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Executive Summary

In June 2011 DCA Kyrgyzstan commissioned an end-of-programme evaluation to assess its Access to Basic Services programme in relation to its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and implementation. The overall conclusion of the evaluation team is that the DCA programme has contributed positively to promoting access to basic services for poor population groups, both in terms of providing immediate solutions and changing legislation preventing migrants from accessing education, health services and social services.

Relevance
The ABS programme approach has been to encourage partners to work together and strengthen capacity for strategic advocacy around the residence-based registration system (propiska). The target group has included internal migrants, the elderly and children in difficult circumstances. The evaluation team considers the programme approach, focus, target groups and geographic areas to be relevant to the Central Asian context. The stated objectives of challenging legal frameworks to increase access to basic services, empowering communities and strengthening partner organizations also remain relevant.

Effectiveness & Efficiency
The programme has been effective as well as efficient, particularly taking into account its short lifetime and the fact that 2010 mainly was devoted to responding to the humanitarian crisis in Osh and other post-crisis initiatives after the April 2010 revolution. The self-help group approach appears highly efficient at addressing community needs. The ability of the partner platform to articulate the humanitarian implications of the system and create political understanding for the need for change, both at national and international level, is also remarkable. The one exception is the failure to maximize the results of the studies on the impact of propiska, both in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. While due in part to the 2010 events, the absence of a strategic plan to use the findings to fuel a campaign suggests scope for strengthening the effectiveness of the programme’s advocacy component.

The evaluation team learned of numerous examples of impact of the self-help groups and advocacy work, although these are not described adequately in the project and programme reports. DCA should pay more attention to its own monitoring and to the quality of reporting of partners to trace outcomes and adjust approaches according to lessons learned. The current quality of available information about partners renders a disservice to DCA.

Impact - Advocacy Capacity
Since the programme inception, DCA has worked to increase advocacy capacity of its partners. These have been exposed to advocacy training and DCA has facilitated their participation high-level meetings at the EU Commission and Parliament. The result is a partner platform with a clear concept of advocacy, confident that they can make a difference and a proven track record that this is the case. Yet, with the widespread recognition among decision makers of the need to revise the current propiska system, it is time to change the approach. The absence of an advocacy strategy and a clear understanding of how the registration system work and which planning needs it fulfils in key sectors such as education, health and social security, is a liability in this respect. For DCA and the partner platform to maintain the lead on the propiska campaign, the function of the system and the planning needs for each sector should be documented, accompanied by sound policy proposals and a menu of options for civil society to participate in moving away from the propiska system. The absence of this technical understanding and clarity on next steps presents an obstacle to continued advocacy by civil society on this issue as there is no clarity, let alone consensus, about what they want outside of getting rid of the current residency requirement.
Impact - Empowerment

The examples of empowerment and community action under this programme – although observed at a distance - impressed the evaluation team. There are indications that the SHGs are considerably active on their own and that Kyrgyzstan could be a model of generating social capital. The examples that are taking place under the ABS programme are being lost because they are not looked at carefully enough and shared within the country and without. They deserve more attention.

DCA and its partners find it difficult to engage men in the self-help groups. However, in a society witnessing massive waves of migration and unemployment, Kyrgyz men risk being disconnected from the family setting. Yet, there are occasional examples of self-help groups that do meet the needs and interests of men. The evaluation team recommends that the future programme devise strategies for the inclusion of men in relationships of cooperation with other men (and women) in their community.

Impact - Public Discourse

It is clear from discussion and activities currently taking place on the topic of propiska in the country that the issue has been put on the public agenda and that DCA has contributed significantly to this turn of events. Across the board, partners report that local authorities recognize the negative impact and discriminatory character of the current propiska system. Failure to monitor the media from the start can be considered a shortcoming of the programme because it is a rare case when one can say that nobody was working on an issue, interventions were made and the public discourse has changed. Currently there is an effort to do this retroactively.

ABS Platform

With a stalled merger of ICCO and DCA in the region and the propiska advocacy campaign at a strategic crossroad, there is scope for improvement too. Lack of progress in the declared merger and lack of clarity about its future have left the partner platform in a vacuum, where renewed momentum depends on ICCO and DCA’s ability to turn a declared commitment to merge into action, or call the project off again.

Sustainability

Empowering local communities, as done in the ABS programme, is a cornerstone of sustainability and there are many examples of interventions and initiatives being taken by target groups with little or no involvement of DCAs partners.

DCA’s active engagement with partners, coaching them in their work, building their capacity in financial management, adding to their advocacy capacity are all examples of how DCA strives to strengthen and sustain the organizational capacity of partners. The initiative and conduct of partners in the partner platform, in liaising with authorities and in seeking representation in ministerial supervisory committees suggests a high degree of technical sustainability of many DCA partners.

Yet, as in so many other countries, the financial sustainability of DCAs partner organisations remains limited. While this may be difficult to solve in the short term, DCA and partners could work to increase ownership and financial support from the Kyrgyz public at large. This would not only add to the financial base of the organizations. It would also contribute to change the (inaccurate) image of civil society organisations being ‘internationally owned’ and acting as ‘spies’ for foreign interests. The results of this evaluation suggest that DCA and its partners do much better than that.

A graphic illustration of the evaluation team’s assessment of the overall performance of DCA and its partners are attached in Appendix E.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Since 1996 DanChurchAid has supported local NGOs in their efforts to improve living conditions of the most vulnerable groups in Central Asia, including Kyrgyzstan. Support has focused on the alleviation of poverty in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet economy, massive migration towards the larger cities of impoverished rural population groups, and the inability of authorities to address the social and economic needs of the population.

In the beginning of 2006 DCA, with active involvement of local partner NGOs, started the process of formulating a programme that could serve as a common framework for the individual projects of DCA’s partners. On a workshop that marked the onset of this process, it was decided that the issue of propiska – the process by which the permanent and interim residence of residents of the Soviet (and Kyrgyz) Republic was registered, should serve as the common denominator for projects supported by DCA in its ‘Access to Basic Services Programme.’

The propiska – or residential registration - is used for economic, law enforcement and other purposes, such as establishing eligibility for social benefits, housing and utility payments, taxes, conscription, medical care, education, etc. However, for the many migrants and their children, acquiring propiska registration can be a painful, lengthy and sometimes impossible endeavour, hampered by legislative and administrative obstacles, as well as corruption and a bureaucratic culture, by which administrative acts are given legitimacy only by being complicated and difficult. As a result, a fifth of Bishkek residents are not registered, and without access to health care, education and social benefits.¹

1.1 DCA in Kyrgyzstan

DCA’s partner programme (hereafter referred to as the ABS programme – Access to Basic Services) was approved in the end of 2007. In January 2008, DCA established a regional office in Bishkek as part of DCA’s decentralization process. The office was officially registered in May 2008.

DCA’s ABS programme in Kyrgyzstan focuses on the lack of access to basic services, particularly within education, health and housing, as well as insufficient participation of civil society actors in decision-making processes. The difficulty of obtaining propiska is seen as a main obstacle for access to services, and the programme’s strategic approach has therefore been to combine short- to medium-term efforts to mobilize and empower vulnerable children, internal migrants/settlers and the elderly to take responsibility for their own development and participate in societal development processes, with long-term efforts to challenge inadequate legal frameworks and budgetary allocations, as well as enhance local government capacity for improved access to health, education and housing.

Finally, the programme seeks to strengthen partner organisations in their networking and strategic coordinated advocacy with others to hold the political system accountable.

1.2 Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation has been to assess the ABS Programme in relation to its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and implementation. In the light of upcoming programme merge between DCA and ICCO, the evaluation has also aimed to provide recommendations for the programme due to the changed context and focus areas of the two sister agencies. The evaluation team notes that the purpose of this exercise was to review the

¹ Gender and Livelihoods of Migration, UNICEF, 2009.
overarching programme and not to assess and verify the work of the partners, which is the role of the end-of-project evaluations.

1.3 Methodology
The evaluation used a range of methodologies to reach its conclusions, including:

**Online Survey:** The evaluation team designed an online survey for DCAs partners to provide the team with the following information:
- description of their work (thematic areas, advocacy capacity and strategic approach)
- self-assessment of their contributions to the achievements of the programme, measured against programme indicators;
- assessment of DCA’s support to the programme;
- recommendations on how the programme can be improved.

The online survey was conducted prior to the evaluation team’s visit to Kyrgyzstan and completed by 13 partners.

**Interviews and skype meetings with external stakeholders and key informants:** The team conducted interviews with more than 20 organizations, individuals and government officials. These interviews included three members of parliament, the Deputy Minister of Social Protection, a specialist in education from the President’s Office, school and health officials, DCA and ICCO staff (including headquarters), academics, media outlets and think tanks. The interviews sought their perspective and inputs on DCA’s ABS programme. The list of informants is extensive because the evaluation was done in conjunction with the context analysis.

**Media Monitoring:** In order to assess the impact of the programme on public discourse on propiska and the obstacles that public discourse may represent in terms of promoting rights of migrants and other marginalized groups in Kyrgyz society, the evaluation team teamed up with DCAs partner Adilet, who had some experience in media monitoring. The purpose of this exercise was to analyse media coverage in Kyrgyzstan on the issue of propiska and related topics of how propiska affects access to health, education and housing.

**Meetings with Partners:** The evaluation team also held individual meetings with 16 current or former DCA partners as well as three ICCO partners.

**Partner and stakeholder workshop:** On June 16-17, the evaluation team organized a two-day stakeholder workshop. On the first day 24 participants from 15 partner organizations, including 6 men and 18 women, came together to highlight some of their achievements under the PT1 programme and discuss the programme approach. Partners also discussed strengths and limitation of the LFA as a monitoring system and of DCA support. Participating organizations included Adilet (1), ADRA (2), Advocacy Network for Children (1), Aikol (1), Arysh (2), CIB (1), CPC (2), DCCA Bishkek (1), DCCA-Osh (1), Delight & Consolation (1), Eagl (2), Eriyym (2), Insan-Leilek (1), Mekhr-Shevkat (2), Rainbow (2), RCE (2). On the second day, partners discussed lessons learned from the programme experience. Additionally, ICCO partners and external stakeholders, including the Central Asia Free Market Institute, Red Crescent, Soros Foundation and representatives from DCA and ICCO joined the workshop to brainstorm on the future of the platform’s work.

**Focus groups.** The team conducted four focus group discussions with target groups and representatives from 7 different partner organizations involved in the establishment of self-help
groups to discuss issues and experiences of self-organisation, coping techniques, relations to local authorities and the role of DCA and partners in bringing about change among themselves.

**Direct observation.** Finally, The team members made use of direct observation at the site of projects visited, during interviews and interactions with partners. In particular it visited two settlements in Bishkek with Arysh (Ala-Too 2 and Altyn Kazyck), a school and a health centre with CPC, and observed two meetings on propiska, one organized by Adilet on June 14 and the other on propiska and education organized by the Central Asia Free Market Institute on June 15. Most of the meetings took place in Bishkek, with two days of meetings in Osh, in the south, and two days in Kazakhstan.

The evaluation team would like to express its appreciation to DCA for its excellent support in arranging the many meetings and providing transportation and interpretation and to its partners for their generosity and flexibility in responding to requests made by the team.

### 2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

With a population of only 5 million people and a GDP of less than 950 USD per capita, Kyrgyzstan remains one of the smallest and poorest countries in the Central Asian region. Like many CIS countries in the transition period, Kyrgyzstan experienced an almost complete collapse of state industries followed by an immediate increase in unemployment. Twenty years after the fall of the Soviet system, the situation in the country has hardly improved. Large population groups have lost their livelihood and are left without access to any social welfare services, such as medical services, free education and community services. In the process of migrating in search for livelihood, many have lost their propiska and thus de facto their rights to housing and basic social services, including health and education.

Today, the number of internal migrants is about 1 million people. The majority of internal migrants live temporarily or permanently in new settlements. Most of them are people without registration (propiska). Only 0.5% of internal migrants in Bishkek have official registration. In parts of the new settlements, registration of the rights of citizens to own land and buildings is not done. This is relevant to the spontaneity of land grabbing, lack of construction permits and restrictions applied to protected zones of certain infrastructure objects such as gas and electricity lines.

The economic crisis has not reduced in recent years. On the contrary, in January 2011 Kyrgyzstan had the highest food price inflation rate in the Europe and Central Asian region—30.5% (compared to January 2010). Meat prices were up some 33%; baked goods and cereals prices had risen 29%. In a country where many vulnerable households suffer from chronic food insecurity, skyrocketing food prices do not suggest a general improvement of the situation of DCAs target groups in the ABS programme. With real wage growth rates that have dropped to zero, even more Kyrgyzstani households are turning to Central Asia’s most common coping strategy: migration.

According to UNDP, the numbers of migrants reported leaving the country between January and November 2010 was up 58% from the same period of the previous year—with particularly large

---

2 AUCA Social Research Center, 2009.
outflows registered from Kyrgyzstan’s poorer southern regions (the site of the May-June 2010 ethnic clashes).  

According to Kyrgyz bank data, remittances in 2010 soared to $1.245 billion, the largest total for remittance inflows reported to date (see below). As a share of GDP, 2010 remittances seem to be around 27% — one of the highest shares in the Europe and Central Asian region.

**Gender and Migration**

Migration is a gendered phenomenon. Women and men differ in migration behaviour, opportunities, risks, and needs. According to focus groups interviews migrating women are more vulnerable at the labour market than men. Women are more likely to agree to low-paying jobs, while men seek high salaries. Moreover, since more women work in a shadow economy they have lower earnings and are more likely to lose jobs and be underpaid or unpaid (when quit or get fired). At the same time, women tend to spend their salaries on family needs. In other words, women execute their reproductive roles, while men tend to keep a part of the earnings for own needs, including alcohol, tobacco, and leisure.

Although migrating women’s earnings are an important part of a family budget, women tend to lose their professional capital due to working at low-paid unqualified jobs. Women who migrate with children experience problems with housing and placement of their children into educational institutions. Only 13% of women are able to give a good education to their children. A large proportion of women migrants from Kyrgyzstan therefore migrate without children. In all, 86% of women from Kyrgyzstan migrate alone.

Yet, migration affects men too. According to DCA partners, men are often more vulnerable to harassment by the police, spending months or years away from the family, residing under very poor living conditions, with no access to health care, and vulnerable to the abuse of employers. Migrating men are also said to be more vulnerable to unemployment — as they opt for higher paid jobs, and thus fail in supporting their families at home. While the lack of support has important consequences for dependants, it does affect the dignity, identity and affiliation of the male ‘bread winner’ to the family as well.

**The 2010 ‘Revolution’**

In early April 2010, anti-government political demonstrations took place in various cities of the Kyrgyz Republic against the authoritarian tendencies of the president that had led to a centralization of power within the presidency. Protests were fuelled by economic and social policy decisions taken without adequate public consultation. Moreover, there was widespread belief that corruption and misuse of public assets had risen markedly. These protests culminated in riots in Bishkek and several other cities in Kyrgyzstan on April 7-8 with a violent crackdown by the government, the subsequent removal of the president from office, and the formation of an interim government headed by a coalition of opposition political and civic leaders.

In June social tensions that had been on the rise in the south of the country with a population fractured by divided loyalties to the new government climaxed with violent inter-ethnic clashes,

---

4 UNDP, Office of the Senior Economist.
6 Ibid.
7 Needs Assessment of Women Migrant Workers: Central Asia and Russia. UNIFEM 2009.
particularly in the cities of Jalalabad and Osh. These two cities and some neighbouring areas erupted in a spasm of ethnically-directed extreme, brutal violence and targeted arson.

In the wake of the violence, an estimated 75,000 refugees fled to neighbouring Uzbekistan and a further 300,000 were estimated to be internally displaced within the southern oblasts of the Kyrgyz Republic. The violent conflict in the south created new and deep social tensions that left many people bewildered, shocked and confused. Although the immediate causes of the conflict remain unclear, key messages are clear. First, there is a need to promote social and political stability and security as a foundation for economic and social recovery. Second, a focus on equity is essential to avoid a perception of unequal attention being given to particular ethnic groups, regions or types of beneficiaries.

**Political Changes Following the 2010 Crisis**

With the first anniversary of the 2010 revolution Kyrgyzstan is once again trying—for the third time in the last 20 years—to consolidate democracy. The current president gives every sign of being more liberal and more honest than her predecessors and presided over free and fair parliamentary elections in October 2010.

In October 2011 a presidential election is scheduled to take place and if she sticks to her word of not running for re-election, Kyrgyzstan will achieve a peaceful transfer of power, always the key test of any democracy. Another good sign is that Kyrgyzstan has an independent press that is free to criticize the government—and does.

Unlike the ousted Bakiev government, the current government is allowing demonstrations—and seems to respond to people’s complaints. Public supervisory councils were established in September 2010 to promote interaction between the public authorities and civil society and to ensure transparent decision making in government. Ten councils were piloted as of the fall of 2011 and in March 2011 the President issued a decree amending the structure in response to initial feedback. The main change is that the candidates for the councils will be selected by a presidential commission rather than the six ministries and four state agencies that currently have councils—ostensibly to avoid having ministers select council chairs that are too susceptible to their influence, thereby increasing the independence of the councils. There are currently 41 public supervisory councils in existence. While this is not the first time that such an oversight mechanism has been introduced in Kyrgyzstan, there does appear to be political will by the current administration to make this system effective.

Although this may appear as a major democratic step forward, and an innovative approach to promote transparency and good governance, civil society representatives complain about the prevailing ‘soviet mentality’ of the government bureaucracy at all levels. Scepticism about the true nature of political change is expressed in a sound and understandable ‘wait and see’ approach to Kyrgyz politics. With two revolutions in 5 years, a weak government, and the unpredictable outcome of presidential elections in the fall of 2011, there are many reasons to remain sceptical about the current widened political space for civil society to express its concern and needs, be it at the local or national level.

Civil society representatives fear that the outcome of the next elections will mark a return to the past parliamentary assembly’s policy and limited independence from the executive branch. And

---

9 For instance in August 2008, the former president signed a law that severely restricted the freedom of assembly and which was used to prevent and disperse gatherings by political activists opposed to the government. A proposed law that
while some widening of the political space seems to have taken place at the national level, changes at the local authority level appear to be less significant or consistent. At the same time, one may question the extent to which political space has widened for religious, not least Muslim, civil society organizations. On the contrary, fear of growing extremism appears to have led to a stricter political line towards this segment of civil society.

In summary, DCA’s ABS programme was implemented in a situation of profound economic crisis, in which the Kyrgyz people have resorted yet again to their common coping strategy: migration. This is a strategy that for most part is associated with limited or no access to basic public services such as education for their children, health and social services. As explained below, the focus on propiska and access to basic services was made no less relevant, yet difficult to implement, immediately after the 2010 revolution.

3. PROGRAMME RELEVANCE (CONTEXT)

In response to the original context analysis, the current ABS programme in Central Asia was designed to build local partner capacity to work in partnership and to improve access of their communities to basic services while increasing participation of civil society actors in decision-making processes. The programme was designed to address the needs of internal migrants, the elderly and children in difficult circumstances. Propiska (residence-based registration) was identified as one of the main barriers to access. Because propiska is primarily an urban problem and also because partners were more experienced in urban settings, the programme chose to focus initially on Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan) and Almaty (Kazakhstan).

3.1 Programme Approach & Focus

a. Kyrgyzstan

The ABS programme in Kyrgyzstan was designed for implementation in a fragile state with a young civil society sector. The original context analysis completed in 2006 assumes that space for advocacy would become more open and inclusive for partners. The programme approach of encouraging partners to work together and strengthen their capacity for advocacy continues to be relevant for Kyrgyzstan in the current context of a widened yet volatile political space. As an example, the adoption of a programme approach has enabled collective documentation of the problems created by the current registration system. At the international level, this collective work enabled partners and APRODEV in Brussels to begin lobbying the EU to include support for an improved registration system in Kyrgyzstan as the EU begins to set its priorities beyond 2013. Further discussion on the value added of the programme approach can be found on the section on the partner platform in Section 5 – Effectiveness.

The promotion of advocacy within the ABS programme as the preferred strategy of interaction with authorities promotes positive, cooperative rather than confrontational interaction between civil society and state authorities. This is relevant in terms of state building and in terms of consolidating the current tendency of the government to engage in dialogue with civil society and accept public criticism and discussion. In addition to increasing voice of civil society, the approach facilitates partner learning on how their individual organizational strengths can

would prohibit NGO involvement in political activities, including election observation and issue advocacy, was under consideration too.
complement each other’s work. This is particularly relevant when dealing with the propiska issue, which is national in scope and requires a broad coalition to be successful.

The focus of the ABS programme to increase access to basic services remains relevant and a priority for DCA’s partners in Central Asia. The events of 2010 increased internal migration resulting in an increase in the number of people without propiska and thus an increase in unmet demand for public services in urban areas. As discussed on the section on Public Discourse below, the emphasis on simplifying the registration system and removing the propiska residency requirement is rising on the national political agenda.

The emphasis on building partner capacity for advocacy is in keeping with DCA’s rights-based approach.

b. Kazakhstan

DCA has been working in neighbouring Kazakhstan since 1996. The original justification for working there was that Kazakhstan shares many similar characteristics with other post-Soviet countries, in particular with regard to propiska, and that DCA’s experience in Russia endows it with unique corporate capabilities to promote simplification of the propiska system in Central Asian countries. The original programme document recognizes the importance of avoiding stretching DCA’s capacity too far and calls for using Kyrgyzstan as the focus of the programme with activity in Kazakhstan and Tajikistan taking a lower priority.

When the ABS programme began in 2007 it inherited two partners and DCA since has disengaged from them. Additionally, 2010 marked the final year that DCA could spend DANIDA funds in Kazakhstan, although it has supported initiatives with EU funds and some of DCA’s own funds. Since the ABS programme was designed in 2007, it has become evident that the Russia’s experience as a post-Soviet country dealing with propiska issues is less relevant to Central Asia, particular with regard to legal frameworks. However, there are other compelling reasons to support civil society in Kazakhstan, namely:

- Migration between Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan continues to increase, making work on migrant issues more relevant.
- Although not reflected in global development indices, poverty and income disparities are acute in certain areas of Kazakhstan, notably remote areas and settlements outside of large urban areas.
- Propiska continues to be a barrier to access to services for many internal migrants and international organizations are not supporting this target group.
- Many settlements are not legally recognized and people live in fear of having their homes demolished.
- There is concern in the country that tensions with migrant populations will increase in the future and may lead to violence.
- The international community appears to accept the official government policy that the country is developing and all is well. As a result, few international organizations support local groups.
- The experience of Kyrgyz civil society initiatives will likely have future applications for Kazakh civil society. Currently civil society initiatives in Kazakhstan are limited to a handful of vocal activists and it is not clear that their engagement has been institutionalized.

DCA CA currently maintains a database of potential partners and intends to keep Kazakhstan as a secondary focus in Central Asia. The evaluation team concurs that work in Kazakhstan remains
relevant, both in terms of propiska and migrant issues, but more importantly as a strategy for
keeping a window open to supporting civil society in a context of shrinking democratic space.
The presence of civil society representatives from Kazakhstan at the European Parliament
meeting in Brussels, for example was considered an important opportunity for Kazakh civil
society.

3.2 Target Group & Geographic Focus
The selection of internal migrants, elderly and children in difficult circumstances as the main
target groups supports the ABS programme goal to support the most marginalized population
groups. The three target groups are linked because adults that migrate in search of employment
— whether internally or abroad – leave the elderly and children behind to fend for themselves.
Thus the number of vulnerable elderly and children in Kyrgyzstan is higher than in countries that
do not have such migration patterns.

The identified target groups continue to face obstacles accessing basic services and thus the ABS
approach addresses their most pressing social needs. Although, as this report indicates,
important progress has been made in documenting the problem and raising awareness of the
need for change, large proportions of Kyrgyz nationals remain outside the formal system and
almost completely excluded from public services. Partner work in communities is facilitating
access to schools, health care and social benefits, but until the national framework is changed
the problem will remain for the estimated one million internal migrants, most of which are
without registration.\footnote{Gender and Livelihoods of Migration: Kyrgyzstan 20095. Alymkulova, Aigul and Balgaky Dosalieva, UNICEF, 2010.}

The evaluation team acknowledges concerns that were raised in the mid-term review regarding
the cohesiveness of including the HIV projects under the PT1, even though the target groups are
related to those identified as rights holders in the ABS programme. This issue will be addressed
with the development of a separate HIV programme under PT4.

The geographic focus at the start of the programme was in urban areas (namely Bishkek) identified as receiving areas for internal migrant families moving in search of employment. Urban areas are also sending areas for those seeking employment abroad. With the higher concentration of migrants, urban areas are where the greatest impact can be achieved. In addition, DCA’s early partners tended to have more experience working in urban areas. HIV activities were initiated in the southern city of Osh as it is a transit place for migrants from Batken, Jalalabat and Osh regions of Kyrgyzstan as well as neighbouring areas of Tajikistan. Prior to the June 2010 events in Osh, DCA was developing plans to begin non-HIV related activities in the south in Batken, Jalalabat and Talas, which are migrant sending areas. The selection of all of these areas is relevant to the ABS programme design.

3.3 Gender Issues
The evaluation team concurs with the finding in the mid-term review that the programme lacks an adequate gender analysis and that most partners do not provide disaggregated data on gender in their reports. The understanding is that in 2009 DCA CA did not have capacity to mainstream gender issues into its programming. The 2010 DCA CA annual report states, “In 2011 DCA and ICCO regional offices will be at the stage of development of new joint programme and these issues will be included to the ABS Programme external evaluation and TOR on context analysis.”

"Aid is not good for men. Men have to try themselves.”
SHG member, Osh
The evaluation team reiterates the importance of conducting a gender analysis and integrating disaggregated data by gender. Such analysis is expected to show that men and women are affected differently by not having propiska and that they have different coping skills to deal with the challenges they face. It should also examine anecdotal evidence of a narrowing space for women as increase in traditional interpretation of role of women by religious institutions.

The evaluation team has attempted to collect some data during meetings with partners (see Section 4 Programme Relevance – Activities). These figures suggest that the programme engages far more women than men. Projecting the current pattern into the future, there is a risk of contributing to a disequilibrium within target group families as a group of strong empowered women emerges whose partners are passive – or have all gone abroad in search of employment. The number of men in the SHGs may be an indication that the approach is not perceived as relevant or appealing to men. As one man said during a meeting with SHG members in Osh, “Aid is not good for men. Men have to try themselves.” In Osh the evaluation team came across three SHGs of men who are reconstructing their homes. A thorough gender analysis would determine whether this type of focus for the SHGs is more likely to engage men.

In summary, the evaluation team considers that the programme approach, focus, target groups and geographic areas are relevant to the context in Kyrgyzstan. It also concurs with DCA CA’s stated commitment to support civil society initiatives in Kazakhstan whenever possible.

4. PROGRAMME RELEVANCE (ACTIVITIES)

4.1 Significant Changes
There were no significant changes in the context that required dramatic adjustment of the programme although it is clear that the 2010 events had a concrete impact on activities. Work was delayed for many partners after the conflict as the focus shifted to emergency response and the constitutional reform process. As a consequence, it was not possible to achieve all planned activities. APRODEV and DCA CA postponed developing new advocacy initiatives on propiska due to the escalation of violence in southern Kyrgyzstan. Similarly, a planned analysis of the regulatory framework governing registration and documentation of the citizens and develop recommendations to simplify the existing mechanisms and procedures by Adilet was not completed.11

In the South, as the number of internally displaced people increased dramatically, partners such as DCCA refocused their efforts to help people deal with their situation and replace their lost documentation. This relates to partner work but not necessarily to activities funded under the PT1 programme.

After the June events donors shifted their focus to the south and emphasized humanitarian aid. There have been some negative consequences to the shift in focus. The first – according to partners – is a tendency for donors to want to fund the same activities. The second is that donors want partners to open offices in the south. As the director of one partner indicated, “I don’t want to open an office there, but the donors are insisting.” With the increase of donor humanitarian assistance to Osh Oblast (district), many people have left their local NGOs to work for international organizations and as a result local organizations had difficult in securing competent staff.

Another challenge has been the turnover of government staff and elected officials due to elections and political wrangling. The Advocacy Network for Children and the Centre for Protection of Children

11 Adilet confirmed that the regulatory analysis was not done, although the legislative analysis was completed (Conversation with Asyl Balybaeva, Adilet, June 14, 2011).
(CPC) point to the challenges of advocating for change with structures that have lost their institutional memory.

4.2 **Relevance of Programme Activities**

The DCA Central Asia ABS programme has four main objectives that include:

- challenging legal frameworks and budgets to increase access to basic services
- mobilizing and empowering communities
- strengthening partner organizations and networks so that they are more strategic in holding policy makers accountable
- increasing DCA coordination with other agencies and strengthening partner capacity.

The four objectives and corresponding indicators are illustrated below:

The finding of the evaluation team is that the activities being implemented by DCA under the PT1 programme are relevant to the stated objectives. In addition to funding, DCA has provided capacity building on advocacy, juvenile justice, documentation & analysis, human rights, budget monitoring, procurement standards, humanitarian accountability and quality and management standards, policy analysis (in cooperation with ICCO), monitoring & evaluation, and EU reporting/visibility requirements, financial management and book-keeping. DCA has also provided internal and external technical assistance, organizational assessments, and project evaluations to strengthen partner organizational structure and performance.

On a programmatic level, DCA commissioned studies in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan on the impact of the propiska system on access to basic services. DCA CA and headquarters were very involved in the APRODEV lobbying of the EU to include the issue of registration as a priority in future programming in Central Asia. DCA has also supported the development of the partner platform.

In its selection of new partners and disengagement from some of the earlier partners, DCA has been working to build a partner portfolio consisting of responsible and competent organizations that are working on issues related to rights, access to basic services and HIV for the identified target groups.
of migrants, the elderly and children. The one area in which the cohesion with stated objectives is questionable is when work with the elderly focus substantially on charity, such as the partnership with Delight & Consolation. Similarly, while the diabetes work responds to an important health need (e.g. 5% of 2,000 people who received awareness training were diagnosed with diabetes) and has involved advocacy (successful lobbying for subsidy on diabetes tests) this project does fall wide of the focus of the programme.

Activities implemented by partners are also relevant to the programme objectives. As the sections on impact below demonstrate, partners have clearly developed their capacity for advocacy and budget monitoring. Perhaps the most impressive aspect of the programme has been the degree of empowerment of communities through the self-help group (SHG) approach.

4.3 Relevance of Target Groups

It is difficult to provide an exhaustive description of participants in the program, as this information is not easily accessible in the reports. The evaluation team has endeavoured to collect information directly from partners with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>SHGs</th>
<th>Part. / Ben.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arysh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC - non project children</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC - adults</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAK/HAI</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCA*</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCA - poultry</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCA - kindergarten</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCA - kindergarten partents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delight &amp; Consolation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagl</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyarm</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insan Leilek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insan Leilek local authorities</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehr Shafkat</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldyr</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASPP</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podrugi</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>17420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* not sure these count under PT1

Not working with SHGs:

- Adilet: 524+ minors represented, documents restored for 106 children, 316 minors learn about rights
As the above rough estimates show, almost 18,000 people are engaged in SHGs or directly receiving some form of rights education or counselling from DCA partners (this includes those who received information about their rights to medical services under the diabetes program). As suspected, participating women considerably outnumber their male counterparts.

The number of participants associated with the migrant, elderly and children target groups come to approximately 65%, 12% and 4% respectively. As the literature continues to confirm that the elderly, children and migrants are the worst off in the Kyrgyzstan, there is every reason to believe that the target groups continue to be relevant to the ABS programme design.\(^\text{12}\)

The decision to support projects in remote areas, such as Batken and Talas, is consistent with seeking to reach the poorest of the poor. If the principle of poverty orientation were to be observed, then DCA should focus more of its work in poor and remote districts, prioritizing support for elderly people who are responsible for children. DCA CA argues that the PT1 programme emphasis on building capacity of rights holders may find it difficult to build on the scarce resources of this group. However, some of the current partners question this assertion as in their experience the elderly are in great need – particularly those with young dependents – and have demonstrated their ability to mobilize themselves and be reliable. **Therefore, the evaluation team recommends that DCA continues its work with the elderly, even if ‘Granny Aid funding is the only funding source available.**

Seventy per cent of the population of Kyrgyzstan is Muslim, often practicing a secular form of Islam. The ABS programme documentation does not contain data regarding religious affiliation of participants in the programme. While such documentation may be useful to include, the evaluation team recognise that it may be difficult, due to the secular nature of religion being practised and the sensitivity of the issue.

### 4.4 Synergy between Partners

In the context of the ABS program, synergy refers to obtaining greater effect by combining the efforts of more than one organization or approach. The general feedback from all stakeholder interviews is that trust among NGOs in Kyrgyzstan was low until a few years ago but has been increasing with interaction. Partners explicitly state that coming together through mechanisms such as the partner platform has increased familiarity among organizations and contributed to building trust. The increase in trust and a better understanding of their distinct roles and capabilities encourage greater cooperation.

Synergies take place among partners with different capabilities – notably when a community-based partner makes a referral for legal services. There also appears to be a high degree of cooperation among the older DCA partners working with the same focus groups (children, elders) in the form of joint lobbying. There are also examples of interesting cooperation among groups in the south (albeit not necessarily under the DCA PT1 programme), for example in the area of Osh where groups assist each other with monitoring of technical aspects of a program.

Older partners express some frustration that new partners come to the platform without knowing its history and being aware of previous discussions on specific topics. This frustration is partly justified

(see discussion on Partner Platform below) but also partly a reaction to having ‘new kids on the block.’ Partners expressed the same type of frustration with new organizations or projects that are not related to the platform. However, this resistance does not appear deep-rooted and a few introductions and interactions seem to be all that is needed to foster cooperation. The DCA programme, through the partner platform, is likely contributing to the development of a culture of greater open-mindedness among civil society organizations in Kyrgyzstan.

4.5 Synergy between service delivery, empowerment, and advocacy

Service delivery in the form of direct provisions (e.g. health care delivery, education or psycho-social support) plays a minor role in the ABS programme as the main focus is on rights education, the establishment of SHGs, empowerment and advocacy for access to basic services. Therefore synergy between service delivery and the other project components is not really an issue. In-stead the capacity of self-help groups are strengthened so that they can care for their own access to service delivery, and/or they cooperate with their NGO to lobby public service providers on this.

In this field, there is a definite synergy between SHGs, empowerment and advocacy as the significant number of SHG members provides legitimacy to advocacy efforts, both at the community level and when representing the voice of communities at the national level.

5. PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS

DCA’s programme in Kyrgyzstan was formulated and implemented as DCA was establishing itself in Bishkek and expanding its partner portfolio at a time when it had no previous experience of programme planning and implementation. Within this context, DCA’s main interest was to set a programme focus that was relevant and covered the interests of as many existing partners as possible. With positive experiences working with propiska in Russia, DCA called for a partner platform meeting in 2006 to explore the relevance and support of partners to such a programme. During the meeting partners agreed to focus on the propiska was a result of two days of intensive discussion and analysis of the Kyrgyz context. The evaluation team finds no reason to doubt the participation and ownership of partners in planning the programme.

5.1 DCAs role in the Programme

Partners all agree that DCA has played a very positive role and been instrumental in strengthening the capacity of partners in key areas such as advocacy and campaigning skills, training in proposal writing, financial management, and strategic planning. In particular the Advocacy Network for Children has benefitted from DCA’s support to the networks strategic planning process; a difficult and lengthy process with a high quality outcome which – according to some partners – has also contributed to strengthening the strategic capacity of their individual organisations.

DCA has also been instrumental in exposing the partners to the experience of international advocacy by helping to facilitate relation building between the ABS partner platform and the APRODEV office in Brussels, and by accompanying partners to speak before parliamentarians and members of the EU Commission. It was an experience that helped build the confidence of partners in knowing that their joint advocacy work matters.

In general, partners speak very positively about DCA, whom they regard as a partner and not as a donor. DCA’s active involvement in building the partner platform and readiness to assist

‘DCA is not a donor, but at partner that contributes many good things’

DCA partner, 2011
partners in problems and challenges associated with project formulation and implementation is seen as a proof of DCA’s sincere support of its partners.

5.2 The Partner Platform

The partner platform consists of all partners and meets at least once a year. Partners take turns in chairing the platform. There is a steering committee consisting of five partners that meet quarterly to address issues such as training needs, updates on the political situation that may need a response (as was the case during the April-June 2010 events), and issues related to advocacy.

As described in the section on impact, there is little doubt that the partner platform has been instrumental in promoting networking among the partners and in assisting partners to establish a joint advocacy focus. This is an achievement that has helped attract the attention of other players, including other civil society stakeholders and representatives from the Kyrgyz parliament.

Partners recognize the usefulness of the platform in creating joint ownership of all activities within the programme and in enabling partners to address structural problems nationally, share ideas, concepts and experiences. Yet there is also a feeling among participants that the platform is not working effectively and that communication is inefficient: partners send different representatives to meetings, including some that are not in a position to make decisions. New attendants are not informed about the purpose, past discussions and operations of the platform, coordination is inefficient and apparently, there is no consensus – or at least clarity – about when partners can speak on behalf of the platform or not.

At the time of the evaluation, the partner platform had lost a good deal of momentum. Partners are clearly frustrated about the lack of clarity about the possible/future merger of the ABS platform and the ICCO supported MADI platform. Partners and DCA appear to agree that the decision on how to continue rests with DCA and ICCO.

There is little doubt, that with a future platform consisting of approximately 15 ICCO and DCA partners it is necessary to invest a good deal of time and resources to clarify the purpose of the platform, working modalities, and terms of reference among all partners.

With a future merger this may be the right time to prepare a more in-depth elaboration of the purpose of the platform meetings and how they would relate to the on-going challenges and progress of the partners’ work. To coordinate the work and diverse opinions of a large group of partners, and to make sure that decisions are executed between meetings, a part-time coordinator, hosted by one of the member organisations is recommended.

- **Proposed actions to increase effectiveness of the partner platform and motivation of partner representatives to participate:**
  - Develop – or finalise – revised terms of references and working regulations for a new, merged partner platform.
  - Prepare orientation package for first-time participants so as to harmonize expectations on the meetings. Package may include minutes from latest meetings so that participants can track the status and progress of the platform’s work.
  - Recruit a part-time coordinator for the platform to be hosted by one of the members.
  - Apply format for minutes that include the following sections for each item on the meeting agenda:
- Topics discussed
- Decisions taken
- Steps to be taken until before meeting
- Name of persons responsible for follow-up

- Seek to include all meeting participants in meeting discussions and avoid meetings that are overtly dominated by 2-3 participants only.\(^{13}\)
- Make sure to invite and network with newcomers in the cause for a reform of the propiska system, so as to assess potential for cooperation and synergies.
- Establish a dropbox or other file sharing system for all partners so as to easily access files and improve communication.

### 5.3 Monitoring practices

According to DCA’s own office standards, partners are supposed to be paid a visit as a minimum twice a year, unless special circumstances necessitates more visits. According to DCA staff, partners are visited quarterly on average. EU-funded projects are visited twice a week, as DCA has a legal obligation to do so. In reality, partners are visited on average once every second month. Some partners reported during the interviews that they had not received a visit for more than 6 months, although they stay in regular contact with DCA via email and phone calls and found the support received sufficient. These findings confirm the findings of the midterm review, that partners are not being systematically monitored.

DCA programme staff asserts that the DCA resource management system – Maconomy – and the paperwork associated with grant management, programme reporting according to DCAs Project and Programme Monitoring guidelines (PPM) and administration associated with procurement absorb up to 70% of their time, making regular field visits and frequent partner visits really difficult. Staff also asserts that new monitoring formats are too long and procedures are too heavy:

> We focus more on procedures to ensure quality of content, but as a result (since following all the procedures takes a lot of time and energy) we do not have enough time to focus on content. I don’t have time to visit partners to work on content as much as I wanted to or I had to. PPM guidelines should make your life easier, but they don’t. And at the same time, partners are working on their own, without our support. We are working more with databases and procedures, than with people.

The evaluation team did not enter into detail on the mechanisms that emphasize ‘systems’ above ‘content’. Yet it is obvious, that it is next to impossible to assess quality of content and to monitor progress without sufficient time to:

- experience the dynamics and relations between partners and their target groups,
- observe how partners council, teach and assist target groups,
- witness how they arrange and implement their own internal meetings or meetings with politicians,
- accompany them when they collect data to assess progress and outcome.

\(^{13}\) Applying ‘Robert’s Rules of Order’ for chairing meetings may be one way of ensuring this. According to these, everyone must be encouraged to speak before a person can speak for a second time. See [www.robertsrules.com](http://www.robertsrules.com).
To achieve this requires a working methodology that allows staff to monitor projects not just by listening to the narratives of partners and writing down the information in a DCA format, but to see, hear and sense what is going on. The evaluation team estimates that in principle the DCA monitoring formats do allow for ‘holistic’ monitoring of partner work. Yet the lengthy formats appear to overwhelm programme staff, who therefore tend to focus too much on the format itself, rather than on the content that is to be monitored.

**Suggestions to improve effectiveness of monitoring practices**

The evaluation team recognizes the difficulty of breaking a vicious cycle as the one described above, yet recommends that DCA pilots alternative practices that allows staff members to use all their senses when monitoring partner work. Even though this may mean less attention to databases and formats in an interim period. The following initiatives may be considered:

- Explore with DCA HQ how time spent on Maconomy can be reduced – preferably by 50%.
- Making quarterly partner visits a first priority and schedule them 6 months in advance, with no opportunity for cancellation, except from emergencies.
- Arrange the monitoring meetings so that they allow DCA staff to not only listen to the words of partners, but to actually, see and experience them ‘in action’, and which allows time for joint reflection on project dynamics.
- Let the monitoring formats stay in DCAs office in order to avoid any distraction from the holistic observation method proposed above.
- Complete the relevant formats when back in the office and follow-up with partners for additional questions by phone or email.

### 5.4 Implications of a future joint programme with ICCO

Although compromises on the programmatic approach may be hard to avoid, the thematic and strategic complementarity of DCA and ICCO work appear to be profound and implications of a joint programme appear to be positive. Both organisations aim to give voice to vulnerable groups by supporting NGOs that represent and care for migrants and poorer rural populations. Democratization work includes supporting self-help groups (SHGs) and clusters/associations of SHGs not only to strengthen the ability of these groups to address community problems but also to hold local authorities accountable for public services. Both organisations work from a rights-based approach and they have a history of supporting many of the same organisations working on migration.

In the opinion of the evaluation team, merging the ICCO and DCA programmes in relation to access to basic services and accountability improves opportunities for:

- Access to information, research and documentation necessary for fundraising and establishing a case for campaigning;
- A broad, national coverage of support of migrants and rural communities in the search for access to basic services’;
- Access to additional resources like expertise, experts, methodology and techniques;
- Increased impact of campaigns at national and international level;
- Improved cost-effectiveness and synergy with relation to capacity building of partners, for instance in the field of financial capacity building, where both organisations are active.

If one imagines a **full merger** of ICCO’s and DCA’s work in general in the region in the coming 2-3 years, interesting opportunities for synergy may also be created between the current programme focus on the living conditions and access to services for migrants, leaving rural areas
in search for livelihood, ICCO’s current focus on local market development and financial services in rural areas and the upcoming programme on HIV/AIDS prevention in migrating communities in southern Kyrgyzstan. Under such a framework, DCA and ICCO could work to alleviate the human suffering and vulnerability in Kyrgyzstan caused by rapid societal changes in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet economy and the recent global economic crisis:

Reducing Push factors for migration:
- Local market development and financial services in rural areas can contribute to improve living conditions in rural areas, thereby reducing the push factors for migration.
- Budget monitoring to hold local authorities accountable to basic services in rural areas.

Alleviating consequences of migration:
- Efforts to ease access to propiska may promote livelihood of migrants who choose to leave rural areas in search for livelihood, thereby reducing vulnerability.
- Efforts to prevent HIV may reduce both the vulnerability of migrants and the sending rural areas to the infection.

A partner workshop held as part of the evaluation confirmed the possibility and willingness of the partners to cooperate under the framework of a joint programme.

Commitment to merge programmes has been declared and repeated several times by both organizations during the past three years. The two organizations share offices and have successfully conducted open calls for proposals for ‘mini-grants’, established a selection committee of external experts and stakeholders to revise the proposals received, and jointly decided which organizations and projects should be supported by ICCO or DCA. The two organisations also share an HIV officer, working part time for each organization.

During the course of these three years, managers and staff from the two agencies have spent much time and resources sharing information about their work and working procedures, and ironing out possible differences in their approaches.

The way the two organisations understand the concept of partnership and their different requirements for reporting and accounting are named to be the most important differences in this respect. Thus DCA is said to be more imposing and controlling of the partners than ICCO, and to have stricter requirements for narrative and financial accounting. Having talked at length both with representatives and staff from ICCO and from DCA, having talked to partners and observed interaction between DCA staff and partners, in the eyes of the evaluation team these differences are by no means too big to overcome.

The fact that the two organisations have not been able to move ahead seems first and foremost to be attributed to differences in personality and management styles, fear and lack of clarity about the vision and consequences of joint cooperation, and de facto limited political will to turn declared commitment into action. While DCA’s representative has a ‘hands on’ management style, engaging with her team and the responsibilities of her office around the clock, the management style at ICCO is said to be more distant and with a higher priority to regular working hours. While this management style is necessary in a situation where the manager is responsible not only for Central Asia but for Southeast Asia as well, it is difficult to reconcile with a management style that creates in-depth knowledge of most if not all activities and processes when the trust between the parties is limited.
It is the view of the evaluation team that until now this obstacle has primarily been articulated indirectly, through discussions of programmatic and administrative differences. Yet, if DCA and ICCO are to cooperate under the framework of a joint programme, issues of confidence building, taking advantage of different management styles, recognizing and building on each other’s strengths, organizing the merger institutionally, and addressing fears of losing organizational identity in the event of a programmatic merger need to be addressed and dealt with systematically without further delay. In the current situation both organisations appear to be halfway committed to joint programming while making their own plans at the same time. In the eyes of the evaluation team, this is far from effective.

In a situation where everybody is overly sensitive, it is the duty of managers to do whatever they can – even to bend over backwards – to make things work. Thus, DCA’s regional representative may contribute to building confidence and reduce fear in ICCO staff by continuing to systematically demonstrate her recognition of ICCOs contributions and concerns, accommodate needs and offer support. Emphasizing joint planning on equal terms and consistent coordination in all activities that are of joint relevance to the two organisations will be equally important: from the drafting of terms of reference for consultancies, like the present evaluation and context analysis in which ICCO only played a secondary role, to the planning of capacity building interventions with partners.

Yet, despite the space available for DCA’s representative to contribute to build confidence and reduce fear, the consultants are of the opinion that it remains a key responsibility for ICCO’s regional management to ensure support from ICCO staff for the declared commitment to merge the programmes.

Unfortunately, due to the representative’s paternity leave, the consultants were not able to meet with him in person, although conversations on Skype did take place. However, the consultants did not feel that a SKYPE meeting provided a suitable framework to discuss such sensitive issues. Therefore the consultants do not estimate that they have received a full picture of his concerns and personal views on cooperation with DCA.

The representative’s apparent busy travel schedule, and plans to base ICCOs management of the region from Delhi is a concern. In the eyes of the consultants, the merger is unlikely to be implemented without the fulltime presence of ICCO’s manager in Kyrgyzstan. At least as long as the programme is formulated and all organizational and administrative issues related to programme management and implementation are sorted out. The consultants are of the opinion that if the representative’s planned move to Delhi comes before the merging process is complete it has only very limited chances of being implemented successfully.

Proposed actions for the implementation of the declared commitment to work with joint programmes:

- Decide, in cooperation with ICCO, if there is real commitment and political will to operate a joint programme. The consultants propose that DCA HQ takes the lead to discuss the issue with ICCO HQ and decide how to proceed.
- In the event of a positive response to the above question, address issues of management setup and personalities, and work to build confidence and reduce fears among staff members – possibly with an external facilitator. The consultants propose that DCA HQ takes the lead to discuss the issue with ICCO HQ and decide how to proceed. The consultants further recommend following the examples of ACT mergers in
Cambodia and Zambia and appointing one joint leader for the office in Bishkek who will have the final say over the programme.

- Make joint programming a priority in both agencies and share all planning with each other.
- Explore jointly positive examples from other countries where ACT agencies have made joint programmes (Zambia and Cambodia may be examples worth to explore).
- Draft an action plan with clear outcomes, activities and responsibilities assigned to named staff members.
- Establish a steering committee consisting managers from ICCO and DCA offices in Kyrgyzstan and relevant representatives from the both headquarters. Issues to be dealt with by the steering group may include but not be limited to:
  - Call for proposals
  - Partner selection
  - Funding
  - Monitoring
  - Capacity building – organizational + programmatic: identifying needs
  - Support / facilitation of platform – contracting/funding facilitator, support meetings, information dissemination
  - Partner participation in planning, grant committee
  - Role each organization will play with regard to the other organization’s partners.

### 6. PROGRAMME IMPACT

#### 6.0 Measuring impact and outcome of projects

When measuring impact of social development and advocacy initiatives, there is a tendency to equate programme performance or programme activities with impact. However, measuring social change is not only about counting the number of people served, number of self-help groups established or number of people informed about a particular issue. While these benchmarks are useful in determining if the programme is on the right track, they do not tell the full story about impact.

Measuring impact is akin to asking: we served these people, but so what? What change occurred as a result of the work? In an attempt to measure impact of DCA’s and its partners’ work under the ABS programme, the evaluation team introduced a timeline, outlining relationship between inputs and achievements over time, thereby answering the ‘so what’ question.

In the view of the evaluation team, the quality of partners’ reports is mixed. Some partners account for numbers of participants reached, while others do not. Yet none of the partners have answered the ‘so what’ question in their reports and most are generally focused on activities, reporting less on the benefits and outcomes of their work. Evaluation reports made available for the consultants during the evaluation were not of much use either, as these tend to be mainly descriptive, accounting for activities done, and not answering the ‘so what’ either.14

---

14 If DCA and partners are to make use of local consultants for evaluations, the evaluation team proposes DCA teach – or make sure they possess – the skills necessary to account for impact.
DCAs own reporting system may – although unintentionally – contribute to limit the report focus on outcomes through its requirement for reporting on outcome compared to planned and expected indicators only: ‘Reports should provide information on activities carried out and outputs produced …. Further it should inform on the development of the outcome indicators selected (in particular those relevant to programme indicators) – comparing to what was expected’. First, the requested reporting on planned outcome indicators may narrow the view on other – unintended or unimaginable, yet equally important outcomes. At the same outcomes may be difficult to trace within a project period of 2-3 years, but may very well materialize after the termination of the project. As DCA tends to work with long-term partnerships, a reporting on outcome beyond the timeframe of a single project could therefore be considered.

During the partner workshop the consultants facilitated the drafting of timelines, establishing a link between inputs, outputs and achievements (the ‘so what’). While it was a bit difficult for partners in the beginning, the consultants do feel that with some assistance from local programme officers, it will be possible to draw timelines as a part of partners’ reporting, provided that DCA is interested.

The timeline was introduced during the partner workshop, and partners were asked to present the relationship between inputs and achievements over time.

While recognizing the problem of verifying attribution, i.e., the fact that factors external to the programme also have an effect, the team estimates that for the purpose of this evaluation, establishing the link between inputs and achievements over time does establish a clearer picture of impact.

It has not been possible within the scope of this evaluation to measure and verify the impact of all the various activities undertaken by DCA and its partners. One reason is the diversity and richness of the projects under the programme. Another is the fact that it is difficult to establish a clear link between project impact and programme impact.

Project impact is a consequence of individual partners’ projects and can be measured at the level of target groups. Programme impact relates to the aggregated impact of each project under the programme, the impact of joint projects conducted by partners, such as the joint advocacy work, and the benefits for each partner of sharing information, exchanging conceptual ideas, etc.

Yet, the consultants hope that the methodology used generates a visual representation of the impact of the programme and may serve as inspiration when seeking to strengthen measurement of project and programme impact elsewhere.

During the preparation of the Terms of Reference for this evaluation, DCA and the consultants agreed to examine three impact areas:

- Capacity of partners to conduct advocacy
- Empowerment of partner target groups
- Changes in public discourse on propiska

### 6.1 Advocacy Capacity

---

15 DCA PPM guidelines
Since its inception, building partner capacity to advocate on issues related to propiska and access to basic services has been an important focus of the ABS programme. One of the first capacity building activities offered to partners was a four-week advocacy course conducted over a period of a year. In retrospect the training may have been offered prematurely, but it was in response to partner interest and partners continue to express appreciation for the course. In comparison to other country programmes that received the advocacy training, turnover of staff who participated in the Kyrgyzstan training has been relatively low and two years after the conclusion of the course most participants are still with their organizations or have moved to other partner organizations. This is in contrast to Uganda, where one year after the conclusion of the course 50% of participants in the training had moved on to other organizations.

In describing the advocacy activities and achievements of DCA’s partners, it is important to note that partners vary considerably in their advocacy capacity, organizational maturity and programme focus. A legal organization such as Adilet has considerably more capacity and experience for advocacy than a fledging organization such as Delight & Consolation, a small organization that focuses more on charitable activities.

Partner Advocacy at the Local Level

At the local level DCA partners have been advocating for increased access to basic services with various local government authorities. For the most part, their efforts have met with success. Targeted decision makers include mayors, departments of health and education and local self-government bodies (LSGs). The most common initiatives relate to getting unregistered children enrolled in schools (CPC, Aikol, Arysh) and getting access to healthcare services and social benefits for unregistered children, elderly and migrants (CPC, Insan-Leilek, Arysh). They have also advocated successfully on a wide range of issues to:

- include women in the courts of elders (Aikol)
- mobilize government health care providers to conduct vaccination campaigns and a mobile x-ray clinic in unregistered settlements (Arysh, in cooperation with the Red Crescent)
- obtain tax exemption for elderly trading pavilions (ADRA)
- secure recalculation of utility rates for elders (ADRA)
- secure subsidies for diabetes tests (DAK)
- secure budget allocations for drugs and transportation subsidies for vulnerable groups (Insan-Leilek).

While the above examples tend to be about individual cases (as noted in the mid-term review), there are examples of advocating for longer-term changes in practices and regulations such as:

- lobbying for the adoption of regulations to prevent juvenile delinquency (Aikol)
- influencing a juvenile facility to fill staffing positions (Eagl)
- obtaining the withdrawal of local government resolutions on timely registration of newborns and preschool children (Insan-Leilek)
- influencing a local department of health to compel pharmacies to post the full and comprehensive list of drugs available to seniors at a discounted rate

---

16 The evaluation team would like to signal that one of the evaluators was the lead trainer for the advocacy course. This has positive and negative consequences for this evaluation. On the one hand it means that the evaluator was familiar with partners and their work, on the other there is an obvious conflict of interest in assessing the quality of the training. However, that has not been an objective of this evaluation.
• signing an agreement with the municipality of Almaty to create a system to work with representatives of government structures and NGOs in solving the problem of women and children (Podrugi – Kazakhstan)
• successful lobbying for a municipal decree on taking additional measures to systematize medical assistance and providing access to education for street and working children (CPC).

All in all, partners feel confident in their ability to conduct advocacy at the local level, to be heard and to effect change. The main challenge they face is in ensuring that bylaws and regulations are implemented.

Partner Advocacy at the National Level
ABS platform members have done significant advocacy work at the national level, mainly through the organizing of round table discussions, legislative review, lobbying of parliamentarians and government officials, and some media work. They also participated in the research on propiska commissioned by DCA, both in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. Targets of national level advocacy have included members of parliament, the President’s Office, ministers of Education, Health, Social Protection and Finance and the State Registry Service (currently charged with propiska registration). Issues that partners have been advocating for include:

Propiska
• Review of propiska-related legislation and participation in a working group on passport simplification legislation organized by an MP (Adilet)
• Memorandum of Understanding to assist the State Registry Service with legislative and regulatory review (Adilet)

Children and juvenile rights
• Inclusion of juvenile justice provisions and provisions to end child labour in draft Child’s Code (Adilet, CPC, ANC)
• Lobbying for amendments to the penitentiary system relating to juveniles (Eagl)
• Advocating successfully for moratorium on recent legislation prohibiting adoption (CPC)
• Lobbying the Ministry of Education to allow children from internal migrant families to start schooling based on simplified procedures (CPC)
• Lobbying the Ministry of Education to prohibition of illegal financial and other contributions in educational institutions (CPC)
• Advocating for the elevation to Ministry of Social Protection and to set up departments for children and for the elderly (CPC)

Elder rights
• Lobbying on the Elder Code and input/drafting of a Law on the Elderly (ADRA, RCE, PASPP)

Migrant protection
• Lobbying for changes to the Agreement between the Kyrgyz Republic and Kazakhstan to strengthen the work against trafficking in persons and protecting the interests of migrant workers (Aikol)

Other
• Lobbying on the tax code (ABS partners)
• Lobbying for the recognition and provision of benefits to single mothers and for the Agency on Statistics to collect and make available data on single parents (Moldyr – Kazakhstan)
The list is impressive and much of the above advocacy work has met with success. There are some exceptions, notably the considerable time and effort that went into lobbying the Law on the Elderly, which is taking years to get through the Parliament (partly due to political events) and which some consider as having been reduced to token legislation.

Partners have been challenged by the turnover over officials and erasure of institutional memory due to political changes. As one partner put it, “It is hard to lobby when no one is there anymore.” The current fragmented state of Kyrgyz politics and the uncertainty as to the outcome of the next elections, and changes they will effect, continue to present an obstacle to advocacy.

If the new Public Supervisory Councils (described in Section 2, above) prove to be effective, they will present an opportunity for continued engagement with government and advocacy. ABS partners are already positioned to be active in these councils. Representatives of RCE, Insan-Leilek, and the Advocacy Network for Children have become members of the Public Supervisory Council established under the Ministry for Social Protection. The Director of Alkol is on the Public Council at the Ministry of Public Health. The Arysh Manager is the Deputy Chair of the Public Council of FOMS, the fund on mandatory medical insurance. Adilet has agreed to be on the Public Councils for the Social Fund and for Public Control, but has withdrawn from the Public Council at the Ministry of Finance due to inactivity.

**Partner Advocacy at the International Level**

Partner advocacy at the international level has been limited, but the experience they have gained has been invaluable. As mentioned earlier, DCA and APRODEV facilitated the participation of five representatives from partners from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan at a EU Parliamentary meeting in June 2010. Participants from Kyrgyzstan included Adilet and CPC. One person from each country made a presentation on propiska and impact on basic services followed by a Question & Answer session. They also met one-on-one with parliamentarians and visited various organizations. As one participant describes,

\[
\text{It was a great opportunity and good experience for us to talk at the European Parliament meeting...Normally only people from our opposition and political human rights organization are invited to such meetings. They are more focused on political and certain civil rights while we are more interested to discuss social rights, environmental rights or civil rights in a broader perspective. So it was very useful for us to talk about the situation in Kazakhstan on human rights from another perspective. In that case it was mainly about access to social benefits. Honestly speaking, sometimes you should more courageous to express an opinion different from the opinion of our opposition and political human rights organizations than to criticize the Government.}
\]

Partner attending European Parliament meeting.

As illustrated in the timeline below, the ABS platform’s cooperation with the APRODEV secretariat in Brussels paid off in terms of being able to include the propiska issue in the EU Commission’s programme for cooperation with Kyrgyzstan in the years to come. Partner ability to establish a joint case under the umbrella of the ABS programme and present it to the APRODEV secretariat, so that it could carry it forward, appears to have been instrumental in this respect.
Impact of partners’ international advocacy

In another example, CPC and ANC prepared a chapter on “Children’s Rights” for the shadow Universal Periodic Review, which was presented by one of the Network members in UN Committee on human rights in Geneva. From 168 recommendations made by the UN Committee on Child’s Rights, 18 were related to children’s rights.

Mature partners clearly have the potential to conduct advocacy at the international level. In order to do this successfully they need coaching and greater exposure to international advocacy networks. Regarding the EU Parliament meeting partners expressed appreciation for the coaching support given by APRODEV.

➢ Recommendation: continue to look for opportunities for partners to connect to international advocacy networks and help strengthen their capacity to participate.

Budget Monitoring

Efforts with regards to budget monitoring have been limited, but partners are encouraged by their recent successes in lobbying for budget allocations at the local level. Interest in budget monitoring both at the local and national level is growing. With a large number of self-help groups and federations in place, partners and their constituencies seem to possess a suitable organisational framework to engage more systematically in this activity too.

In June 2011 CPC organized a workshop on budget monitoring attended by various platform partners and the expectation is that a coalition will be formed to participate in the preparation of municipal budgets and monitor the budget execution for 2011. Additionally, in February 2011 CPC began participating in parliamentary budget hearings. According to the Alliance for Transparency, which conducted the budget monitoring training and is managed by a former staff person of the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry has a legal obligation to provide access to information on budgets. Alliance for Transparency has signed a memorandum of understanding with the Ministry on ‘neutral cooperation’ and is already working with 16 organizations on budget issues.
Working with local authorities to monitor budgets and spending means working hard to build trust and confidence in the relationships between all of those involved. Experience so far shows that at the onset of cooperation, both villagers and village authorities are often suspicious of each other and fearful that working together will be disadvantageous and difficult. Yet, the general experience of cooperation between local government institutions and communities is that it, once barriers are overcome, benefits both parties and does promote transparency in budgeting and spending.

- **Facilitate sharing of experiences and lessons learnt among partners on budget monitoring.**
- **Ensure that all partners receive budget monitoring training.**

**Assessment of Advocacy Capacity**

The above achievements clearly indicate that partners are capable at conducting advocacy at different levels. They are learning to work together – a fact that they attribute directly to participating in the partner platform. As one of the facilitators said of the 2010 partner platform meeting, “Each organization had the opportunity to see their strengths and weaknesses and see how they complement each other.”

Learning to work together has been of special importance with regards to work on propiska. As Arysh points out,

*Propiska and ABS are closely related. It is a pressing topic but has not been raised earlier. For one NGO alone to raise the issue is difficult. Our organization considers the platform as one of the tools to solve this problem. (Arysh)*

Partners use the platform to raise the issue jointly to the authorities, such as Adilet organizing a round table discussion on propiska for MPs, the Vice Prime Minister and other key stakeholders in June 2011. The example of the ABS platform in Kyrgyzstan presents an interesting turn in thinking about DCA programmes. Usually the focus has been on creating synergies between projects to promote service. While this does occur, such as when CPC refers cases of child protection to Adilet for legal services, the real strength of the programme approach has been at the advocacy level, when partners work together and establish a joint case.

The question is whether as a group partners are able to be strategic in their advocacy work. To all indications this is not yet the case. At the organizational level, of 13 organizations that responded to the online survey, only 6 (46%) indicated that they have an advocacy strategy. There is also a complete absence of an overarching propiska advocacy strategy and policy papers that examine the implications of removing the propiska residency requirement for access to basic services and propose solutions. At this time DCA does not have the in-house capacity to help partners become more strategic. What is clear is that contracting an outside organization to assist partners on a short-term basis, such as the Centre for Social and Political Study in Kazakhstan or the occasional facilitator, is not a solution to the problem because partners need on-going support and coaching.

This issue is discussed at greater length in Section 6.3 **Public Discourse.**

One final point: current DCA reporting requirements do not enable the reader to get a full view of advocacy work and achievements by issue, particularly when multiple partners cooperate on a single campaign. In order to get an overview, the evaluation team had to comb through the programme and project reports to extract pieces of information, complementing them with the partner interviews. The absence of issue-based documentation renders a disservice to the advocacy work and to DCA in its role in bringing the platform partners together to work on an issue.
At this juncture the evaluation team makes the following recommendations regarding advocacy capacity of partners:

- Include review and discussion of advocacy plans in monitoring visits and as part of final project evaluations.
- Produce occasional write-ups of advocacy campaigns. Partners may be able to write these with guidance from an advisor.

6.2 Empowerment of Affected Groups

Organising poor and marginalized people in Self-Help Groups (SHGs) is a strategy for support used by several of DCAs current and former partners, including Arysh, ADRA, RCE, CPC, Delight & Consolation, DCCA, Erayim, Mehr Shfakat, and Moldyr.

Individuals of 10 people or more are organized by DCAs partners and assisted in formulating by-laws, electing a chairman, a secretary and a cashier, and are trained in conducting meetings, in conflict management and in communication. It is up to each group to decide exactly what it wants to do and how frequently it wants to meet. Many groups engage in production and sales of handicrafts, in addition to following life-skill courses offered by one of DCAs partners. Courses include a wide variety of subjects, like raising chickens, vaccination, fundraising, letter writing and addressing local authorities.

The citizen-centred/empowerment advocacy approach adopted by the ABS partners clearly facilitates the transformation of target group consciousness from being disempowered to a critical, active and analytical one, which involves target groups as allies in the process of prioritizing and shaping the advocacy strategies and messages. The widespread use of this approach by so many NGOs in Kyrgyzstan is remarkable and has not been experienced to such an extent by any of the consultants before. At the same time, the approach adopted by partners seems to facilitate a close dialogue between partners and their target groups about prioritization of future projects. While some partners ask SHGs to appoint spokespersons to liaise between SHGs and the NGO, others meet regularly with SHG and provide counselling in prioritization and local community project planning.

'Arysh (partner) opened our eyes'
Women in illegal settlement explaining why her self-help group, after 6 years of waiting for the local quarter committee to produce results, was in a process of writing to the authorities of Bishkek to complain about the lack of water, sanitation, health and educational services in her area.

2010 Round table with MPs and government officials
Interministerial group established to address the issue
SHG send letters to member of parliament
2007
4 SHG established in settlement Alatoo 2 outside Bishkek
Selfhelp groups trained in liveskills and how to promote rights
2011
Impact of empowerment of SHGs in Alatoo. Entries below the horizontal line represent input, those above outputs.
The evaluation team did not have the time or opportunity to visit self-help groups from all DCAs partners, and the partners selected the SHGs visited by the team. Nevertheless, with these limitations in mind, it is was quiet clear that the organization of community members into SHGs has a very positive impact on the lives of those participating, first and foremost in terms of:

- Providing opportunities to acquire life skills that participants can use to develop coping strategies in their daily lives;
- Giving a sense of hope and opportunities to socialize;
- Increasing self-esteem when experiencing that own initiatives for resource mobilization and addressing local authorities for claims actually paid off;
- Provision of loans from self-established loan funds, where the interest rates would be much lower that average market interests.

The evaluation team was presented with several examples of how participants in SHGs used their newly acquired personal skills and the social capital acquired to improve their livelihood, either for themselves or for their local community. From lobbying local authorities and mobilizing community resources to improve roads, sanitation and irrigation systems, to establishing small business on poultry raising. In one community around Osh, the federation of 10 self-help groups was working with the local authorities to establish a kindergarten, and in the outskirts of Bishkek, a self-help group of elderly had done a fundraising campaign and established cooperation with shop owners to buy meat and bread at a discount. Several SHG members are also elected representatives in their districts or villages, while 9 people from the SHGs are deputies on district Keneshes – lobbying the interests of their villages supported by the NGO.

Tracing the impact of SHGs in writing applications.

While it was not possible for the team to trace the impact of all the more than 1,300 SHGs supported by DCA’s partners (but necessarily funded by DCA), the team has no reason to doubt the effectiveness and impact of the approach used. In fact, the widespread use of the approach, geographically and by so many different civil society organisations was very encouraging and hard to find elsewhere.
The evaluation team questions the view expressed in the mid-term review that partners need to understand their constituents better. The variety of activities initiated by the SHG groups is so wide that they can only be in response to needs identified by the community. Communities are advocating for everything from official recognition of their communities, to traffic lights, playgrounds, school construction, roads, bridges, irrigation and canals, to mention but a few.

**Poverty Orientation**

The programme’s main focus is on migrants and their children living in the outskirts of Kyrgyzstan’s main cities, most notably Bishkek. While this choice of target groups is evidence of the programme’s poverty orientation, migrants as such are not the most vulnerable group in Kyrgyz society, but certainly a group which, if marginalised may be a key factor in future conflicts. In Kyrgyzstan, pockets of extreme poverty do exist; in particular in former industrial zones and high altitude areas, currently inhabited by elderly people and their grandchildren only. The work of some DCA partners suggest, that the formation of self-help groups among this group of people is compatible with a PT1 programme focusing on empowerment of target groups to claim their rights, and the propiska issues are relevant for those groups too. The evaluation team therefore recommends that the elderly remain among the target groups of the future programme or that DCA provides a justification of the exclusion of this group.

**Gender**

The gender imbalance in the groups is apparent, with 80-100% of participants being women, of which a large proportion is widows and single mothers. The latter is an indication of the importance of the social capital and social support that is associated with participation in a SHG. The groups themselves partially explain the low participation of men with differences in life expectancy. Already in the age group 65-69 years there are 1.3 times more women than men.

Yet other factors, including high migration rates of men, and gender differences in the coping strategies of men and women, are equally, if not more important. As in so many other countries, men in Kyrgyzstan are assigned responsibility as breadwinners while women are responsible for child-raising and maintenance of the household. When this division of labour breaks down due to chronic unemployment and inability to support the family financially, women seem to turn to the SHGs for support for herself and her children.

The evaluation team also received the feedback that ‘aid is not good for men’ as it affects their dignity and counters their need to ‘try for themselves.’ At the same time, the soft subjects of communication and negotiation skills, group dynamics, and cooperation that are taught in SHGs appear to be less attractive to men, who prefer something more tangible. It is indeed food for thought that in Osh one partner had manage to establish three self-help groups for men helping each other reconstruct their houses after the 2010 riots in the city. Another partner had organized community rescue teams, responsible amongst other things for first aid and rapid response in times of flooding, roads blocked by falling trees or electric power cuts. In these groups 40% of participants were reported to be men.

There is little doubt, that the SHGs play a significant role in terms of empowering its (female) participants to cope with poverty and claim their rights in front of local and national authorities, and that it is an effective way of promoting dialogue between citizens and authorities.

- **Recommendation:** DCA and its partners should consider developing services that are attractive to (younger) men too, bearing in mind the economic, social and identity crisis men are exposed to, when not being able to support their families financially, how such crises will inevitably affect their families. The relevance of such activities may be even
more profound, if DCA and ICCO choose to target male migrants as part of its future HIV/AIDS programme.

Federation of SHGs
And important component in the development of grassroots empowerment under the ABS programme is the grouping of SHGs into clusters and the establishment of regional SHG federations. In particular Arysh has been supporting the establishment of a formal federation. At the end of the 2010 nine cluster members were elected to a formalization board and three of these to an executive committee. Plans are underway to organize a conference on the federation formation. Similarly, the SHGs organized by ADRA have a council that has established a permanent advocacy committee.

Recommendation: DCA should ensure that all partners have exit strategies on how to withdraw support to mature SHGs. Strategies should include considerations about the future relationship between the ‘mother NGO’ and SHGs, clusters and federations, additional partners and / or sources of future support.

6.3 Public Discourse on Propiska

Achievements to Date
Since the start of the ABS programme, DCA has had as its goal the elimination of the propiska or residential-based requirement to obtain a Kyrgyz identification document. The elimination of this requirement would remove the primary obstacle to access to public services for all migrants in Kyrgyzstan. A complete analysis of the propiska campaign will be presented in the upcoming context analysis. For the purpose of this evaluation, it suffices to review activities to date and assess the impact/contributions of the ABS programme towards progress made.

At the international level, as mentioned earlier in this report, DCA CA with facilitation from APRODEV organized the participation of six representatives from the ABS platform from Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan in hearings on the Sub-Committee for Human Rights of the European Parliament in June 2010. The aim of this initiative is to convince the EU to include propiska as a priority issue in its plans for Central Asia post-2013. This is a long-term effort and will require follow up and continued support and input to APRODEV from DCA CA and the ABS partners. Due to the upheavals of last year and uncertainty of the outcomes of the upcoming elections (and how they will affect current plans being drafted by the State Registry Service) support in this area has waned over the last six months.

At the country level, DCA has promoted the elimination of the address requirement by commissioning two studies on the impact of propiska conducted by the American University of Central Asia (AUCA, for Kyrgyzstan) and the Civil Society Development Association (‘ARGO’, for Kazakhstan) with the assistance of community-based partners such as CPC, RCE, Adilet, Arysh and Moldyr. These studies have increased awareness of the negative impact of the address requirement on migrant communities. The studies provided important information for the EU Parliament presentations and for discussions within Kyrgyzstan. AUCA reports that following presentations on the research findings the researchers received a number of calls from MPs asking for more information.

There is concrete evidence that the issue of propiska is rising on the agenda of key political figures. During the second week of the evaluation exercise there were two round table discussions organized on the issue of propiska. The first was hosted by the ABS platform coordinator (Adilet) and included two MPs and the Vice Prime Minister. The second was a discussion on propiska and education hosted by the Central Asian Free Market Institute (CAFMI), attended by a representative from the President’s Office.
There is also reason to believe that registration is being discussed within the government, particularly with regards to access to social benefits. CPC reports the existence of an inter-ministerial working group on reform of social services that is also discussing propiska. However, civil society proponents for changing the system – including DCA and its partners – do not appear to be engaging with other government agencies, in particular those that may be considered opponents to change, such as the Ministry of Interior and National Security Service.

At the community level, ABS platform partners have been raising the propiska issue with local authorities, schools, health centres, departments and ministries of education, health and social protection. They have been simultaneously pressing for change and attempting to find temporary solutions to address the needs of their communities. In their view, general attitudes of local authorities and government bodies are changing: “Whenever we raise the topic of children’s rights and we have high-level representation, they always say that they understand the problem. This is something new.” (CPC) In particular, partners point out that local authorities recognize that propiska institutionalizes discrimination against a large portion of citizens. “Authorities have come to understand that propiska is creating a problem for access to basic services.” (Arysh)

It is clear from discussions with partners and other informants that public discourse on the propiska issue has gone from non-existent to high profile in the last five years. On June 13, 2011, the news service 24.kg published an article announcing that MPs had introduced a draft bill into Parliament aimed at simplifying the system of certification and the institute of registration. ABS platform partner Adilet is a member of the parliamentary working group working on the bill. ABS partner Adilet has also signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the State Registry Service (currently responsible for registration) to assist them in reviewing registration-related regulations.

DCA has undoubtedly played a central role in raising the issue of residence-based registration in public discourse in Kyrgyzstan. The evaluation team is endeavouring to conduct a media monitoring exercise with the assistance from Adilet to substantiate this conclusion, however, such an exercise takes time. It would have been beneficial to include it as part of the original ABS programme design. At the time of this writing the media tracking exercise is still underway, thanks to the goodwill of the Adilet staff. It is hoped that an analysis of propiska-related articles in three newspapers – two in Russian language and one in Kyrgyz – can be conducted for the last five-year period.

The On-going Propiska Campaign

With the propiska issue clearly on the political agenda, the ABS platform is at risk of being a victim of its own success. With public recognition of the need to change the propiska system DCA and its partners need to move beyond the point of documenting the problem of the propiska to proposing solutions. In this context, the current greatest weakness of the ABS platform is that it lacks a national propiska strategy and as a result the campaign appears to have lost momentum. Partners lack a sense of direction and sense that they are being overtaken by events.

New actors are appearing on the scene that do not necessarily know about the past activities and achievements of the platform members and they are moving forward with their own plans. While they may have the same goals – to de-link eligibility for social services from residency – they are more flexible in presenting the propiska issue in terms other than human rights. For example, CAFMI has chosen to couch the discourse on propiska in terms of harmful economic effects, arguments that may serve to draw the attention of other government actors.

The absence of a national campaign strategy explains in part DCA’s failure to maximize the results of the research because lacking a strategy DCA and the ABS partners are not sure what more can be
done with the research findings. In fact, the research represents a wealth of information that can be tailored to different audiences (e.g. ministries and departments, LSGs, media outlets members of the public) to mobilize their support for changing the registration system.

Another weakness of the programme is the complete absence of policy proposals on propiska-related topics. Authorities in health, social services, education and security all use the propiska system for different planning and budgeting purposes. These are legitimate and even necessary functions to secure efficiency and transparency in public spending. Thus, the challenge now for DCA and its partners is to understand these needs and the day-to-day function of the system in order to be able to provide recommendations for a system that meets the legitimate budgetary needs of public authorities and which accommodates the needs to absorb the many Kyrgyz men, women and children without a registration and allow them to move smoothly from one part of the country to another without having to go through cumbersome and lengthy application processes and processes of negotiations with local authorities.

Actors such as the Red Crescent and CAFMI are already beginning to look into these issues. If DCA and its partners wants to remain key actors in the formulation of a future registration system that accommodates the needs of a highly mobile population as well as the planning needs of local and national authorities, it is time to start studying the functionality of the current system and engage more intensively with decision makers operating and managing the system so as to understand their needs and concerns.

- Proposed actions to improve DCA and partner advocacy work on propiska issue:

  - As soon as possible, facilitate the development of a national propiska strategy that highlights the possible roles and contributions of different actors, including newcomers outside the ABS platform.
  - Provide technical assistance in the form of an advocacy/policy expert to coach to:
    - Examine and document – the needs and concerns of public authorities for a transparent and efficient planning system and – and using partner experiences and insight as the starting point – how removing the propiska requirement will affect the different sectors (education, health, social benefits). For example, CPC has already conducted an exercise (supported by USAID) with LSGs to count first grade entrants in 5 migrant settlements of Bishkek as a mechanism to promote accurate school enrolment estimates.
    - Assist partners in the platform to develop policy proposals for the various sectors.
  - To remain updated on the propiska situation in Kazakhstan, commission occasional updates (e.g. every six months) from ARGO.

7. EFFICIENCY

7.1 Cost-Efficiency and Timely Implementation of the Programme
DCAs ABS programme started in 2008 and was implemented in a context of DCA having to open an office in Bishkek, select partners, establish a partner platform, secure funding, increase the financial turnover and deal with a political crisis that temporarily left 375,000 people displaced. Taking this into account, it is hard to question the efficiency of the programme as such, although the long time
taken in planning and preparing programme documents does point to some inefficiency in the early stages of the programme. The likely reasons for this are lack of experience, management oversight and multiplicity of priorities and stakeholders.

During these past four years, the programme has succeeded in bringing the issue of propiska to the attention of international agencies such as the EU and the OSCE as well as national decision makers in the State Registry Service, the President’s Office and the among parliamentarians in the opposition. Key government officials have understood that the inefficient and bureaucratic registration system adds to the suffering of large population groups and are beginning to acknowledge the need to address the problem. Additionally, new stakeholders in civil society, such as the Red Crescent and the Central Asia Free Market Institute, have been attracted to the cause.

A total number of 1300 self-help groups have been established and supported by DCA’s partners in the last four years (however, not necessarily supported by DCA only), leading to stronger claim-making by constituents and dialogue with local authorities and, ultimately to improved access to school, health care institutions, and social benefits.

DCA has been equally efficient in building the capacity of partners in key areas such as advocacy planning, financial management and juvenile justice. This has been done while at the same time shedding ineffective partners, a process that DCAs takes very serious and is not just done overnight.

7.2 Opportunities to Increase Efficiency
With the very slow merger of ICCOs and DCAs activities and an opening from the Kyrgyz authorities to actually discuss ways of solving the propiska issue, it is time for a change of approach if momentum and efficiency are to be preserved.

While DCA and its partners have been very efficient in documenting the human and social impact of the propiska system on migrants and other population groups without propiska, there is very little understanding among the partners about the needs of the authorities for a registration system in the first place. At the same time, the confusion among platform members about ‘what to do next’ appears profound. This gap, discussed in depth in Section 6.3, represents inefficiency because partners lose momentum and their relevance to duty bearers diminishes.

Another key factor affecting efficiency is the proposed, yet very slow process of merging ICCOs and DCAs activities. The fact that the platform has not been able to follow-up on decisions made during the joint partner platform in December 2010 is attributed to ICCO and DCA being unable to agree on how to proceed. While this issue is discussed at length in Section 5 Effectiveness, the lack of clarity about how and when to proceed with the merger adversely affects cooperation and momentum within platform.

7.3 Cost Efficiency
With 1300 self-help groups supported, almost 18,000 direct participants and an annual budget of approximately 5 million Danish kroner, the programme is cost efficient.

The self-help group approach is a way of reaching and educating people, while investing a minimum of resources, and counting on resources of the participants themselves. This approach appears to work well in a context of a fairly well educated population and – compared to other development settings – a high level of trust between civil society actors. Both are indicators of a solid social capital that – with the facilitation of self-help groups - can be easily activated (compared to other settings).
With a variety of donors, including DANIDA, the Soros Foundation, EU, the World Diabetes Foundation and funds from ‘Granny Aid’ and ‘Give a Goat’, the programme has been able to diversify its funding base, thereby reducing the dependency on one donor and at the same time bridging the interests of several different sources of funding.

The consultants have not been able to go into details with the way fundraising efforts and programme focus influences each other. However, the consultants believe that a key reason for the ability of the programme to maintain its focus, despite the diversified funding base, is the broad focus of the programme itself: ‘Access to basic services.’ Attempts to alleviate the negative consequences of not having propiska and mobilise local communities to be responsible for their own development, can be addressed in several ways, working with diverse target groups such as migrants, children of migrants and the elderly, thereby accommodating interests of donors, without severely compromising the focus of the programme.

8. SUSTAINABILITY

Empowering local communities, as done in the ABS programme, is a cornerstone to sustainability. When acquiring life skills such as negotiation and communication skills, and key knowledge such as understanding of one’s rights and where to claim them, participants in self-help groups are much more capable of addressing their own needs and fight for their rights, even without the support of the NGO that facilitated the learning process in the first place. SHG members being elected to local village committees, engaging in fundraising initiatives in their own community, producing and selling handicrafts to top their pensions, and addressing local authorities and meeting with MPs are all examples of interventions and initiatives taken by target groups with limited or no involvement of DCA’s partners.

DCA’s active engagement with partners, coaching them in their work, building their capacity in financial management, adding to their advocacy capacity are all examples of how DCA strives to strengthen and sustain the organizational capacity of partners. The initiative and conduct of partners in the partner platform, in liaising with authorities and in seeking representation in public supervisory councils suggests a high degree of technical sustainability by various DCA partners.

Yet as in so many other countries, the financial sustainability of DCA’s partner organisations remains limited. While this may be difficult to solve in the short term, DCA and partners can work to increase ownership and financial support from the Kyrgyz public at large. This would not only add to the financial base of the organizations. It would also contribute to change the (wrong) image of civil society organisations being ‘internationally owned’ and acting as ‘spies’ for foreign interests.

Some of the partners have already begun to think about their long-term sustainability. Over the past decade CPC has initiated a number of income generating activities. CPC also solicits and receives occasional support from small businesses. However, like all DCA partners, CPC has no experience in developing a long-term fundraising strategy. In particular, they could use assistance:

- analysing potential givers in Kyrgyzstan
- surveying the private sector – in particular successful small and medium enterprises
- educating potential givers about their activities
- examining income-generating opportunities
- accessing information about international non-profit grants
- developing and implementing a long-term public relations and fundraising strategy.

As CPC points out, “We can do it, we just need some help to get started.”
Finally, while DCA RO is very much aware of this issue, it will be important to develop and share exit strategies with the partners so that they understand that they need to be focusing on developing their fundraising strategies and that they cannot remain complacent about on-going DCA funding.

- **Recommendations for increasing partner sustainability:**
  - Place of a fundraising specialist in DCA CA for six months to assist the most mature organizations develop a fundraising strategy.
  - Set up subscription of a web based ‘early warning system’ for all international calls from private foundations and international donors agencies relevant to the ABS programme.
  - DCA HQ to produce and disseminate guides on (a) local resource mobilization and (b) international small grant funding opportunities (Rotary International, Lyons, etc.)
  - Develop exit strategies with partners.

9. **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the evaluation team finds that the ABS programme and the activities implemented are highly relevant given the country’s economic crisis and the fragility of its democracy. In this context, civil society organisations appear to play a stabilizing role at the local community level. The evaluation confirms that civil society organisations are capable of articulating the needs and concerns of the Kyrgyz citizens to decision makers locally and nationally.

The determination and goal-directedness by which DCA RO has been able to establish itself as a credible and influential partner for project support and advocacy of Kyrgyz civil society organisations in a period of only 3.5 years has impressed the evaluation team.

Yet, moving from the current phase of setting up and consolidating an office to maturing into a highly professional humanitarian player in Kyrgyz development and public discussions on poverty alleviation is never without challenges. This applies to DCA too. The evaluation team would like to point to three challenges in particular that DCA may want to address as part of its continued growth and development as an organization in Kyrgyzstan.

**To merge or not to merge**

At the time of the evaluation, a merger of the DCA and ICCO programmes on ‘political space’ had been discussed for more than 3 years, with commitment declared repeatedly from both sides. Yet, as this evaluation demonstrates, a commitment without action can hardly be termed a commitment. And the long time taken since the first ‘declaration of interest’ has certainly taken its toll among staff members on both sides.

Sharing offices (as mentioned in the mid-term review) is no doubt of vital importance if one is to create a joint organizational culture between two separate organizational entities. However, such sharing of offices may be in vain, if one does not work proactively and simultaneously on a joint organizational set-up with clear divisions of responsibility and management structures. The situation in Kyrgyzstan appears to confirm this.

As the case in Kyrgyzstan demonstrates, merging programmes can be associated with a good deal of fear of losing identity, control – or even jobs. This appears to be the case in particular with ICCO staff members, whose programme is significantly smaller than DCA’s. It may therefore be inappropriate to assume that a merger can be left to those that a likely to be the most affected only.
The evaluation team would like to recognize the huge efforts made by DCA RO staff in trying to build the trust needed to turn the words of commitment for a merger into action in Kyrgyzstan. Yet the team would also like to express its concern about the feasibility of this effort. Without the active involvement of staff from DCA and ICCOs headquarters – i.e., from actors who are less likely to be directly affected by the merger, it is unlikely that it will take place. An active intervention of managers in the ICCO and DCA HQs and Bishkek office managers alike is necessary if words of commitment should be turned into action and the programme be brought out of its current stalemate.

Advocacy Capacity
As described in this report, the evaluation team was impressed by the ability of DCA and its partners to bring the propiska issue to the attention of public policy makers and bring about a change in the public discourse on the issue: from a state of non-recognition to acknowledgement of the problem. The ability of DCA to organize a partner platform under the programme appears to have been instrumental in partners establishing a joint advocacy case that could be taken into account by national authorities as well as by the EU. The capacity of the programme to unite partners behind a common advocacy cause may be one of the most profound values added of DCAs programme approach (as opposed to the project approach).

Yet it is also obvious that the programme’s success in terms of making authorities acknowledge the problem of the propiska, presents new – and in the eyes of the evaluation team – interesting challenges. If DCA chooses to confront them, this may add to the organization’s professionalism and advocacy capacity.

As described in this report, DCA and its Kyrgyz partners have reached a stage where it is no longer sufficient to document the humanitarian consequences of the propiska system. Now is the time to propose solutions. In order to do this, DCA and its partners need to understand the planning needs of the authorities that use the propiska system on a daily basis and the consequences of abolishing the system. To do so, DCA and its partners would need to assign a senior advocacy officer with previous experience from working with or inside the government system, with the skills to understand and negotiate the technicalities of a new registration system. The evaluation team recognizes that taking such a step would represent a challenge in terms of including a staff member with a slightly different profile, experience and viewpoint. However, the team is convinced that taking such a step would contribute to sharpening the advocacy capacity and profile of DCA and its partners and that it would therefore be worth the investment. This person could be located at DCA or within a partner or other institution.

Monitoring outcome rather than reporting on activities
As described in this report, the numerous examples of the impact – the difference – that DCA and its partners make to the lives of poor and marginalized people in Kyrgyzstan is not described adequately in partners reports, DCA annual reports or project evaluation reports. The evaluation team finds that the quality of the evaluations and the information about partners – while it has improved with time – is so low that it presents a disservice to DCA.

DCAs own reporting system, which requires the gathering of so much information that it appears to overwhelm its staff and – possibly – derange the focus from the essential question of ‘what is the benefit’ of DCAs investment, may be one reason why.

A second explanation may be the inadequate skills of partner project staff and external consultants hired for end-of-project evaluations to trace and describe the benefits and impact of projects. And a third is the tendency of project planners to look for outcome and impact within the short lifetime of
a project only (usually 2-3 years). Yet, as some of the timelines prepared for this report demonstrate, outcome and impact may not be traceable within such a short timeframe. Self-help groups established in 2004 may take several years to mature and establish trust among its members. It may be some time before the requisite skills are needed, such as when they sat down in 2009 to write a letter to the mayor of the city, bringing the needs of the local community to the agenda of the city council.

It remains outside the scope of this report to provide recommendations on how DCA may want to strengthen its reporting on outcome and impact. Yet for the sake of DCAs own learning and for future fundraising, the evaluation team recommends that DCA make an effort to develop its own internal understanding of how to trace and report on benefits and impact of DCAs and its partners’ work.
### Appendix A: List of Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adilet</td>
<td>Cholpon Djakupova</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asyl Balybaeva</td>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cholpon Babalyva</td>
<td>Public Relations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRA</td>
<td>Igor Litvinov</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Network for Children</td>
<td>Natalia Vorobyova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mirlan Midietov</td>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veniera Stamaliva</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gladis Temirchieva</td>
<td>PR Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikol</td>
<td>Gulmira Temirbekova</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGO</td>
<td>Djamila Asanova</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arysh</td>
<td>Jumagazy Sadyr Uluu</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuriya Temirova</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mamatkul Aidaraliya</td>
<td>Division Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roza Ajimamatova</td>
<td>Social Worker, SHGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamila Asylbaeva</td>
<td>Fundraising Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Mira Itikeeva</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olga</td>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurgul Alybaeva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCCA-Osh</td>
<td>Ikbola Bakhramova</td>
<td>Manager, Osh Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Cholpon Omurkanova</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roza Jailova</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atay Alamazuul</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meder Sadeykov</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Veronina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eraym</td>
<td>Rakhila Zhupuova Ismailovna</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insan Lelek</td>
<td>Gulsana Satyeva</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonun Leilek</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator, Bispana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterBilim-Osh</td>
<td>Gulgaky Mamasalieva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBIHR</td>
<td>Roza Akylbekova</td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denis Jivaga</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldyr</td>
<td>Lyazatt Ishmuhamedova</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galina Meermanova</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehr-Shafkat</td>
<td>Maharam Taabaldieva</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA HIV Program</td>
<td>Saida</td>
<td>HIV Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zamira</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podrugi (HIV program)</td>
<td>Nadejda Gladyr</td>
<td>Coordinator, Youth Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena NAME</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow (HIV program)</td>
<td>Fatima Koshokova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCE</td>
<td>Svetlana Bashtovenko</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DCA/ICCO/ACT Alliance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCA HQ</td>
<td>Carol Rask</td>
<td>Policy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joergen Thomsen</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator, Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elsebeth Gravgaard</td>
<td>Policy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA CA</td>
<td>Tatiana Kotova</td>
<td>Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatiana Zorina</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cholpon Akmatova</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO CA</td>
<td>Pepijn Trapman</td>
<td>Regional Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muratbek Ismailov</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gulzat Temirova</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO/DCA</td>
<td>Vassily</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRODEV</td>
<td>Martin Schuster</td>
<td>APRODEV Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Propiska/Political Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Society of Red Cross and Red Crescent (working on propiska)</td>
<td>Rima Sultanova</td>
<td>Programme on Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elena Pabluka</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator, Labor Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Delegation</td>
<td>Colombe de Mercey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Erkin Kasybekov</td>
<td>Democracy &amp; Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinara Suyunbaeva</td>
<td>Democracy &amp; Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Democratic Institute (NDI)</td>
<td>Aida Suyundueva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Human Rights Expert and Activist</td>
<td>Dmitry Kabak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Center for non-commercial law (ICNL)</td>
<td>Nookat Idrisov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House</td>
<td>Almaz Esengeldiev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ACSSC
- **Aidar Mambetov**
- **Aida Kurbanova** - Co-facilitated 2009 and 2010 Partner Meeting

## Small Business Development Center (SBDC)
- **Zaure Sadykova** - Co-facilitated 2010 Partner Meeting

## Central Asia Free Market Institute (CAFMI)
- **Mirsulzhan Namazaliev** - Co-Founder
- **Seyitbek Usmanov** - Co-Founder
- **Chinara Elsultanlieva** - Coordinator

## Adylsoz
- **Tamara Kaleyeva** - Director, Adylsoz (International Foundation for Protection of Freedom of Speech, Kazakhstan)

## American University of Central Asia (AUCA)
- **Mehrigul Alezova** - Lead Researcher, DCA study on impact of propiska on access to basic services

## Law and Environment Eurasia partnership
- **Vadim Ni** - Researcher, DCA study on impact on propiska, Kazakhstan

## Independent Journalist
- **Alexander Kulinsky**

## Consultant
- **Dana Jarikova** - Conducted organizational assessment of Moldyr

## Citizens Against Corruption
- **Tolekan Asanalievna** - Director

## Alliance for Transparency
- **Roza Mavlyanovna** - Director

## Center for Social Political Studies
- **Olessya Khalabuzar** - Director, Conducted advocacy consultancy for Moldyr

---

### ICCO Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights and Democracy Center (Osh)</td>
<td>Idrisbek Kubatbekov</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akbiy Musaev</td>
<td>Programme Manger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aida Beklasheva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Center</td>
<td>Jenishbek Toroev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Members of Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>Asia Sasykbaeva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>Dastan Bekeshov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>Ravshan Zneenbekov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Social Protection</td>
<td>Gulnara Derbisheva</td>
<td>Deputy Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #43, Bishkek</td>
<td>Jamalka Ismailaeva</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #10, Bishkek</td>
<td>Ludmilla Jiockamenco</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>Gulmira Kudaiberdieva</td>
<td>Education Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B - DCA Partner Highlights

The table below highlights partner work under the ABS programme and is not intended to reflect the full scope of partner activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Partner</strong></th>
<th><strong>Focus</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adilet</strong></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adilet is working at the national level on analysis of propiska-related legislation and regulatory framework. Adilet has provided legal services for hundreds of minors and works to help them restore their documentation and learn about their rights. In 2010 Adilet is the coordinating agency for the partner platform. The Adilet Director attended the EU meeting in Brussels in 2010.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADRA</strong></td>
<td>Bishkek</td>
<td>Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRA has established 31 self-help groups of elders in the Bishkek area. They have participated in the campaign to adopt an Elder Code, lobbied to have the Babushka trading pavilions (of elder products) awarded tax-exempt status, and lobbied to have non-profit organizations declared tax-exempt. ADRA also monitors medical services for the elderly and corruption related issues such as illegal payments for hospital treatment, non-attendance of doctors and refusal to treat elders. ADRA's SHGs have established a permanent advocacy committee that has engaged in monitoring public utilities. SHGs have successfully lobbied for the installation of traffic lights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Network for Children</strong></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Organizations working on children's rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Advocacy Network for Children monitors amendments regulating the protection of the rights of juveniles. In 2010 it participated in a working group at the Ministry of Justice and prepared a chapter on children's rights for presentation at the UN Committee on Human Rights in Geneva where 18 of its recommendations were adopted. In 2010 the Advocacy Network for Children underwent an organizational assessment and strategic planning process. In 2010 the network underwent an organizational assessment and strategic planning exercise supported by DCA. One of the resulting decisions was to broaden its scope and membership to cover the entire country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aikol Development Center for Citizen Initiatives.</strong></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Civil society organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikol works to strengthen civil society organizations. Aikol has been advocating to reduce the state registration of unregistered children and to change the agreement between the Kyrgyz Republic and Kazakhstan related to human trafficking and the protection of migrant workers. They have also advocated for the inclusion of women in the courts of elders and for the adoption of regulations to prevent juvenile delinquency. Aikol has lobbied successfully to withdraw a resolution by the Governor of Talas on the timely registration of newborn babies and preschool children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arysh</strong></td>
<td>Bishkek</td>
<td>Internal migrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Since 1998, Arysh has organized 205 SHGs in 13 new settlements of Bishkek. Arysh advocates to increase access to schools for settlement children and to bring government medical services to the communities. Arysh participated in the DCA-sponsored research on propiska. Arysh supports SHGs to advocate with local authorities for legal recognition of their communities, implementation of projects (such as playgrounds) and increased access to basic services. | }

CPC works to reintegrate street children into their families and society, provide them with medical care, proper nutrition and life skills through by maintaining two daycare centers. Parents are organized into self-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Support Groups</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target Group:</strong> Street &amp; working children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diabetes Association of Kyrgyzstan, HelpAge International, ADRA &amp; RCE</strong></td>
<td>Support groups to promote an interest in their children’s wellbeing and education. Some receive vocational training. CPC also works to influence school administrations and the government to provide children with access to education and medical services. The organization also works to obtain birth certificates for children. The CPC Director attended the EU meeting in Brussels in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group:</strong> Elders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delight &amp; Consolation</strong></td>
<td>With DCA support, the project on Improving Diabetes Prevention and Treatment in Kyrgyzstan has provided education on early diabetes diagnosis to almost 2,000 people. DAK and his partners have organized 32 diabetes support groups and teaches people about their medical rights. DAK has trained 102 people on how to monitor medical services. Finally, DAK has also advocated for government subsidies for diabetes tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> Bishkek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group:</strong> Elders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCCA – Osh</strong></td>
<td>In Osh (southern Kyrgyzstan), DCCA has established 300 SHGs, many of them with doing agriculture or animal husbandry and many of them involving men. Since the 2010 conflict, DCCA has focused on helping community members recover their lost documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> Osh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group:</strong> Rural communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eagl</strong></td>
<td>Eagl works with children in law with the law, establishing the first rehab center in a government juvenile facility. Eagl works with the staff of the facility to provide services and skills training to 70 youth, all young men, and facilitate their reintegration into society. Eagl is part of a coalition of organizations advocating for the implementation of principles of juvenile justice in Kyrgyz law. Eagl has also produced a teaching manual on working with children in conflict with the law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> Juvenile facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group:</strong> youth in conflict with the law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eraym</strong></td>
<td>Eraym works with SHGs in Osh and Jalalabad, provides skills training and supports them as they approach local authorities to solve problems such as lack of child care, absence of electricity, the need to clean canals and allocate plots for young families. Eraym currently works with 37 SHGs the include almost 400 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> Osh &amp; Jalalabad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insan-Leilek</strong></td>
<td>Insan-Leilek focuses on vulnerable groups, including the elderly and the disabled in 3 districts. The main activities have been advocacy on social benefits and medical issues, through education of government officials and service providers, an education campaign, and focus on monitoring and transparency. Insan-Leilek has been a member of the Alliance for Transparency for some years and has successfully advocated for allocations for public transportation and drugs in local budgets. Insan-Leilek has kept regular pressure on the FOMS (medical insurance) agency to inform the elderly of their benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus:</strong> Isfana, Batken, and Toguzbulakssii Ailnii districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target group:</strong> elderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Mehr-Shafkat** | Mehr-Shafkat is a community development organization that works with SHGs in Aravan and Karasuu districts of Osh Province in the south. The organization has established 240 SHGs with 5,000 members. Under the DCA program, Mehr-Shafkat conducts HIV/AIDS awareness raising and post-conflict assistance recovery/humanitarian assistance. Most of the SHG members are wives of labor migrants. The organization has worked closely with HIV testing centers to motivate members of the public to go for testing. | Focus area: Aravan and Karasuu districts, Osh Province  
Target group: migrant families. |
| **Moldyr** | A partner of DCA’s for many years until the end of 2010, Moldyr has established 20 SHGs with 200 women members in Kazakhstan. Moldyr has taken up the issue of social benefits for single parents and single mothers in particular. The organization has lobbied successfully for social benefits for single parents and for the collection of social and economic data on single parents by the national agency for statistics. | Focus: Almaty, Kazakhstan  
Focus group: women, single women |
| **PASPP** | A partner of DCA’s until 2010, PASPP established SHGs for 330 elderly members. PASPP worked on the elder code, and provided skills training to assist elderly people to generate income. | Focus area: Bishkek  
Target group: elderly |
| **Podrugi** | Podrugi conducts awareness training for students in four educational institutions of Almaty, Kazakhstan. The organization recently concluded a Memorandum of Understanding with the Municipality of Almaty to create a system to work with representatives of government structures and NGOs in solving the problem of women and children. | Focus: Almaty, Kazakhstan  
Target group: youth |
| **Rainbow** | DCA is supporting Rainbow to provide litigation assistance for 250 cases of children who contracted HIV through the medical system. So far compensation has been awarded (although not collected) for 11 families, with another 60 cases pending. Rainbow also organizes support groups for families (particularly mothers who are left to care for the sick child alone), trains hospital staff to be more sensitive and increases capacity of HIV counselors. | Focus: national  
Target group: families of children with HIV. |
| **Resource Center for the Elderly** | RCE has established 127 SHGs with the elderly in addition to a senior daycare center. RCE has been a key advocate for the adoption of an Elder Code and passage of a Law on the Elderly. RCE was also one of the organizers of the conference on developing a culture of philanthropy in Kyrgyzstan. | Focus: Bishkek  
Focus: Elderly |
Appendix C – DCA Partner Timeline

- = started prior to indicated year, + = partnership concluded activity in South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year added</th>
<th>Year ended</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Focus (target &amp; area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>CIB Bishkek</td>
<td>Youth, Voting rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>DCCA-Bishkek</td>
<td>Rural communities, community mobilization, advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>D&amp;C</td>
<td>Vulnerable groups, diaconical/social work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ARYSH</td>
<td>Internal migrants, Self-help groups and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Street children, advocacy, self-help groups, capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>RCE</td>
<td>Elder people, capacity building and advocacy of rights of elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Baspana</td>
<td>Community development, new settlements in Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>PASPP</td>
<td>Elder people, capacity building and advocacy of rights of elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Podrugi</td>
<td>Women rights, education of children on HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Moldir</td>
<td>Women rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>DCCA-South</td>
<td>Rural community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rainbow</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ELCRK</td>
<td>Diaconical work, single women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Adilet</td>
<td>children in conflict with the law, legal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Eagl</td>
<td>children in conflict with the law, advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Insan-Leilek</td>
<td>Elder people, capacity building and advocacy of rights of elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>APRODEV</td>
<td>Interchurch Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Project Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Mehr-Shavkat</td>
<td>Rural community development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>DAK</td>
<td>diabetes patients, Advocacy and health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Eraiym</td>
<td>Rural community development, Self-help groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CSIP</td>
<td>legal support for vulnerable groups, including crisis affected people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>KBIHR legal support, human rights protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>CAAW</td>
<td>water users, community development, advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>CIB Osh</td>
<td>people affected by the crisis in the South, advocacy, social partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Aikol</td>
<td>Children and their parents without documents, advocacy, social partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D - Tracing Impact of ABS programme and project activities (additional example)

As part of the stakeholder workshop conducted on 16-17 June, participants were asked to draft timelines indicating the relationship between inputs and outputs over time. The exercise gave an interesting picture of the multitude of activities and initiatives that DCA and its partners had been involved in during the past 5 years, and the outcomes. Inputs appear below the horizontal line and outputs above it. While it was outside the scope of this evaluation to trace all the impact and outcomes of DCAs and its partners’ work, a few examples are included below (in addition to those in the main evaluation report) for inspiration and further clarification.

 Advocacy of SHG of elders to restore traffic light
Appendix E: Report Card

The following report card provides a graphic illustration of the evaluation team’s assessment of how the DCA CA programme is measuring up to the programme indicators. Explanation of scores: \( \sqrt{ } \) = poor  \( \sqrt{\sqrt{ }} \) = medium  \( \sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{}}} \) = good  \( \sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{}}} } \) = extraordinary  ? = unclear/in question.

- Local authorities aware.
- Partners understand and monitor budgets +
- Local institutions question legal frameworks ?
- Local institutions propose solutions. ??

- Communities understand rights and negative impact of structures.
- Communities have more control over own development
- Increased claim making within communities towards local structures

Legal Frameworks and budgets challenged

Affected groups organized

DCA increases networking capacity

Partners stronger, more coordinated & strategic to hold decision makers accountable

- Partner advocacy supported by documentation.
- DCA documents lessons learned through partner platform on propiska and budget monitoring

- Partners work well in coalitions
- Partners involved in monitoring resources
- Partners involved in documenting propiska
- Partners focus on advocacy on structures rather than cases.
- Partner platform forum for strategic advocacy.