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**COUNTRY:** Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan

**TYPE OF REPORT: SEMI-ANNUAL, ANNUAL OR FINAL** Semi-Annual Report
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** Cross-border Cooperation for Sustainable Peace and Development  **Project Number from MPTF-O Gateway:** 00097384 and 00097385 | |
| **PBF project modality:**  ☐ IRF  ☐ PRF | **If funding is disbursed into a national or regional trust fund:**  ☐ Country Trust Fund  ☐ Regional Trust Fund  **Name of Recipient Fund:** |
| **List all direct project recipient organizations (starting with Convening Agency), followed type of organization (UN, CSO etc):**  UNDP Tajikistan, UNDP Kyrgyzstan, UNICEF Tajikistan, UNICEF Kyrgyzstan, WFP Tajikistan, WFP Kyrgyzstan, FAO Tajikistan, FAO Kyrgyzstan, UN Women Tajikistan, UN Women Kyrgyzstan (All UN)  **List additional implementing partners, Governmental and non-Governmental:**  Tajikistan: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Tajikistan (Co-chair of the Steering Committee), State Border Service, Office of Ombudsman, districts administration (local authoriees), Ministry of Education and Science, Committee on Youth Affairs and Sport, and Committee of Women and Family Affairs under the Government of Tajikistan, local NGOs  Kyrgyzstan: Office of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic (Co-chair of the PBF Steering Committee), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Kyrgyzstan, Office of the Vice Prime Minister, LSGs, State border service, Ombudsman, Ministry of Education and Science, State Agency for LSG and Interethnic Relations, State Agency for Youth and Physical Training | |
| **Project commencement date[[1]](#footnote-0):**  First phase: 10 December 2015 (TJ), 11 December 2015 (KG)  Second phase: 13 April 2018 (TJ); 30 April 2018 (KG)  **Project duration in months:[[2]](#footnote-1)** 18 | |
| **Does the project fall under one of the specific PBF priority windows below:**  ☐ 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):**  UNICEF Tajikistan $200,000  UNICEF Kyrgyzstan $ 170,000  WFP Tajikistan $200,000  WFP Kyrgyzstan $170,000  UN Women Tajikistan: $ 100,000  UN Women Kyrgyzstan: $ 140,000  FAO Tajikistan: $ 130,000  FAO Kyrgyzstan: $150,000  UNDP Tajikistan: $370,000  UNDP Kyrgyzstan: $ 370,000  :$        : $        : $        : $  Total: USD 2,000,000  *\*The overall approved budget and the release of the second and any subsequent tranche are conditional and subject to PBSO’s approval and subject to availability of funds in the PBF account*  **How many tranches have been received so far:** 1 | |
| **Report preparation:**  Project report prepared by: All RUNOs with the contribution of PDA  Project report approved by: UN RC a.i. in TJ, and UN RC in KG  Did PBF Secretariat clear the report:  Any comments from PBF Secretariat on the report:  Has the project undertaken any evaluation exercises? Please specify and attach: The lessons learnt exercise (LLE) was conducted in October-November 2017 by an independent expert seconded by the PeaceNexus Foundation. The LLE aimed to review results of the first phase of the project (December 2015-December 2017), as well as analyse relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project, including analysis of peacebuilding dividends of each intervention. The report of lessons learnt exercise was used to formulate and revise strategies for the second phase of the project. In addition, the internal lessons learnt exercise was conducted by the team, and finalized in July 2017. | |

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

* *Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general / common language.*
* *Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.*
* *Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.*

**PART 1: RESULTS PROGRESS**

* 1. **Overall project progress to date**

Briefly explain the **status of the project** in terms of its implementation cycle, including whether all preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (1500 character limit):

The project is off track. Only in-country activities and some cross-border activities were implemented in both countries.

In-country activities are implemented in Tajikistan since August 2018, most of them carried out according to the Workplan timeline. In-country activities in Kyrgyzstan are implemented since 2019 with delay in several areas.

Further implementation of infrastructure activities is pending the full approval of the workplan, directly related to the ramifications of a lingering dispute under active resolution by the UN through intense cooperation with the two governments. The Workplan has been approved by Tajikistan and negotiations are progressing very positively in Kyrgyzstan. UN RC and UNDP in Kyrgyzstan held regular consultations with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, other relevant authorities at all levels, RUNOs to facilitate the approval the Project's Work Plan (WP) by the KG Government. There has been a notable progress in recent WP approval talks, and the decision by the KG Gov is expected in coming weeks. TJ government is informed.

UNDP teams from Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan held a workshop to discuss mitigation measures in Batken on 13 March 2019. The way forward for completing the project is proposed below in description of measures to address the project status.

Given the recent/current political/peacebuilding/ transition situation/ needs in the country, has the project been/ does it continue to be **relevant** and well placed to address potential conflict factors/ sources of tensions/ risks to country’s sustaining peace progress? Please illustrate. If project is still ongoing, are any adjustments required? (1500 character limit)

The project remains highly relevant and appreciated by the two governments, as it has been demonstrated to contribute directly to a reduction in incidences of cross-border conflict. Conflict risk in the project clusters remains high, due to yet incomplete process of border demarcation and delimitation, which continues to trigger incidents around natural resources, border crossing and other. 40 incidents were registered between January 2018-May 2019, majority (26) related to land disputes, just in Jan-June 2019 13 incidents were registered. Fire arms were used by Border Guards in three incidents (warning shots). One incident (in March 2019) resulted in 2 people killed and 20 people injured. The project remains crucial to prevent the risk of violence escalation, and works in most at-risk areas of Tajik-Kyrgyz border. In situation of heightened tensions, continuation of positive UN interventions is especially important.

As most conflict incidents take place around natural resources (aggravated by mistrust), the project is well placed to mitigate some risks around natural resources distribution (water, pastures) and to bring people (especially young people and women) from both countries in joint actions to build confidence. The project works at community level, without contributing to the political processes of delimitation, since governments - so far - have not expressed interest in UN's involvement into the process.

In a few sentences, summarize **what is unique/ innovative/ interesting** about what this project is trying/ has tried to achieve or its approach (rather than listing activity progress) (1500 character limit).

The cross-border project is unique due to the approaches used, such as: conflict sensitive and bottom-up approach ensuring involvement of border residents and authorities in project implementation; providing a platfrom for dialogue to prevent rumors and misinterpretation and promote understanding and cooperation; addressing root causes (water, lack of social infrastructure, and education, border crossing etc.) and multiple stakeholders involvement (youth, women, water users, duty bearers etc.); consolidating efforts of five UN agencies on each side of the border; ensuring Governments'ownership and involvement.

The new approach UPSHIFT has been used within this project that gives essential peacebuilding competencies to young people to analyze the situation of their communities and look for innovative ideas to solve problems at local level with involvement of duty-bearers.

Considering the project’s implementation cycle, please **rate this project’s overall progress towards results to date**:

In a few sentences summarize **major project peacebuilding progress/results** (with evidence), which PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

The key peacebuilding progress in the reported period is achieved through strengthening tolerance and peacebuilding competencies and skills among border population.

The project among others, enhanced engagement of women in peacebuilding, as proactive agents of change by supporting the establishment of the Association of Women Peace-makers stronger pro-peace community engagement. 36 women-led self-help groups (SHGs) were formed across Batken province of KG, reaching to 210 women from targeted village clusters. Women from SHGs strengthened their capacity on efficient natural resource management, including land and water resources.

Empowerment of youth remains a critical tool to strengthen tolerance and peaceful dialogue in border areas. 343 Tajik young people (44% women), 206 adolescents developed their peacebuilding competencies to advocate for peaceful relations with neighbour communities and promote peaceful attitude in their communities. 6 innovative ideas for peacebuilding were developed by adolescents of KG & TJ. 22 young people from both countries attended a media camp and jointly developed 10 advocacy videos.

To foster the confidence building, 40 representatives of border service, police and other security structures were trained on human rights-based approach to resolve border conflicts in Isfara and B.Gafurov district (Tajikistan).

In a few sentences, explain how the project has made **real human impact**, that is, how did it affect the lives of any people in the country – where possible, use direct quotes that PBSO can use in public communications to highlight the project (1500 character limit):

Majority of women activists acknowledged they had capacity and willingness to participate in peacebuilding efforts, and they received access to facilities and resources to voice the concerns and recommendations in decision-making.

The established demonstration fields on drip irrigation systems increase communities' interest, knoweledge and skills on using water saving technologies and development of fruit gardening - and contribute to reduced pressure on water resources in border areas. One family in KG changed their migration plans and decided stay in the country to deal with fruit gardening on dry lands using drip irrigation systems.

60 Kyrgyz and Tajik adolescents worked together during 4 days to develop solutions for tolerance building in their communities within the UPSHIFT social innovation programme.

If the project progress assessment is **on-track**, please explain what the key **challenges** (if any) have been and which measures were taken to address them (1500 character limit).

Off-track

The key obstacle to project implementation has been the hesitation of the government of Kyrgyzstan to endorse the Workplan, triggered by the ramifications of project sensitivities. The delay poses the following challenges:

1) Time left to carry out infrastructure activities will be sufficient only with a project extension.

2) Failure to deliver results and follow through on commitments may pose a reputational risk to the UN in both countries.

3) Situation in targeted clusters deteriorated in March 2019; implementation of infrastructure works under heightened tension may represent higher risks. Less risky interventions need to be considered.

Following UN consultations at multiple levels, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kyrgyz Republic has recently expressed strong support for the implementation of PBF-supported cross-border programme and indicated that he will take the process of necessary review and approval of the joint work plan under his direct control. He also indicated that the Government will work with regional authorities on the timely advancement of activities, with due appreciation for time constraints. Anticipating a positive response within August 2019, the project will require a no-cost extension to complete envisaged infrastructure activities which cannot be fully completed by the October time frame, and therefore justifies a programme extension of 6 months. Not extending the programme would have severe negative impact for UN in both countries.

If the assessment is **off-track**, please list main reasons/ **challenges** and explain what impact this has had/will have on project duration or strategy and what **measures** have been taken/ will be taken to address the challenges/ rectify project progress (1500 character limit):

It is expected that the Government of Kyrgyz Republic will approve the work plan which is focused on infrastructure activities on both sides. In the event some activities cannot be agreed as proposed, the two UNCTs will cooperate to refocus those activities to enhance equipment to generate peacebuilding dividends and reducing risks associated with the infrastructure interventions, in consultation with respective governments. Pastures will remain an area of intervention in Tajikistan, implemented with special sensitivity considerations (not as a cross-border activity).

Project extension is required until April 2020, for proper adjustment of the project activities and timely implementation, especially considering seasonality/weather conditions for all interventions.

Please attach as a separate document(s) any materials highlighting or providing more evidence for project progress (for example: publications, photos, videos, monitoring reports, evaluation reports etc.). List below what has been attached to the report, including purpose and audience.

* 1. **Result progress by project outcome**

*The space in the template allows for up to four project outcomes. If your project has more approved outcomes, contact PBSO for template modification.*

**Outcome 1:** Cooperation and trust between communities increased to mitigate risks of renewed violence

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

**Progress summary:** *Describe main progress under this Outcome made during the reporting period (for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-November; for final reports: full project duration), including major output progress (not all 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. Where possible, provide specific examples of change the project has supported/ contributed to as well as, where available and relevant, quotes from partners or beneficiaries about the project and their experience. (3000 character limit)?*

TJ: Legal consultations were provided by Ombudsman's Office to 419 border residents (54% women), 22 complaints registered, 3 of them submitted to border service of RT.

6 in-country consultations conducted (172 people, 34% women) to develop the priority list of infrastructure projects.

The pasture management issue discussed with TJ Government and pasture users; joint visits conducted. The topographical surveys conducted for rehabilitation of the alternative non-contested pasture areas in TJ.

7 Water users associations were provided with equipment and trainings. Installation of remote transmitters to distantly measure water flow in irrigation canals and simultaneously provide data to both communities for monitoring as well as development of electronic water distribution plan was initiated.

Youth Conference (128 people) on business & innovations was held. 21 business ideas were developed.

200 adolescents were trained on peacebuilding, 700 adolescents & youth took part in UPSHIFT social innovation programme, incl.34 adolescents from KG. 6 innovation solutions were produced by TJ & KG adolescents to build tolerance and intercommunal collaboration. 1052 adolescents raised their awareness and received access to youth-friendly health services, incl. psychological support.

243 women were trained on conflict analysis, negotiations & mediation of disputes on NRM, gender equality and women’s role in peacebuilding. 5 women’s business initiatives were supported. 66 women received food for training assistance.

KG: In-country consultations with representatives of local self-government bodies and local leaders conducted. A list of infrastructure projects developed.

An action plan signed with the Ombudsman Office.

Activities carried out on efficient use of water resources in Batken and Leilek districts. 5 demonstration fields of drip irrigation system created. 3125 seedlings of fruit trees were planted. Installed 5 tanks, 10 672 meters of pipes and other equipment for drip irrigation. Trainings conducted for 119 border residents (46% women), 36 young people under 30 years and 12 farmers from border villages of TJ. Video materials and other publications for water users and WUAs released. Software programs on water management are installed in all border WUAs and staff trained. Short-term practical courses on gardening and agrotechnology of vegetables growing provided for 220 young women and men from project villages, participants attended training program on drip irrigation conducted by trained farmers.

30 LSG rep-s from target municipalities in Batken strengthened their skills on Gender-Responsive Budgeting and Programming (GRBP) and implementing e-governance tool "Aimak". 36 women SHGs were formed across Batken with 210 members trained in NRM.

3 out of planned 4 joint activities with TJ conducted with participation of 340 participants from both countries (65%): Media camp, Global Youth Service Day, Trainings of UPSHIFT & peacebuilding competencies of youth.

**Outcome 2:** n/a

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

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

**Outcome 3:** n/a

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

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

**Outcome 4:** n/a

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

**Progress summary:** *(see guiding questions under Outcome 1)*

* 1. **Cross-cutting issues**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **National ownership:** How has the national government demonstrated ownership/ commitment to the project results and activities? Give specific examples. (1500 character limit) | The national ownership is ensured through several mechanisms. At national level, the project strategy and its workplan are approved by the multiagency Steering Committee (led by the Government and co-chaired by the UNRC). The Government in both countries closely monitors the project progress and results. The focal points in the Government are being consulted and informed about project status on a regular basis.  The national partner of the UN Women - Committee of Women and Family Affairs under the Government - expressed the willingness and commitment to develop the 2nd NAP 1325 for 2019-2022. The plan is fuelled by the practical recommendations and existent lessons learnt of women leaders and activists who actively participated in the process of conflict resolution. The project aligns itself to various government strategies and action plans, including e.g. National Development Strategy, Water Strategies, Youth Strategies etc. The Government acknowledges the unique methodology of project implementation and its conflict-prevention focus. |
| **Monitoring:** Is the project M&E plan on track? What monitoring methods and sources of evidence are being/ have been used? Please attach any monitoring-related reports for the reporting period. *(1500 character limit)?* | The detailed M&E plan for Phase 2 has been discussed and drafted during the Coordination meeting on 16-17 May 2018.  UNDP continues monitoring of situation in target areas through its field monitors.  UNICEF TJ has developed internal monitoring system to track project results at activity and output levels. The data collected through this system will contribute to the larger project M&E system. WFP has developed and introduced the Conflict-Sensitivity, Gender and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist to address the recommendations of the Lesson Learned Exercise. The purpose of the checklist is to enhance positive peacebuilding, gender and environmental opportunities as well as ensure that adverse risks and impacts are avoided, minimized, and mitigated in WFP interventions. The data for WFP Checklist will be collected using mobile tools. |
| **Evaluation:** Provide an update on the preparations for the external evaluation for the project, especially if within last 6 months of implementation or final report. Confirm available budget for evaluation. *(1500 character limit)* | By the end of first phase of project the midline survey was conducted in both side of border to analyse changes in people's beliefs, trust and perception of neighbours. The findings of survey informed the strategies and approaches of the second phase of the project.  External evaluation in the form of Lessons Learnt Exercise was conducted by an International Consultant from Peace Nexus in October-November 2017. The report was shared with PBSO. The second phase of the project integrates recommendations of the LLE exercise |
| **Catalytic effects (financial):** Did the project lead to any specific non-PBF funding commitments? If yes, from whom and how much? If not, have any specific attempts been made to attract additional financial contributions to the project and beyond? *(1500 character limit)* | UNDP is negotiating the new intervention with SDC to address natural resource management issues in border areas through conflict-sensitive and human-rights based approach. The SDC scoping mission to project site is planned in the end of June 2019. SDC is interested in the long-term program with evident development impact on the lifes of cross-border communities. |
| **Catalytic effects (non-financial):** Did the project create favourable conditions for additional peacebuilding activities by Government/ other donors? If yes, please specify. *(1500 character limit)* | Many of implemented initiatives of the project serve as an example and a guide for local communities and LSGs. For example, projects on streets lighting, concreting inland water canals, sports and cultural events between border communities independently carried out by the efforts of the local communities themselves. Several Youth Contact Groups and women's social initiatives supported in Phase 1 continue activities independently, e.g. cultural visits, sport events and craftwork exchange of experience, etc. Besides, there is a mutual memorundum of understanding between cross-border village clusters at municipal level that promotes cross-border cultural visits, for instance the celebration of River Day. Peacebuilding competency curriculum that has been developed within the PBF project has a potential for catalytic effect for broader competency building among adolescents and youth in the country with the focus on peacebuilding. |
| **Exit strategy/ sustainability:** What steps have been taken to prepare for end of project and help ensure sustainability of the project results beyond PBF support for this project? *(1500 character limit)* | To ensure sustainability of introduced methodology the project is focusing on promoting the leading role of local state structures on its practical application. For this purpose in-country consultations to develop the priority local initiatives/sub-projects (“soft” and “hard”) were made under the leadership of district administration which facilitated the multi-steps meeting with border residents and further ensured their implementation with wider communities’ participation.  Building strong ties between the established community based Youth Contact Groups (YCG) and Department of Youth Affairs at the level of district administration was ensured through supplement of Department’s Plan of Action, Introduction of YCG at district level and support of Dialogue meetings of youth with the representatives of tax, investment department and district administration where the facilitation role was done by the youth department.  Sustainability of the capacitated women leaders ensured by establishing a Regional Association of women peacebuilders to network and collaborate by exchange of knowledge and experience on women's empowerment in peacebuilding.  It is unticipated that capacity building of WUAs will improve their work. Demo-fields of drip irrigation systems ensure sustainability in the post-project period through provision of consultation by farmers to farmers. |
| **Risk taking:** Describe how the project has responded to risks that threatened the achievement of results. Identify any new risks that have emerged since the last report. *(1500 character limit)* | Considering that project WP is not approved by the Government of Kyrgyzstan, the infrastructure related and cross-border activities are not commenced in order to prevent possible risks of disbalance of international support in target border area.  The project continues monitoring of conflict risks through TRACTION. The intensity and participation of law enforcement in incidents creates higher risks of further escalation. In March 2019 an incident occurred between Vorukh and Aksay residents with the involvement of Border guards on which 2 people were killed. The agreement made by sides didn't content parties entirely and left the level of tension considerably high. |
| **Gender equality:** In the reporting period, which activities have taken place with a specific focus on addressing issues of gender equality or women’s empowerment? *(1500 character limit)* | During the Coordination meeting on 20-21 November 2019, the Gender Mainstreaming Stategy of the project was endorsed, outlining specific measures RUNOs should introduce to ensure embedding of gender mainstremaing mechanisms in all cycles of the project implementation.  In KG 36 SHGs were created to empower over 210 women and train them on sustainable and green enterpreneurship and efficient natural resource management.  In TJ, the FFT modality along with the trainings and provision of equipment were used to enhance women participation. 66 women benefited from the women focused income generating support.  The FFT assistance is considered as an investment in supporting women’s life condition and rights, testing a more focused and better-resourced income-generating activities for catalysing and sustaining gender equality efforts.  Specific trainings were provided for women leaders to increase their knowledge and potential to serve as advocates and in partnership with local authorities to promote rights and interests of women and girls in communities. They carried out local actions to coincide with the theme of 16 Days of Activism to stop VAW.  Efforts were made to create required conditions for qualitative participation of qirls and young women in all youth related activites. |
| **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)* |  |

**1.3 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** | **Current indicator progress** | **Reasons for Variance/ Delay**  **(if any)** | **Adjustment of target (if any)** |
| **Outcome 1**  Cooperation and trust between communities increased to mitigate risks of renewed violence | Indicator 1.1  a: % of community members from the 6 pilot village clusters who indicate an improvement in cross-border relations/cooperation with community members in the same village cluster on the other side of the border (disaggregated by gender, age, villa | a) 35% of respondents described their relations with neighbors as bad/open conflict.  b) 60% of respondents think that relations will not be improved (data disaggregated by nationality, gender and age is available) | 10% increase over baseline | KG: score 4.5/5 (scales: 1-open conflict; 5-close cooperation) = 90%  TJ: a) 25.5% increase:  87.6% of respondents described their relations as neutral or friendly (BS:62.15%)  b) 19% increase - 68.4% of respondents indicated that relations are good and will improve quickly/slowly (BS:49.3%) |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2  b: # of violent incidents in pilot cluster is decreased | Kyrgyz Republic – 32 in 2015  Republic of Tajikistan - 26 incident cases in 2015 | 20% decrease over baseline | 13 incidents reported for Jan- June 10, 2019 - 19% decrease  in compare with the same period of 2015  (uniform 2015 baseline based on TRACTION) |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3  c: % of community members from the 6 pilot cross-border village clusters who would be ready to work together with community members in the same village cluster on the other side of the border to improve the lives of cross-border communities o n both | 37% of respondents do not want even to work with the neighbors and 74% do not accept keenship relations (data disaggregated by nationality, gender and age is available) | 10% increase over baseline | 49% of respondents in KG and 88.3% in RT who are fully or partially willing to cooperate with representatives of the neighboring village to resolve personal or social problems. |  |  |
| Output 1.1  Improved linkages and cooperation between security providers, local authorities and communities to reduce violent incidents | Indicator 1.1.1  Number of interventions/ activities/ preventive actions that were implemented by security providers, local authorities and communities on one side of the border in the 6 pilot cross-border village clusters to improve information exchange and pr | 94 events in KG and TJ (in the Phase 1 by December 2017; the target was 8) | At least 20 (10 in TJ and 10 in KG) interventions/ activities/ preventive actions that were jointly implemented by security providers, local authorities and communities on one side of the border in the 6 pilot cross-border village clusters to improve information exchange and prevent security incide | 2 events at district and 5 at jamoat level are conducted in Tajikistan.  Handbook on cross-border rules that will be used for awareness raising on crossing the border among adolescents, teachers and community members has been revised. |  |  |
| Indicator 1.1.2  1.1.3 Number of problem solving and complaints mechanisms – PSCM, (either cross-border or on one side of the border) established/improved that bring security providers, local authorities and communities together to address community grievances and re | 4 (2 in each country) (by December 2017) | Maintain and improve 4 existing problem solving and complaints mechanisms - 2 in TJ and 2 in KG (either cross-border or on one side of the border) | 2 mechanisms established within the 1st phase of project in TJ are functioning. In 2019  Office of Ombudsman in RT registered 22 grievances of border residents.  Through partnership with CSO "Legal initiative" and Ombudsman office complaint mechanism is improved and awareness raised about it. |  |  |
| Output 1.2  Communities restore cross-border linkages and trust by jointly addressing interdependent needs/ challenges associated with community infrastructure and natural resources, as well as by establishing platforms of confidence-building and cooperation between various societal groups | Indicator 1.2.1  Number of projects that were agreed by communities from both sides of the pilot cross-border village clusters and to address interdependent needs/ challenges associated with community infrastructure (with information on how many of those were i | 83 \* projects implemented in RT and KR, according to AR (\*projects financed both by IRF and SDC) | 20 projects (10 TJ, 10 KG) jointly agreed/implemented by communities from both sides | 0  Presently, the foundation for the dialogue process within community and intercommunity dialogue on identification of projects addressing interdependent needs/challenges associated with community infrastructure is being established |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2.2  Number of youth (disaggregated data for young men/ boys and young women/ girls) that benefitted from training/ support or participated in; a) cross-border joint youth events, and b) in-country youth events that aim to promote inter-ethnic toler | a) 7,293 b) 7,311 | a) 1000 (500 from TJ and 500 from KG) b) 800 (400 from TJ and 400 from KG) (segregated data for young men/ boys and young women/ girls) that benefitted from training/ support or participated in joint cross-border youth events in pilot cross-border village clusters | TJ: a) 50 adolescents from TJ;  b) 833 (627 youth and 206 adolescents).  In addition, about 700 adolescents improved their skills for 21st century through UPSHIFT social innovation programme;  KG: a) 100 young people from KG overall 345 young people have participated in joint trainings. |  |  |
| Output 1.3 | Indicator 1.3.1  Indicator 1.2.3: Number of joint cross-border initiatives responding to specific gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) issues are implemented by women activists | 7 social and business initiatives | At least 4 cross-border women’s initiatives (small projects) implemented by women | 5 women small-scale business initiatives are supported jointly by WFP and UNWOMEN to improve the economic security of vulberable women in 4 village clusters |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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 |  |  |  |  |  |

**PART 2: INDICATIVE PROJECT FINANCIAL PROGRESS**

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

Please rate whether project financial expenditures are on track, delayed, or off track, vis-à-vis project plans and by recipient organization:

How many project budget tranches have been received to date and what is the overall level of expenditure against the total budget and against the tranche(s) received so far (500 characters limit):

Budget:

Total received: 2mln$ Expenditure: $996,720 (50%)

TJ: received $1,000,000.00 Expenditure: $536,045 (54%)

KG: received $1,000,000 Expenditure: expenditure: $460,675 (46%)

When do you expect to seek the next tranche, if any tranches are outstanding:

N/a

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

Please state what $ amount was planned (in the project document) to be allocated to activities focussed on gender equality or women’s empowerment and how much has been actually allocated to date: In project document, up to 30% of project budget is aimed to be allocated for gender mainstreaming activities, following the guidliness of the PBSO. To date, the TJ UN Women spent $99,882.68 (with $117.32 leftover) for activities focused on GEWE.

Please fill out and attach Annex A on project financial progress **with detail on expenditures/ commitments to date using the original project budget table in Excel**, even though the $ amounts are indicative only.

1. Note: commencement date will be the date of first funds transfer. [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. Maximum project duration for IRF projects is 18 months, for PRF projects – 36 months. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)