Aksy, Alabuka, and Aravan rayons**

Travel Dates: 27 April – 1 May 2025

The exercise focused on two primary themes: strengthening trust and cooperation between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, and promoting climate-smart technologies to enhance climate resilience.
The recent independent evaluation (March 2025) noted the evaluators' inability to confirm an increase in trust, citing inconsistencies in the M&E system. It also recommended further follow-up on the long-term impact of climate resilience initiatives. Additionally, the evaluation concluded that Output 4—focused on enhancing the capacity of local authorities for cross-border cooperation—had limited impact, but it did not explore the underlying reasons. The OH exercise aimed to address these gaps. | **• An increase in trust between communities in Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan was confirmed through OH. Cross-border economic cooperation among members of Self-Help Groups (SHGs) strengthened this trust. External factors such as the reopening of cross-border points also enhanced collaboration, particularly in trade and interpersonal relationships.**
• The contribution of climate-smart technologies to conflict prevention and long-term resilience was evident, though limitedW. Not all technologies targeted climate issues/drivers of conflict (e.g., Bio-humus contributes to food security but it was not a conflict driver). Furthermore, participants initially struggled to link these interventions to peacebuilding. However, prolonged OH discussions revealed improved resource use and climate adaptation outcomes as a result of the integration of climate-smart technologies.
• Interviews with local actors indicated a moderate improvement in cross-border trust and interaction, especially at grassroots and informal levels. Outside the scope of the project, cooperation continued in areas such as border demarcation, water and pasture management, and the organization of joint social and cultural events. Despite persisting challenges, interactions |

			between local authorities tended to be spontaneous rather than strategically planned or institutionalized. • Self-Help Groups demonstrated unique sustainability results and remained ones of the main local collaboration platforms between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. However, further opportunity to build on these connections is limited by the lack of economic cooperation agreement between two countries and complicated customs procedures for small-scale businesses.
Event 4	**FGD on Early Warning and Early Response (EWER) System under the Inclusive Governance project (UNDP, UNICEF, OHCHR)**	**Date: 14.05.2025** **Participants: Executive Secretaries of the Public Reception Centers at district and local levels; and Mr. Iskender Eshimbekov, Head of Interethnic Relations Department of the Ministry of Culture, Information and Youth Policy (later moved to the reformed National Agency for Religious Affairs and Interethnic Relations under the President of the Kyrgyz Republic**	**• The project did not establish the EWER system but strengthened it mainly through Kyrgyz Jarany concept which is still being applied for awareness raising events during inter-ethnic incidents.**

Event 5	**KIIs at the Youth Peacebuilding Initiatives presentation event**	**Date: 16.09.2025** **Participants: 4 youth grantees under IDEM project (Saferworld).**	**These young people's understanding of peacebuilding is authentic and deeply connected to local realities. This authenticity is a strength, ensuring that peacebuilding remains context-driven and people-centered rather than externally imposed. However, to maximize impact, these individual and community-level achievements and understandings must be connected to broader, systemic peacebuilding knowledge. It was therefore recommended to organize a dedicated training on peacebuilding and understanding youth's contribution in it.**

Event 6	**Fergana Peace Forum M&E Coordination**	**15-16.10.2025** **Fergana, Uzbekistan**	**• The Forum was widely viewed as strategically valuable, strengthening regional cooperation, trust building and shared commitment to peace and climate resilience across the Fergana Valley.** **• Participants consistently requested improvements in format, including better time management, more interactive small-group discussions, stronger moderation, fewer long presentations and greater inclusion of youth, women and rural voices.** **• Cross-border themes such as water governance, climate adaptation, youth engagement and private sector contributions were identified as central entry points for sustaining peace, with strong demand for practical examples and co-creation of concrete actions.**
Event 7			
Event 8			

Final Steps

- Please save a PDF copy of the form by clicking on the *Printer* icon on the top right corner of the page.
- A dialogue box will appear: Please select the A4 size and portrait orientation.
- Click "prepare" and save the document as a PDF.
- (If on first attempt, the generated page is not readable, close the pop up page and go back to the first page of the online form using the "Return to Beginning" option and try to print the PDF version from there)
- After printing the PDF version, please submit the report in the last page of the form. You can use the "Go to End" button in the bottom right corner.
- In compliance with our reporting requirements, **please upload the PDF version of the report as well as your *financial report in excel format* to the MPTF-O Gateway.**

If you encounter any difficulty in filling the form or generating the print-out for MPTFO Gateway, please contact Gabriel Velastegui gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org

Thank You. You have finished the report. Please Click on the SUBMIT button below. When the report is submitted, a confirmation note will appear on a yellow banner on top of the page. This can take a few seconds.