



Mid-Term Evaluation

KabarOrdo: Our Time for Dialogue

A program implemented by
Search for Common Ground|Kyrgyzstan
and
Youth of Osh (YoO)

With support from the
US Agency for International Development (USAID) in Bishkek

Award number:
USAID APS-176-11-000001
Conflict Mitigation Activities in Kyrgyzstan

March-April 2013

Evaluator
Shiva K Dhungana
Asia Regional DM&E Specialist
Search for Common Ground

The views expressed in this report are those of program participants and the author and may not necessarily represent the official views of the USAID, SFCG and Youth of Osh in Kyrgyz Republic

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
I. BACKGROUND	6
1.1 Context Description	6
1.2 Program Description	8
1.2.1 <i>Capacity building component</i>	8
1.2.2 <i>Reporting component</i>	9
1.2.3 <i>Outreach component</i>	10
1.3 Mid-Term Review Methodology.....	10
II. MAJOR FINDINGS	12
2.1 Effectiveness.....	12
2.1.1 <i>Planned versus Participant-reported Results</i>	12
2.2 Contributions and Challenges	24
2.3 Relevance	25
2.4 Implementation Process	28
2.5 Coherence and Coordination	32
2.5.1 <i>Internal KabarOrdo Coherence</i>	33
2.5.2 <i>Coordination among Partners</i>	33
III. CONCLUSION	35
IV. APPENDICES	37
Annex I: Planning Guide for Common Ground Reports	37
Annex II: Criteria for Evaluating Common Ground Reports.....	41
Annex III: Community Discussion Planning Template.....	42
Annex IV: List of people interviewed during the midterm evaluation.....	43
Annex IV: Interview Checklists.....	45
<i>FGDs and KIIs checklist for journalists</i>	45
<i>KII/FGDs Checklist for Media Directors</i>	46
<i>KII checklists for Media Consultants</i>	46
<i>KII Checklists for Community Discussion Facilitators</i>	47
<i>KII Checklists for Project staff</i>	47
Annex V: Mid-Term Terms of Reference (TOR)	49
Annex VI: Survey Questionnaires Administered to the Journalists.....	55

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the organizations whose individuals helped us during the conduct of this midterm evaluation. The Project Manager and the Monitoring and Communications Officer of Search for Common Ground (SFCG), the Director and Project Assistant and other members of Youth of Osh (YoO) were gracious and supportive in supplying me with documents and information, answering questions, helping arrange visits to the field and to their program sites, and explaining the background and various elements of their work. Personnel in SFCG were interested and helpful with this evaluation, and mindful of how the information gathered and analyzed might inform their peacebuilding and conflict transformation investments for the coming years.

The program participants, Directors of the Media Outlets and the community members, who I visited and interviewed in Osh, Jaalal-Abad and Ala-Buka gave me valuable time and information. They traveled distances to meet with me and allowed me to interrupt their busy days to tell us of their involvement in and commitment to peace and democracy in Southern Kyrgyzstan. The people were hospitable and their willingness to talk with the evaluator was praiseworthy. The drivers who drove me within Osh and other parts of South Kyrgyzstan deserve special thanks, as does Mr. Andre, my driver in Bishkek.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Search for Common Ground|Kyrgyzstan has been implementing a project entitled “*KabarOrdo: Our Time for Dialogue* (formerly Engaging Young Reporters and Community Leaders in Early Warning and Conflict Prevention in Kyrgyzstan’s South)” with the funding support of USAID. The project is being implemented in Osh and Jalal-Abad Oblasts of South Kyrgyzstan in partnership with Youth of Osh (YoO) and seven media outlets (3 TV, 2 Newspapers and 2 Radio) from the two oblasts and National Television Channel OTRK. The **overall goal** of the project is “to prevent the re-emergence of violent conflict in Kyrgyzstan’s south through more comprehensive and accessible conflict-sensitive reporting and early warning analysis. More specifically, the **project’s objectives** are i) to support the dissemination of conflict-sensitive information and analysis of local conflict trends; and ii) increase public awareness and understanding of collaborative approaches to inter-ethnic conflict dynamics. As part of the project’s monitoring and evaluation plan, the internal mid-term review was designed to assess the effectiveness, relevance, implementation process, coherence, and coordination. The review is expected to help the SFCG|Kyrgyzstan, Youth of Osh and its donor to improve the project’s implementation process and mechanism for year two and incorporate lessons for the similar projects in the future. The review included mixed methods of research such as document review, FGDs and KIIs, process observation and quantitative survey among participants of media training. The review included 4 FGDs, 44 KIIs, one community discussion and one quantitative survey among 30 participating journalists.

According to the work plan developed for the first year, SFCG was supposed to train 35 journalists and 15 Youth of Osh Media School participants on Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis training, 4 participants on dialogue and debate facilitation skills and 3 media experts on TOT on Common Ground Reporting. SFCG successfully completed all trainings with 14 additional journalists being trained as part of the *KabarOrdo* project. The work plan asked for 175 media products of which only 89 (51% of the target) were produced by the first week of January 2013. Similarly, the project was supposed to organize 28 community discussions by December 2012 and additional 16 by April 2013. However, it has been able to organize only 21 (48% of the target) community discussions by the end of April 2013.

The common ground reporting training has equipped the mostly young journalists to apply the skills of common ground journalism into practice. Since the training was first of its kind in the region, the journalists are beginning to learn the concept and apply it slowly in their profession. The regular follow up coaching/training sessions provided by the three media consultants significantly helped them sharpen their professional skills on common ground and conflict sensitive journalism. The media products produced by *KabarOrdo* project have produced many success stories in resolving outstanding conflict issues in the community. The use of media products to initiate the dialogue among stakeholders in the community discussion has been very useful tool to deepen the discussion on certain issues in contention. It has also given an opportunity for the journalists to connect with the community and bring their voices to the media programs. The community discussions have helped the local community people to connect with the local government authorities and local decision makers. Such an effort has given the voice and concern of local community a platform and helped solve many problems as evidence by the success stories.

The program design is still very relevant to the current conflict dynamics of South Kyrgyzstan. However, the post design conflict analysis of the project team revealed that the project theories of change around inter-ethnic relations (in their original version) could not be achieved without beginning from some ‘softer’ issues around governance and intra-community conflicts through both media products and the community discussions. Thus, SFCG’s effort in dealing with the issues of governance and community conflict has prepared groundwork to address the ‘harder’ issues around the interethnic relations in the second year.

The coordination between SFCG, Youth of Osh, and the media outlets (particularly the media directors) has significantly improved, despite some challenges encountered at the beginning of the project implementation. However, the leadership transition within Youth of Osh team and lack of understanding of the *KabarOrdo* objectives and subsequent lack of ownership of the project among the media directors are the areas that need to be addressed by the project team sooner than later. SFCG needs to deal with the leadership transition within YoO with the departure of its current Director and work towards building a good rapport with the new leadership within the organization.

The project's implementation was delayed by at least three months because of a number of factors such as delay in getting approval of the partnership modality from the SFCG headquarters and the donor as well as predatory time taken by the journalists and media outlets to launch the common ground media products popularly known as "*KabarOrdo*" media products. There has been subsequent delay in production and dissemination of the Common Ground Reporting Training Manual, formal launching of the *KabarOrdo* website, translation of media products in English and Russian, finalization and dissemination of conflict analysis report and launch of the radio and TV talk shows. There is increased pressure on the project team to meet the deliverables deadline in the second year of the project. However, there have been a number of lessons learned and preparatory work done in the first year, which may help expedite the implementation process in the second year. However, once the media products and the community discussions were started they are being implemented smoothly and gaining popularity among the listeners and the civil society stakeholders, as reported by the journalists and the facilitators through a number of success stories. SFCG needs to develop a quarterly plan for the second year and implement them efficiently and effectively, as the burden of work in the year two is much higher than that in year one.

Because of the lack of an M&E person within SFCG Kyrgyzstan and YoO for most of the first year, the monitoring aspect of the project suffered greatly. Despite technical support provided by the SFCG Chief Programming Officer in developing data collection and quality control tools for media programs and community discussion, not much progress has been made yet. The media products produced so far have not been weighted against the Common Ground Criteria developed. There has not been a mechanism yet to assess to what extent the media products and the community discussions meet the common ground criteria. The project team has proved itself efficient in collecting monitoring data from the programs, but weak in analyzing, interpreting and disseminating them for reflection and lesson learned. However, with the arrival of the Communications and Monitoring Office in early 2013, efforts are being made towards improving the basic monitoring system. This effort is evidenced by the work of the CMO, who worked hard with YoO Project Assistant to draw out some data and success stories around media products and community discussions during the mid-term evaluation are already documented in this report. The recently started refresher workshop among the journalists might help share lessons learned and improve the quality of program in the future.

To conclude, the project has given a positive message to the communities in south Kyrgyzstan that conflicts can be solved regardless of the strength and size of the conflicting parties. It also has helped develop a sense of hope among community people that the media products and the community discussions are the platform they can exploit to raise their concerns and voices. The data and success stories presented in the report easily vindicate the statement. The most important success of this project is that it has changed the way participating journalists think and work. The prevailing adversarial approach among the journalists is slowly disappearing and the sense of journalistic accountability is taking shape in their hearts and minds, as revealed by the journalists. The only hiccup the project has faced is that due to high conflict sensitivity around the inter-ethnic issues, it has not been able to work in this field as envisioned by the project design and has not been able to produce any early warning analysis as demanded by the project objective. However, SFCG needs to take this as a challenge as well as an opportunity to work with people and shift their stereotypes and prejudices prevailing among ethnic Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbek in the second half of the project period and beyond.

I. BACKGROUND

1.1 Context Description

Since its independence in 1991, the Kyrgyz Republic has experienced several outbursts of inter-ethnic violence between its ethnic Kyrgyz majority and the ethnic Uzbek minority, especially in the three oblasts of Southern parts of the country: Osh, Jalal-Abad and Batken. Inter-ethnic tensions have run high: on one hand, ethnic Kyrgyz claim Uzbeks are more prosperous, control the markets, and create frictions and instability by seeking autonomy; ethnic Uzbeks, on the other hand, have historically felt politically marginalized at the local and national levels.¹

The interethnic tension took an ugly shape when ethnic violence erupted in June 2010, during which the city of Osh, along with other regions of South Kyrgyzstan, witnessed savage killings, torture and sexual assault, widespread destruction of residential, commercial and state property, mass lootings, and significant population displacements. Both parties suffered and committed grotesque crimes, with Kyrgyz government figures reporting that 418 people (295 Uzbeks and 123 Kyrgyz) were killed.² The aftermath of the ethnic violence in the Southern Kyrgyzstan has left a long-lasting scar in the hearts and minds of both ethnic Kyrgyz and Ethnic Uzbek communities. Since June 2010, Kyrgyzstan has witnessed a series of show trials, acts of daily intimidation and random violence, the forcible seizure of land and property, the exclusion of minorities from public employment, and a climate of fear and lawlessness around the actions of the agencies of law and order. These conditions could easily return the country to widespread violent confrontation.³

The interviews carried out with 55 people revealed that almost three years after the June 2010 ethnic violence, there is deep-rooted lack of trust and prejudice among one another and this has been used as a political tool by leaders to continue to manipulate these differences for their political benefit. There is systematic marginalization of members of Ethnic Uzbeks from government mechanisms and efforts of positive discrimination (in favor of Ethnic Uzbeks) by international organizations has not been taken positively by the nationalist leadership at regional and local level.

The interviews and the FGDs revealed that people in South Kyrgyzstan do not want to talk about the issues related to interethnic relations. More than half of the people interviewed pretended that the problem does not exist or it has already been addressed. However, they cannot tell how has the problem been addressed and what were the reconciliation activities carried out to heal the wounds of the 2010 violence. Some of the people interviewed mentioned that people are afraid of talking or working on interethnic relations and there is strong perception of coercion at the community and regional level rather than any sort of coercion from the central government. It was evident that most people believe that the issue of inter-ethnic relations is a too serious and sensitive issue to be discussed. None of the respondents of the interviews were ready to talk about the need of systematized reconciliation and peacebuilding effort in the region. There is strong sense of insecurity and fear among all including journalists.

Media can play both positive as well as negative role in the time of crisis. All the people interviewed during the evaluation supported the argument of Post-June 2010 analysis that media representing both ethnic groups played major role in spreading rumors and instigating hatred and violence during the crisis. Some of the journalists agreed that there is lack of trust and cooperation between the two ethnic groups

¹ International Crisis Group. "The Pogroms in Kyrgyzstan" *Asia Report N°193*, 23 August 2010, p.3.

² Megoran, Nick. 2012. Averting Violence in Kyrgyzstan: Understanding and Responding to Nationalism, Russia and Eurasia Program Paper 2012/13. New Castle University, December 2012.

³ Melvin, Neil. 2011. Promoting a Stable and Multiethnic Kyrgyzstan. Overcoming the Causes and Legacy of Violence. Central Eurasia Project, Occasional Paper Series No 3, Open Society Foundations, New York.

and political leaders are exploiting the ethnic sentiment among people. However, they said that it is too sensitive issue for them to take on and there is a chance that their personal security as well as that of their media outlet could be in jeopardy if they started to raise issues related to interethnic relations. There is strong sense of self-censorship among the ethnically Kyrgyz journalists in the south. As a result, there is strong state of hopelessness among journalists and the civil society that the interethnic prejudice not an issue that can be solved. The unanimous voice of people that the issue cannot be solved indicates that people do not even know there is a positive way of addressing such sensitive issues.

As the long-standing ethnic grievances remain unaddressed, the situation continues to be fraught with instability and perceived mistrust and fear against each other, particularly among the minority ethnic Uzbek community and Majority Kyrgyz community. The persistent border tension between Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan and the rumor that the ethnic Kyrgyz are suppressed in Uzbekistan has been a strong reasoning among so-called nationalist leaders and their followers to continue to look down and spread prejudice against the ethnic Uzbek community.

Further, the development of South Kyrgyzstan has been in a state of standstill in the post-independence period. The infrastructure developments that took place during the USSR regime have been physically deteriorating and there is no proper work on maintaining them. People unanimously said that there is plenty of corruption and the governance, especially local governance and service delivery, has been poor. The State mechanism is very weak and that there is increasing sense of frustration among people that the government is not fulfilling its duty and regular protests related to government service delivery have become commonplace. The political leadership in the South, on the platform of ethnic nationalism, has been powerful enough to ignore the policies of the central government and there is strong disconnect between the government in Bishkek and the local government in the South.

Following was the brief conflict analysis carried out by SFCG before implementing the project:

Inter-ethnic trust across the country remains very low. Despite the protection accorded to national minorities by the government of Kyrgyz Republic, the (President) Akaev era policies did not accomplish genuine integration of the different ethnic communities, exacerbating deep-seated grievances.⁴ These grievances, aggravated by poor socio-economic conditions, continue to have a significant interethnic dimension, especially in the South of the country with increasing so-called Kyrgyz nationalism and exclusionary approach adopted by the nationalist leaders. The June 2010 violence added a new layer to the hitherto unaddressed structural causes of the conflict. This has severely impeded dialogue channels and increased distrust, with tensions and continued low-level violence persisting in Southern Kyrgyzstan.²

Media practitioners contributed to the escalation of the June 2010 violence by using unreliable sources of information, spreading distorted news and rumors.⁵ The conflict was poorly covered, with very little accurate information and data available on the events.⁶ By employing “civil war rhetoric”, many journalists have also contributed to the atmosphere of intolerance and reinforced the fragmentation of the society.⁴ In addition, there has been a lack of objective analysis on the drivers of the conflict, thus preventing an accurate understanding of the dynamics and underlying issues of the conflict. Finally, the low number and suboptimal quality of media outlets in the South accounts for the lack of accessible quality information both for the local population and for conflict transformation practitioners.⁴

⁴ Promoting a stable and multiethnic Kyrgyzstan: Overcoming the causes and legacies of violence – Neil Melvin – OSI – March 2011

⁵ International Federation for Human Rights. “Kyrgyzstan: A Weak State, Political Instability: The Civil Society Caught Up in the Turmoil” September 2010. p. 22

⁶ “2010: Lessons to be learned by journalists reporting on political conflicts”, Institute for Public Policy, Conference transcript, December 2010

Since the outbursts of violence in June 2010, the international community has invested millions of dollars in early recovery efforts, especially in the South. Dozens of NGOs and international humanitarian agencies are now working in the Osh region. However, very few organizations are supporting comprehensive and accessible conflict-sensitive reporting as a driver for positive social change.

This conflict analysis before the project implementation and during the mid-term review shows that the overall conflict dynamics remain vulnerable in South Kyrgyzstan and the project in its design concept remains valid for the current situation.

1.2 Program Description

KabarOrdo project works with media, local decision makers and local community to promote peace, harmony and community reconciliation in ethnically divided communities in Southern Kyrgyzstan. It works with television, radio and print and online media in Southern Kyrgyzstan to build their capacity in conflict sensitive/common ground journalism and mobilizing them for playing a catalytic role in promoting reconciliation and spreading messages of peace and harmony in the region, particularly in Osh and Jalal-Abad Oblasts. Similarly, it engages with local decision makers and community people through facilitated community discussions, organizing conflict analysis workshops and holding consultations to promote messages of peace and harmony and to address tensions related to local governance and government service delivery. This project aims to connect the local community to local government through community discussions and media products and reaches wider population of southern Kyrgyzstan. It works with both ‘key people’ and ‘more people’ with the help of different activities implemented as part of the project. The project provided opportunity to local decision makers and community people to interact with each other through community consultations and bringing peoples’ voices to local decision makers through media programs.

The long-term goal of this project is “to prevent the re-emergence of violent conflict in Kyrgyzstan’s south through more comprehensive and accessible conflict-sensitive reporting and early warning analysis.” More specifically, the project aims to:

- Support the dissemination of conflict-sensitive information and analysis of local conflict trends;
- ii) Increase public awareness and understanding of collaborative approaches to inter-ethnic conflict dynamics.

In order to achieve the goal and objectives, *KabarOrdo* Project has been implementing following activities under three main thematic areas:

1.2.1 Capacity building component

▪ **Training in Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis for Media Professionals:** SFCG, in collaboration with three local (one Uzbek speaking and two Kyrgyz speaking) media experts organized the eight **in situ** training to professional journalists from the seven participating media outlets (TV/Print/Radio), as well as for journalism students from the YoO Media School. Of those eight trainings, three were jointly conducted with SFCG’s Chief Programming Officer Lena Slachmijlder and remaining five were facilitated by the media experts. The training session lasted for five days and covered three days of theoretical aspect of Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis and two days of practical aspect of common ground journalism techniques.

▪ **Partnership Discussions with Key Directors/Editors**

SFCG’s Project Manager organized one-on-one Partnership Discussion meetings with directors and/or editors from key departments within the participating media outlets. The purpose was to sensitize media outlets’ editors to the importance of publishing/airing balanced and conflict-sensitive information, to get

their participation in the project, and to ensure that the young journalists will be able to publish/air their Common Ground media outputs.

- **Creation of a Training Manual on Common Ground Reporting**

SFCG and YoO are committed to produce a Training Manual on “Common Ground Reporting” based on existing SFCG training materials⁷ but adapted to the local context and realities and translated in local languages.

- **On-Going Coaching for Young Journalists**

The project has hired three media experts from South Kyrgyzstan to provide intensive onsite/online/telephone/Skype coaching to the journalists who took part in the training earlier and are currently producing Common Ground Media products. Of the three Media experts, two are Kyrgyz speaking and one is Uzbek speaking.

- **Training in Debate Facilitation for the Youth of Osh staff**

SFCG and YoO hired two consultant facilitators, including two YoO Staff, and organized a two day training on how to facilitate public debates and how to conduct the discussions around the Common Ground media outputs in a constructive and solution-oriented way. The training was facilitated by SFCG’s Director of Leadership and Training, Shawn Dunning. The training imparted skills necessary for facilitation, dialogue and mediation of public discussions.

1.2.2 Reporting component

- **Production of Common Ground Reports by the Trained Journalists**

The trained journalists, who are working with the participating media outlets, are producing common ground media products with the intensive help of the media experts. Each journalist is receiving financial compensation for his/her work. The participating media outlets are provided with technical equipment support for strengthening their capacity in independently producing and broadcasting/publishing high standard media products. The journalists have also been given the opportunity to travel to the field to produce their program or to carry out research for producing the program. Their field expenses are covered by the travel stipend every time they visit communities outside the town. Each participating media outlet broadcasts/publishes the CG reports produced by their own journalists in the framework of the project. To ensure sufficient level of branding for the project, the seven participating media outlets have committed a specific weekly slot/page to disseminate the CG reports. SFCG plans to place these media products into its website, which is under construction.

- **Production of Quarterly Analyses on Local Conflict trends**

SFCG and YoO initially planned to hold stakeholder consultations every three months and to produce a document that analyses local conflict trends and future possible scenario based on the discussion. SFCG and its partner also envisioned bringing eight young journalists (on a rotating basis) together with local community leaders– traditional or civil society leaders– from the communities where the journalists conducted their reporting. The consultations were also to bring two local Conflict Analysis Experts to discuss the conflict dynamics observed over the past month along with and SFCG’s project manager. The objective of the discussion was to review together the Common Ground media outputs produced, discuss evolving conflict trends, and identify opportunities for common ground solutions. However, this component was dropped from the list of project activities, as it was very similar with the conflict analysis

⁷ See:

http://www.radiopeaceafrica.org/assets/texts/pdf/Talkshows_EN_color.pdfhttp://www.radiopeaceafrica.org/assets/texts/pdf/manual_03_EN_color.pdf

http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/jerusalem/updates/A_Guide_for_Professional_Journalism_in_Conflict_Zones.pdf

workshop, which forms inherent part of the project. This decision was also influenced by the baseline findings that the community people are fatigued by the events that bring people together to “talk.”

1.2.3 Outreach component

▪ **Creation of a project’s website**

SFCG is in the process of creating a website for the project, featuring all the Common Ground reports and conflict analysis reports produced as part of the project. It will also have a link to the Common Ground Reporting Training Manual. Through this website, citizens, civil society actors and policymakers will be invited to subscribe to a mailing list to receive the Quarterly Analyses and a selection of CG reports on a weekly basis. They will also be encouraged to react to the CG reports. SFCG and YoO are planning to link the website to Facebook and other social media to attract more readers.

▪ **Dissemination of the Common Ground Reports and Quarterly Conflict Analyses**

The Common Ground Articles and programs aimed at informing policymakers, civil society actors and local communities are being disseminated through: i) the seven participating media outlets through a weekly slot/page to the CG reports produced by their journalists⁸; b) the project’s website; and c) community discussion sessions in local communities (see below);

▪ **Community Discussions on Local Issues of Contention**

SFCG plans to organize 72 community discussions (4 each month) over the period of 18months. The sessions are generally co-facilitated by a trained journalist presenting its Common Ground news story, a YoO Discussion Facilitator where the local traditional/civil society leader are engaged in dialogue and discussions.

▪ **Quarterly Conflict Analysis Workshops**

SFCG and YoO are convening **one-day workshops** bringing together the reporters and local traditional and civil society leaders for the morning session; the above participants together with media professionals and key government and IC stakeholders for the afternoon session. The workshops: a) discuss evolving conflict trends, and identify early-warning signs of emerging conflicts; b) create constructive relationships between different actors working in the field of conflict and peacebuilding, and c) establish a constructive channel of dialogue with the government authorities. Two of the workshops are proposed to take place in Osh, two in Jalal-Abad, and two in Bishkek for advocacy towards the national government.

1.3 Mid-Term Review Methodology

The evaluator developed the key review questions in consultation with SFCG DM&E Manager in Washington DC and the SFCG Program Manager in Osh and chose to focus on effectiveness, relevance, coordination, and implementation process. Since this is a mid-term review and only 30 percent of the deliverables have been completed so far, the review excluded evaluation criteria such as strategic alignment, sustainability, efficiency and impact. The evaluator took note of the baseline data and compared where it is appropriate. Key questions for the review were prioritized with the understanding that only the top priorities would be addressed.

The mid-term evaluation employed mixed methods but was primarily qualitative. Data collection was done through interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), and a survey of journalists. The review also analyzed and utilized both the reports and raw data gathered as part of the monitoring of the *KabarOrdo* implementation process. Three locations in the project area were selected for the qualitative data

⁸ The media outputs prepared by the journalism students will primarily be disseminated via the website. However, all this material will be available for participating media outlets for further re-publication or broadcasting

collection (Osh, Jalal-Abad and Ala Buka) in order to cover the varying socio-demographic characteristics of the locality and the people. No control or comparison groups were used.

The semi-structured interviews were used to identify different types of results from the different activity streams. This helped test the assumptions relating to non-affiliated participants and provided the information needed to construct the individual journalist survey instruments. Insufficient replies (30 out of 64) of the survey questions may be some implication on the scientific validity of the few information generated through the survey and used in this report to explain various indicators.

Specific analyses that were performed for each of the key lines of inquiry were as follows.

1. Effectiveness:

- Has the project achieved its milestones set for the period in a timely manner?
- Are there any signals of increased capacities and skills of skills of project beneficiaries such as media professionals, in particular?
- Has there been any significant change in attitude or behavior of media professionals, local leaders or other stakeholders because of the project activities?

2. Relevance:

- Are the project's stated goals and objectives relevant to the issues central to the conflict in Kyrgyzstan one year into the project?
- Do the activities and strategies fit project objectives?
- Is the project adding value that other actors in peacebuilding and the media were not previously providing?
- Is the project covering the right conflict themes and convening dialogues that would not otherwise happen?
- How relevant is the project strategies and activities as perceived by the beneficiaries and other community stakeholders?

3. Implementation Process

- Do all project team members share a vision for what the Common Ground Approach is/should be in Kyrgyzstan?
- Do all project activities model the Common Ground Approach?
- Are all necessary tools in place to ensure methodology for conflict transformation is sound?
- Is there effective monitoring of the project implementation? What are the mechanisms of the reflection and learning process?
- What are the major factors that are contributing towards the achieving or non-achieving of the stated objectives?

4. Coordination:

- How smooth is the coordination, communication and synergy between SFCG Kyrgyzstan and implementing partners?
- Is there any room for improvements?

II. MAJOR FINDINGS

2.1 Effectiveness

The project activities started in July 2012 with in-house (*in situ*) training on Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis for journalists from different media outlets including television, radio, and print media and trainees from Youth of Osh (YoO) Media School. However, the production and broadcast of media products and implementation of other project activities, such as the community discussions and workshops, only started in September 2012 because the project staff needed time to finalize the partnership modality, the approval of the donor and SFCG headquarters, and time to prepare for the actual implementation of activities. SFCG and YoO did not push the media partners too much, as they were exposed to the concept of common ground for the first time and wanted to let them take some time to process the learning and apply it into practice.

Considering the timeframe for the media products and field based consultations and discussions, the project was only six months old during the time of the mid-term evaluation. However, within such a short period, the project is already showing some promises in developing the capacity of journalists on the basics of common ground journalism, producing balanced and conflict sensitive media products and creating a sustained conversation in the community through community discussions and facilitating a conducive environment for addressing some of the contentious issues in the project locations.

2.1.1 Planned versus Participant-reported Results

Result: The project has contributed to shifting one-sided reporting approaches of participating journalists in Southern Kyrgyzstan to balanced reporting following their participation in the training and common ground criteria developed as part of the project.

Finding: The training, being the first to train journalists on Common Ground Concept, was able to orient journalists on a new concept and provided them new knowledge and skills to harness their journalism skills. The journalists interviewed reported that the project has been very effective in developing their capacity as a ‘balanced’ journalist. They reported that before participating in the training they never thought of including voices of more than one person in any media products they produced. The effect of the training has helped them understand the concept of common ground journalism, which (in their own words) helped them to understand the International Journalism Standards. The recently started one-day refresher workshop with participating journalists has been very effective, as it helped them share their work with others and provided opportunities to share their problems and challenges and learn new things or clarify their confusion.

“I am working as a journalist for a print media for more than 30 years. I was trained as a journalist during the Soviet Union time. That time we were trained to report what has been given to us and not try to analyze the thing. I was working as a journalist with the same set of skills for so many years. I never thought of writing an article by bringing voices of many sides of the story. Many times, I created articles based on listening to a narrative given by a single person. It is only when I participated in the training provided by SFCG and Youth of Osh, I realized the importance of a balanced and inclusive reporting. Now I plan my article before I write and include the views and opinions of as many sides of the story as possible, analyze their views and become sensitive when I write. This is the contribution of the training and I am proud to be part of the training even if I am working as a journalist for more than 30 years.

A Senior Print Journalist

The project has contributed to increasing knowledge and awareness of the journalists on effectively communicating with and including voice of local community; developing an impartial media products without being judgmental; promoting role of media and media person in resolving community conflicts; investigating issues without being biased to any side; collecting factual information to increase credibility of the media products and diligently promoting justice through media instead of spreading rumors (Source: Interviews).

“I am in the journalism profession for last 3 years. Before participating in the training, I never heard of conflict sensitive journalism and never tried to do detailed investigation of the issues I raised in the Television. I used to talk to one or two people I feel comfortable or get access to and develop idea about the issues I am dealing with and produce the program and broadcast. I never reflected on what the impact of my program on community people. Now I am aware that what should be role of media and media person like me and how shall I need to develop media products and go into the depth of the issue so that a balanced report can be produced. Now days, I try my best to be conflict sensitive and bring perspective of all individuals or communities related to the issue.

A Television Journalist

“Before taking part in the training, whenever I hosted a talk-show in the television, I used to invite one person in the studio and talk to him or her and draw a conclusion on the issue based on what he or she has to say. After participating in the training, I invite at least three persons in the studio which includes representatives of both sides of conflict and an expert who has better knowledge of the issue so that the expert can help clarify issues that the conflicting parties are disagreeing or unclear of. I also use Vox Pops to bring people’s opinions and concerns.

A FGD participant journalist

The combined results of the pre-test and post-test completed by 4 out of 7 participating media organizations revealed that the training for journalists significantly contributed to increasing their knowledge on different issues such as how to frame a story(48%), the meaning of stereotype (40%) and two positive things a journalist can do (44%). This was followed by increased knowledge around key standard of professional journalism and meaning of being a responsible journalist. However, the participating journalists seem to have a better understanding about the meaning of conflict and difference between fact and opinion as the margin of contribution are small in comparison to other aspects mentioned above.

Knowledge categories	Pre-test	Post-test	Contribution
Understanding of conflict	54.8	57.1	2.3
How a journalist should frame a story	22.9	71.3	48.4
Understanding the meaning of stereotype	28.1	67.7	39.6
Difference between opinion and fact	52.9	69.8	16.9
Tow positive things a journalist can do	27.7	71.7	44.0
Three key standards of professional journalism	49.8	80.2	30.4
Meaning of being a responsible journalist	45.8	80.6	34.8

The participants who were interviewed during the evaluation expressed that they were lucky to be part of the training and the production of the media program. They also requested that the training is not enough and they need more exposure to common ground journalism concepts so that they can make better use of them in their professional lives.

The program sought to reach all types of media outlets in South Kyrgyzstan and shift the way journalists work in the region. It was noteworthy that the project focused on empowering more women journalists than men (40 women out of 64). The journalists reported that the training helped build better image of the journalists in the region, particularly in the context of negative role played by media during 2010 ethnic violence and the credibility lost thereafter. This has been especially important because 46 out of 64 (72%) journalists were young (less than 25 years) and raw talent and this training provided them useful tips at the very beginning of their career on how to be a responsible journalist. Despite its initial plan to train young journalists only, the inclusion of ‘first generation’⁹ of journalists in the training helped two generations of journalists work together and bridge the prevailing gaps among them. However, not all journalists who participated in the training have the opportunity to practice the learning and strategies needs to be developed to refresh their knowledge and skills so that the investment made to increase their learning does not get lost. According to the journalists, the recently initiated one-day refresher workshop has been an ideal platform for them to refresh the learning and share with others.

Further, a survey questionnaire was distributed to the participating journalists from all seven media outlets of which 30¹⁰-responded back with filled in questionnaires. Based on the sample size, all 30 respondents said that the common ground journalism booklet and the training materials distributed during the training were either useful (68%) or very useful (32%). More female journalists (43%) rated the documents distributed during the training to be very useful compared to male journalists (18%). Similarly, 17% of total respondents started a new media program after participating in the training, while 33% applied the knowledge and skills learned from the training into existing program they were working in. More than one-third (38%) of 30 journalists working on *KabarOrdo* project shared the knowledge and skills from the training to other colleagues in their respective outlets, thus creating multiplier effect within the organization. However, a small number of journalists (4%) surveyed did not get any opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills into practice in any way. The journalists surveyed also revealed that the training has helped them to establish a better communication and access to local policy makers and local leaders. More than half (57%) of the journalists said that their participation in *KabarOrdo* media products and community discussions has helped them establish better communication and access to local policy makers and local leaders, which they could not do effectively before participating in the *KabarOrdo* project, despite working in the journalism field.

“The training was really interesting and full of information. For the first time in my life, I got opportunity to discuss conflict issue from a different angle. It taught me how to analyze the conflict through an unbiased angle and how to bring together conflicting parties together into a platform for discussion and dialogue. The training gave me the courage that if I raise a conflict issue properly in media, it can be solved easily. After participating in the training, I do not just look for temporary solution, rather I try to unravel the root causes of conflict and address them.

A FGD participant journalist

However, the intention of training journalists within the premise of their own media outlets (*in-situ*) did not go well, as most of the participants left the training for their other work within the office and the attendance rate in the latter half of the training was very low. The attendance sheet of the 7 training available reveal that total participants present each day dropped down from 64 in the first day to 52 in the third day and 21 in the fifth day. This resulted in the training being reduced to three days only instead of originally proposed five days, as the participants did not show up. Further, the intention of the project team to train journalists from both ethnic Kyrgyz and ethnic Uzbek community has not been successful as desired not because of the lack of intention, but because of the lack of availability of willingness of Uzbek

⁹ Those who started journalism in the last decade of Soviet era and first decade of independent Kyrgyzstan era

¹⁰The survey was responded by all the journalists who are producing in *KabarOrdo* project except one in Ala Buka.

youth to take journalism training. There is perceived fear and the trauma hanging over their mind as a result of the attack on Uzbek-led media and ethnic Uzbek journalists on June 2010 violence that discourages the Uzbek youth to take journalism as a profession.

Recommendations: Considering the participation issue in the *in situ* training (poor attendance), SFCG and YoO needs to rethink the approach and either get a prior commitment from the journalists or closely coordinate with the journalists' bosses so that the attendance remains close to perfect (barring emergency reasons) during the entire duration of training. It is essential to hold a consultation and planning session with the directors beforehand so that the journalists cannot leave the sessions for other works. Another alternative could be organizing residential training outside of their media houses in the future so that the journalists or any other training participants could fully devote their time to the training. If such residential training has budget issues, SFCG needs to plan accordingly and increase budget for the training so that maximum attention and learning would be possible. During the refresher workshop, attention could be paid more to those journalists who attended only three days out of five days of training earlier, particularly from Osh TV, Intymak Radio, Jalal-Abad Tele-Radio Network (JTR) and Ayil Akiykati Newspaper.

Result: "The regular coaching/on-site training provided by the three media experts has significantly contributed in not only producing better media products but also shaping the professional careers of the journalists through close and frequent interaction and monitoring."

Findings: The program offered a continuous professional support from the media experts in improving the quality of the media products through the bi-monthly meetings with the journalists and frequent telephone/email/Skype communications before the point of broadcast/publication. One of the minor weaknesses of the coaching was that the media experts were not aware of the principles of coaching, such as Grow Model¹¹, and, thus, were not following the principle while working with the journalists. They are instead working as a technical expert to help them produce better quality media products. Had they been aware of the principles of coaching, they would have been even more effective in facilitating the sessions and helping the participating journalists apply the Common Grounds journalism skills into practice more effectively. Further, the busy schedule of the media experts and their tendency to work for the journalists instead of coaching but expecting journalists to do their own work (especially in the early days) has slowed down the process of learning among the journalists and increased the burden on the media experts.

"I highly appreciate the contribution of the media expert to harness the skills of journalists in my TV channel. My journalists working with KabarOrdo Project are always looking forward to meeting and discussing the media products with the media experts and I can already see the result of such collaboration".

Director of one of the TV channels

"I visit the media house three times a month, besides email and telephone communication with the journalists. Before the training and the coaching, the journalists did not even think that they could contribute in addressing local problems/conflict. They used to highlight a specific issue or present the position of a certain stakeholder and wait for the solution from outside such as from the government agencies. However, after working as part of the project, they have started to believe themselves, are taking initiatives to resolve problems at local level and have managed to do so. In the past three months, the journalist I worked have managed at solve 70 percent of the issues they have covered in their programs, which have increased their credibility among community members. Now, journalists are being called by local community members to resolve their conflicts or issues."

One of the three Media Experts

¹¹ For details please refer to www.growmodel.com or www.mindtools.com

The statement of the media experts that they are visiting the media outlets at least twice a month for coaching is not fully supported by the journalists' survey, as only 18% journalists said that they participate in coaching twice a month. However, the disparity could partially be attributed to the fact that not all journalists who participated in the survey are producing the *KabarOrdo* products. However, their impression of the coaching session is highly encouraging as 93% of the participating journalists (28 out of 30) rated it as either very useful (47%) or useful (52%). Similarly, the same percentage also said that they believed that the coaches are helping them to become better journalists, with 36% strongly agreeing with the statement. Despite a smaller sample size, the data indicates that the coaching, in its present form, is extremely helpful for developing professional skills and molding them in common ground journalism.

“When I started to work with journalists in the beginning of the project, it was extremely difficult to work with them, as they did not have any idea on how to structure and develop a good piece of media products. The Common ground Criteria were very new and difficult concept for them. There was a time I would reject the entire work for them and develop a new product for them. Many times, I myself had to give the topic for the media program, as they were not able to determine which topic to chase. However, much has been changed since then and now the journalists are able to determine the topic, develop the first draft of the product and publish/broadcast with minimal support. I feel proud when I see the change in the way they work and the professionalism developed in them. However, not everyone is in the same level despite improvement.”

One of the three media experts

The conversation with the media experts and the journalists highlights the importance of the coaching in bringing the desired change in the way the journalist and the media outlets work in south of Kyrgyzstan. It is helping in shaping the role of media professionals and the media outlets in positive actors in building public opinion in number of contentious issues. The cooperative and respectful dynamics between the coaches and the journalists is proving to be an effective mechanism to build conflict sensitive media fraternity in south Kyrgyzstan.

The three media experts reported that the amount of work they are doing is far more than what was originally expected of them. Despite the contribution of the three to five days of training and the effort of the media experts, the intention of the project to produce and broadcast/publish the media products with minimum standard as guided by the Common Ground Criteria (see annex 2) has been a huge challenge. This is particularly true where most of the journalists are just beginning to learn the professional skills of journalism and the media directors are not yet fully aware of the objectives of the project and what exact changes are intended by the project with the media and media professionals in the region. After six months of beginning to produce the media products, some journalists are still dependent on the media experts on identifying the topic or developing the products and there are cases where the media products are rejected by the media experts as a result of which there is a sense of frustration among some of the journalists.

*When the media experts did not approve our work to be good enough for broadcast/publication and did not fully explain what the shortcomings were, we were a bit frustrated, because we thought we did a good job to produce the product. However, there are also incidents, where the media experts explained fully why our product does not qualify to be published or broadcast under the Common Ground Criteria of *KabarOrdo* Framework; it was good learning for us too.*

Participants of the FGDs in Osh and Jalal-Abad

Recommendations: A short orientation to the media experts on coaching principles would definitely add value to the good work they are already doing. It is advisable that SFCG explore the possibility of recruiting a fulltime coach rather than having part-time coaching (media) consultants or purchase more time from the media consultants to provide maximum onsite coaching to the journalists and spend some

time with the media directors when necessary. It is advised that SFCG hire a fulltime media expert to work rather than having three (less than) part-time experts in order to increase the effectiveness of the coaching/one-on-one training.

Finding: The media directors are cooperative and well receptive of the project team and project activities, not because they fully understand the objectives and intention of the project, but for the equipment and technical support provided by the project to their media outlets. Two of the media directors said, *“The project should continue in the future too because we need more equipment support in the days to come and we cannot afford to buy them under the prevailing financial situation of our media outlets.”*

Media directors are not the direct participants or beneficiaries of the project. However, they can have a major influence in producing media products and letting their journalists work independently in the *KabarOrdo* component. Their only participation or exposure to the project was the signing of the memorandum of understanding and occasional informal meetings with the SFCG Project Manager while she visits their media outlets. Four of the seven Media Directors said during the interviews that they do not exactly know what the role of media experts in their media outlets and what contribution they are making. One of the directors said, *“I know the media experts come here and talks with the journalists but I did not know that he was coaching our journalist as part of the project”*. However, this confusion was also partly because of the fact that the concerned media consultant is also associated with the media outlet in different capacity. Indicating the lack of knowledge about the objectives of the project, one of the directors said, *“Anyway we were doing same thing even before working with the KabarOrdo project. The only benefit we are getting is we are receiving new and high quality equipment that is helping us to enhance the technical quality of our media projects”*. Regardless of their understanding of the project objective or lack of it, the directors were highly receptive and cooperative during the evaluation.

In general, all the journalists reported that the directors are supportive to their involvement with the project and do not prevent them from participating in any activities or going out in the communities with equipments to produce programs and participate in community discussions. However, there were at least two incidents in which the media directors did not allow their journalists to bring the camera to the community for producing programs and did not allow their journalists to share their program with other journalists during the one-day refresher program.

Recommendations: It is recommended that SFCG organize a quarterly or bi-annually half-day workshop with the media directors, where discussion around *KabarOrdo* project objectives and role of media in successful completion of the project and sustaining the initiatives could be discussed. This initiative will help build understanding of the project and its objectives among the directors and they will share increased ownership of the project in the future. Having a buy-in among the media directors of the project activities will definitely add value for successful implementation of the project.

Results: “Production and broadcast of media products on television, radio and print media which have not only raised awareness among people but also worked as tools for solving local conflicts or problems by linking general public to the decision makers from local to national level.

Finding: The project is slated to produce 450 Common Ground Reports over the period of 2 years. At the time of midterm, the project had been able to produce 89 media products (51% of the targeted 175) of which 28 (32%) are newspaper articles, 17(19%) are TV programs, 47%) are radio programs and one (1%) are on-line products. Of those 89 media products, 76 (85%) are produced in Kyrgyz, 10 (11%) in Uzbek and two (2%) in Russian languages. Besides, three programs have been produced in both Kyrgyz and Uzbek languages and one program has been produced in using Kyrgyz and Russian languages. There were 336 male participants and 252 female participants as source of information in those media programs.

The monitoring and content analysis of ethical standards of print and online media in Kyrgyzstan¹² has shown that media outlets very often violate fundamental principles of journalism ethics.¹³ Major findings include that journalists' lack basic knowledge on basic ethics of journalism and/or face pressure from the owner of the media outlets to advocate for certain political positions, either from the sitting government or from the opposition. In order to transform the role of journalists and media outlets, *KabarOrdo*'s project is promoting Common Ground media production in South Kyrgyzstan.

The level of impact of the media products has been generally positive. One of the *KabarOrdo* media products has led to a debate in the National Parliament, and others have been able to resolve conflicts between local government authorities or local private sector stakeholders. Some of the cases resolved by the media products are:

- Conflict around the transportation cost of remains of the deceased Kyrgyz labour migrants in Russia,
- Controversy between the borrowers and the microfinance company on high interest rate and strict payment conditions,
- Conflict on the penalty imposed by the Osh electro to the victims of the June 2010 violence in Osh City
- Conflict between local community and the coal mine and cement factory management,
- Conflict between Osh City Government and the internal migrants living in the city

Some other media products have been able to create a sustained conversation among community members on issues of contention even if they did not contribute in bringing an immediate solution to the problem. The media products on negative implication of child marriage among girls, controversy surrounding the government medical insurance and medical check-ups, false annuity contract given to elders have not been able to resolve the issues but they have been able to generate discussions around those issues. The media products and the journalist have played a positive role to either resolve those controversies or conflicts or convince people to have further discussion to solve the problems amicably. However, none of the media products has been able to address issues around interethnic relationships except one media product, which raised and settled one personal conflict between one Kyrgyz and one Uzbek adult. The issue of prohibition of head cover (hijab) in schools addressed an intra-ethnic conflict within the Muslim community. However, the issue is yet to reach a solution.

¹²BakytOrunbekov, KubatChekirov& Elmira Toktogulova. 2012. Monitoring and Content aAnalysis of Ethical Standards in Print and Online media of Kyrgyzstan. Bishkek: Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

¹³Baisubanova, Daniya. 2012. Summary of the project report: "Professionalism of Mass Media: Monitoring of the Ethical Standards among Print and Online Media in Kyrgyzstan. GAP Intern.

Cargo 200: Power of KabarOrdo Media Program

In the post-independent Kyrgyzstan, there is a massive flow of Kyrgyz youth to Russian Labor market. This labor migration has been source of remittance to Kyrgyz economy and means of livelihood for many Kyrgyz families in Kyrgyzstan. However, this migration phenomenon has a negative dimension too. Many of those migrating youth are cheated by the recruiting agencies back home and made to work with hazardous and unhygienic conditions in Russia. Working under such difficulty and hazardous conditions, many of them lose their life. When those migrant youth die in Russia, the transportation of their corpse (famously known as Cargo 200) back from Russia to Kyrgyzstan is a very expensive. The corpses are not sent through Kyrgyz Embassy, but through the Russian agencies. The Cargo Company used to charge high amount of money to bring the bodies back to their country. The money is collected from the families of labor migrants by the Russian Agency. Many families, already traumatized by the loss of their loved ones, had to take a loan from Micro-Credit Company or other informal sources in a high interest rate to pay for the cost of the Cargo transportation. Once of the journalists working with a Television channel was told this story by one of the persons close to the victim's family, the young journalists decided to take this issue into KabarOrdo program. This was her first TV report ever. She did some research on the issues and produced a program by bringing the voice of the victims, family, local government authorities and government agencies in Bishkek such as the representative of the Migration Department and representative of the Ministry of Youth and Labor. Once the program was aired through the TV channel, one of the Members of Parliaments from Jalal-Abad area took that issue personally and raised that in the Parliament. After having a discussion in the Parliament, the Parliament asked the government to create a fund of KGS 25 Million to pay the cost of transportation of the corpses of the about migrants. While discussing the issue in the parliament, the Member of the Parliament also thanked the TV channel for its effort in highlighting such an important issue through their program. Once the fund was allocated by the Government, the TV channel also informed of this development through its news program and explained how families of the deceased can claim the amount form the government fund.

-Reported by TV Director, Journalist and the Media Coach separately

The fundamental intention of this component is to produce media products around the issue of inter-ethnic relations and contribute to healing the wounds of the inter-ethnic violence that took place in 2010. Because media is the most popular and accessible mode of communication in the modern times, the project intended to use media as a vehicle for promoting inter-ethnic understanding and reconciliation and healing. It was important to start the project by introducing the concept of Common Ground Approach in ethnically divided South Kyrgyzstan. The project contributed to mobilizing the media in resolving conflicts in manner it was done never before.

The completion of 20% of the promised media products produced and disseminated, ill date, do not fulfill the intention of the project of bridging the interethnic mistrust and stereotypes. However, they have prepared the background for instilling the public faith on media and entering into more 'harder' issues dealing with interethnic relations.

All the people interviewed during the mid-term evaluation said that the trauma, aggression and suffering from the June 2010 violence is still fresh in people's heart and mind, and that people are not yet ready to talk about the issues related to inter-ethnic reconciliation. "The prevalent peaceful situation on the ground is not as easy as it looks and there is strong sense of mistrust and prejudice against each other," said one of the journalists. Even the journalists were constantly arguing that they could not just start producing the programs directly dealing with interethnic issues. "There is strong sense of 'self-censorship' among journalists in the region," said one of the participants of the FGDs. All the people interviewed told that working on interethnic relations is too risky and that the time is not yet ripe to work this issue. One of the

Media Directors said, “If I started to air program on this issue in a hurry, I will put our personal security as well as the existence of the media outlet in jeopardy”. Another Director said, “We are already producing some media products in Uzbek languages to serve the Uzbek speaking population. However, if people feel that we are intentionally promoting programs in Uzbek languages, we might need to close down the station. It will be unwise to put undue pressure on those media outlets and journalists to start programs on interethnic relations unless they feel comfortable and confident to produce and broadcast/publish such programs. Consequently, the decision to hold back on programs addressing inter ethnic relations has been made with strategic consideration in order for the media programs to build public confidence before addressing more sensitive issues.. However, it is also not clear that how much time and which steps this process will require.

Power of KabarOrdo Programs: Case of Migrants Registration in Osh City

Osh is the second largest city (after Bishkek) of Kyrgyzstan and the largest city and centre of socio-economic conglomeration of South Kyrgyzstan. According to an unofficial data there are approximately 200,000 internal migrants living and working in Osh city. However, the local government in Osh city does not recognize these internal migrants as regular residents of Osh city and does not register them with the municipal government. They are also deprived of many local government facilities and most of them live in dilapidated conditions within the city. The local government provisions require all residents of the city to register with the municipal government in order for them to enroll their children to schools, get electricity and heating system connection, to avail medical facilities provided by the government. The most important thing is if not registered, these internal migrants are deprived of their voting rights during the election.

On December 12, 2012 Osh TV organized a talk show in which Ulan Bekmuratov, a lawyer of HRDC and Kursanbek Sultanov, Chief Expert of Osh City Passport and Visa Department were invited as guest resource person to discuss the issue. This TV program was followed by a community discussion on 25 March 2013 where 25 people from different sector participated in the discussion. These two program provided concerned residents, NGO representatives and the government authorities to discuss their issues together. At the end of community discussion, all concerned parties agreed to form a working group with the convenorship of the HRDC lawyer and the working group will analyze the difficulty faced by the internal migrants and furnish recommendations to the Osh city councils so that the problems faced by internal migrants are solved as soon as possible. .

Program Producer from Osh TV and one of the three the Media Coaches

Microcredit Conflict: Power of KabarOrdo Media Programs and Community Discussion

In Kyrgyzstan, there is widespread practice of community people taking loan from micro-credit organizations with high interest rates. There was an ongoing friction between the lenders organizations and borrowers regarding the non-payment of the loan by the borrowers. The micro-credit companies were collecting borrowings from the borrowers through force majeure because of which many poor families were having serious problem of paying the loan. During the summer and autumn of 2012, this conflict reached high point and protests by the borrowers against the micro credit organizations spread around the country. While most of clients blame the high interest rates, absence of subsidies to those clients who are facing the challenge to pay back the loan and stringent conditions of loan repayment are the major causes for their inability of paying back the loan. Many borrowers even threatened to commit suicide, if no action will be taken by the government on this issue.

The women groups who were protesting against the micro-credit organizations blamed that the company is using unfair approach to recover the loan. They further accused the companies that they never provide detailed information on the loan policies and interest calculation procedure, frequent cheatings against the clients and threats issued by the by microfinance staff even during the consultation and lately during the loan payback period. The protesting women were demanding the closure of all micro credit organizations in the region and waiver of the outstanding loan amount of all the clients.

On other side, deputies of Jogorku Kenesh from fraction Ata -Meken was initiating the new law considering on limitation of interest rate and activities of micro credit organizations. KabarOrdo, prepared few media reports on micro credit loans and conducted meetings in different communities in order to bring all parties for discussion. Series of community discussions followed by media program were organized. The consultation process ended with a round table discussion that brought high-level decision makers, the representatives of the micro-credit companies and the borrowers and their supporters into a single platform. These series of media programs and discussions helped people to understand and investigate the issue from different perspectives. Participation of representatives of association of micro credit companies, civil society, clients, human right protection organizations could create a platform for dialogue among them, to find number of solutions on both local and national level.

As it was brought up on the discussions that women were forced to sign the loan papers even if they did not understand the documents, as they were not in local languages. Issue was also raised about the indifferent behavior of representatives of the micro-credit organizations to the clients who were having problem in understanding the documents related to the loan and were struggling to pay back the loan. These issues were discussed thoroughly after hearing the perspective of both sides of the conflict. After a long discussion and analysis of the context, it was agreed that the main reason of misunderstanding between the conflicting parties is the absence of financial literacy and understanding of liabilities among clients, which was also highlighted by the KabarOrdo media product. The micro-credit organizations agreed that they would develop detailed information brochures and simplify other application documents in local languages and communicate with the clients frequently so that any problems related to the borrowing can be discussed immediately so that the crisis does not get out of control. Based on the discussion, MOI- Bulak Finans and FINCA have already started developing informational brochures in three different languages and conducted trainings financial literacy and capacity of their clients. Even if the program has not been address the problem faced by the borrowers in the recent past fully, it has created a mechanism that will definitely prevent conflict between the micro-credit organizations and borrowers.

Recommendations: Because of the three month delay in kicking off the project, the media partners are lagging behind the schedule in producing the media products. At the time of the mid-term evaluation, only 20% of the media products have been produced. SFCG and its partner have to expedite the process of producing the media products without compromising the quality. The availability of media experts to provide support to all journalists could be a major challenge, considering the experts' busy schedules. SFCG has to ensure that the media experts will provide enough time to the journalists in order to ensure high quality media products in the remaining project period. With the first half of the project period already lapsed without producing programs that deal with interethnic relations, the media partners have to start producing programs on those issues so that the theory of change around interethnic relations will be proved successfully. Further, the assessment of the media products' quality against the Common Ground Criteria has not been done yet, and SFCG needs to make sure that the media experts will regularly do the assessments of the media products based on the criteria and submit them on a monthly basis. One of the media product presented in the community discussion that the evaluator attended in Ala Buka did not meet the common ground criteria, showing further need to carry out assessments of future media products.

Result: The community discussions have provided platform for community people to interact with (local) government authorities and discuss contentious issues to resolve them. Further, the community discussions have also given opportunity for complementarity between community-based public discussions and the media products to inform people and facilitate their discussions.

Findings: The project is scheduled to implement 72 community discussions during the life of the project, of which on 21 (29%) have been completed by 18 April 2013. This is only 48% of the target (44) by April 2013. In order to facilitate the workshop, the project was scheduled to train four Youth of Osh (SFCG partner) staff in dialogue facilitation. However, due to shortage of staff with YoO, SFCG and YoO decided to hire two external consultants as facilitators and train them for dialogue facilitation. The project could not employ four facilitators right from the beginning as one of the YoO employee started working with another project within YoO and other facilitators could not join the project as planned by the project team. At the time of mid-term evaluation, there were only two consultants facilitating the community discussions. The third joined the project from the first week of April only and was yet to start the work as facilitator. The two facilitators who are engaging with the project are highly confident in organizing the discussions as one of them is university lecturer and the other one is working with another NGO in Osh in a senior position.

The facilitators and the YoO Project Assistant have developed the participants list and the feedback form for the community discussions. While they have collected the list of participants for every community discussions, they have not been successful in getting the feedback from filled in all community discussions as only 13 out of 21 community discussions have filled in feedback form.

The participants list shows that 209 male (57%) and 155 female (43%) participants took part in the 21 community discussions. The ethnicity-disaggregated data shows that only 210 (58%) participants mentioned their ethnicity in the feedback form of which there were 179 (85%) Kyrgyz, 25 (12%) Uzbek and six (3%) others.

The analysis of the information of the feedback revealed that 33% of the participants agreed that the issue discussed in the program was highly relevant to their community whereas 60% agreed that it was relevant to their community. Only 7% thought that the issue was irrelevant to their life. Similarly, 78% of the participants reported that the media product shown at the beginning of the community discussions provided them with a new point of view about the problem discussed in the community discussion. The participants almost unanimously (99%) agreed that the community discussion helped them enhance their understanding on the issue discussed in the program. However, the analysis of the questions on how the

program can be improved show that the participants were expecting the community discussions to solve the issue in concern, which could be because of the framing of the program where the facilitators highlight their intention of solving the problem at the outset of the program. There are also comments from the participants where they thought the community discussions could not invite relevant authorities or they invited junior authorities who could not speak authentically during the program. However, majority of the participants have plenty of appreciation for the program as it provided them platform to express their concern and voice through media as well as the discussion.

“Through the radio and TV report, nothing will change in our society”
“There were lots of people invited, but nothing has been solved through the program”
“No details were discussed, rather highlighted general things which we already knew.”
“The representatives from government offices such as Mayor’s Office and Oblast administration were not present in the discussions”

The community discussions addressed some of the major problems encountered by the people in south Kyrgyzstan. Some of the major issues covered by the community discussion to date are:

- Compulsory health insurance and its challenges;
- Service quality of heating system in Osh,
- Conflict between microcredit company and borrowers,
- Financial literacy and financial pyramid,
- Misunderstanding between local authorities and local miners,
- Cargo 200 (transportation of dead body of labor migrants from Russia),
- Prohibition of head cover for girl students in schools,
- Land conflict,
- Conflict around gold mining company and problems of internal migrants in Osh.

The community discussions addressed issues that were being covered by media, particularly in TV, in order to deepen the dialogue among the concerned stakeholders and try to find a lasting solution or generate a sustained conversation among the stakeholders.

The community discussions failed to take into account the project’s theory of change. None of the community discussions discussed any issues related to inter-ethnic relations. The community discussions also failed to include sufficient youth participants (aged below 25). Only 9% of participants were youth below 25 years and 16% of participants were below the age of 29 years.

The purpose of the community discussions as designed in the project documents was to reinforce the messages delivered through the Common Ground Media products and deepening the dialogue around the issues in contention. As evidenced by the success stories of the Cargo 20, micro-credit conflict, migrants registration in Osh city and the issue of head covering of girl students, among others, showed that the combination of media products and the community discussions are yielding good result in the community level. This is facilitating the dialogue at two levels: First, between young (often) journalists and the community people and second, between among the different stakeholders involved in the issues in contention. The journalists who participated in the community discussions said, *“The community discussions have provided them opportunity to not only interact and build relationship with community people, but also helped build relationship with local decision makers, which was rather difficult before participating in the KabarOrdo project.”*

It was learned during the interviews that the post-June 2010 conflict context did not provide opportunity for people to discuss issues in contention into facilitated platform regardless of the sensitivity or the nature of the conflict. It was reported by the facilitators that the community discussions have raised hope among people. People believe that there is a mechanism to help them raise their grievances formally with the government and compels the government authorities to listen to those grievances. However, it was observed during the community discussion in Ala Buka that it has an other side also which has raised too many expectations among people that they expect every community discussion to produce a result or resolve the problem regardless of the nature of the conflict, which could be as complicated as international border conflict with Uzbekistan. Thus, framing the community discussion in the form of dialogue rather than an arbitration mechanism is a challenge that needs to be managed by the *KabarOrdo* project team.

Recommendations: Considering the framing problem noticed in the community discussion in Ala Buka and the subsequent reflection meeting with the facilitators in Osh, SFCG needs to monitor the community discussions closely and organize follow up coaching on dialogue facilitation with the facilitators, especially with the new facilitator. The team needs to clarify among participants in the community that the community discussion is not mechanism to solve all the problems, but a platform to start a conversation and provide opportunity for all stakeholders to express themselves and look among themselves for a win-win solution. There is also need for strategic thinking on selecting the topic to be discussed in the community discussions, as some of the complicated topics such the international border dispute could be beyond the scope of the project. It is important that the facilitators invite more participants from the youth age groups (inclusive of girls) to meet project’s TOC to facilitate the dialogue between youth of diverse communities and local leaders and decision makers. Further, SFCG needs to expedite the process of organizing the community discussions without compromising the quality of the discussions in order to finish the deliverables within the planned date.

2.2 Contributions and Challenges

A number of factors contributed to or blocked *KabarOrdo*’s achievements and may merit further inquiry by SFCG and YoO. Internal factors include design and implementation, but the external environment may have been more of a determinant. Other factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the program results that are related to implementation are as follows

	Contributing to Achievement	Blocking Achievement
<i>Within program’s sphere of influence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentionality in the selection of participating journalists • Top level media persons hired as consultants and respect of journalists for the media consultants • Working with all four types of media outlets to reach larger audiences • Proving platform for people to voice their concerns (both media programs as well as community discussions) • Media content used in community discussions as discussion trigger • Mobilizing media as tool for addressing local conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volatile conflict context that prevented working on originally intended issue (“strategic what”) and process of bring together divided community (“strategic how”) especially around the theory of change addressing the interethnic relations; • Busy schedule of media consultants • Lack of specialized coaching skills among media experts • Not all journalists getting opportunity of produce <i>KabarOrdo</i> products or apply those skills outside of the project framework • Lack of confidence among journalists that they can develop

		programs around interethnic relations
<i>The Broader Environment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obvious persistent need—the wounds of June 2010 ethnic violence are yet to be healed. • Increasing popularity of media, particularly television, among Kyrgyz citizens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent, on-going lack of trust of ethnic Kyrgyz towards ethnic Uzbek and vice versa • Increasing frustration among people regarding poor service delivery and governance • Political and ethnic centric manipulation of “Kyrgyz Nationalism” • Persistent fear among journalist and media outlets to work on inter-ethnic relations • Continued marginalization of minority ethnic groups in the country, particularly in the south • Lack of will of the government (central and local) to genuinely promote the inclusive democracy and heal the wounds of the 2010 violence

2.3 Relevance

The objectives of the *KabarOrdo* project are to support the dissemination of conflict-sensitive information and analysis of local conflict trends and to increase public awareness and understanding of collaborative approaches to interethnic conflict dynamics. The mid-term evaluation found that the project has been able to fulfill the first component of objective one (dissemination of conflict sensitive information) through the 89 media products produced so far. The media products have been produced and disseminated smoothly. Using conflict sensitive journalism approach, they have highlighted the issues that have negatively affecting people’s lives. However, the project is yet to produce and disseminate the analysis of local conflict trends, despite holding a conflict analysis workshop. The second objective of increasing public awareness and understanding on collaborative approaches to interethnic conflict dynamics has not been started yet despite the project reaching half way mark of the project period.

The review assessed the relevance of the project to the conflict context as defined in the conflict analysis carried out by the SFCG mission at the beginning of the project. The conflict analysis has particularly focused on the challenges faced by South Kyrgyzstan in the aftermath of the June 2010 ethnic violence and guided the project concept accordingly to bridge the interethnic tension and promote interethnic reconciliation. However, once the project started, the project team also realized that working on inter-ethnic issues is not as easy as it was thought during the project design. They also realized that unless they started with the everyday plights of local community and people’s frustration towards local government, politicians and service delivery (both state and private sector), it would not be possible for them to motivate people to talk and act on sensitive issues around interethnic relations. It was also vindicated by the interviews carried out with range of stakeholders who said that the issues around inter-ethnic relations are too sensitive to deal now as the trauma and wound around the 2010 violence are still fresh in the minds of people from both side.

In addition to this challenge, the local politicians are still using the so-called ethnic-Kyrgyz nationalist campaign to continue to promote the majority ethnic sentiment for their political gain and create deep division between the two ethnic groups.

The interview with the Project Manager of *KabarOrdo* revealed that there was another reason for not focusing so much on inter-ethnic relations. She said, “*The project design talks about conflict early warning and conflict prevention, not reconciliation. Reconciliation is still needed, but if you look at purely conflict early warning and violence prevention, you see there is a lot of political conflict here that could potentially turn violent. If we are supposed to be looking for conflict trends, then we are probably doing the right thing by focusing on these other issues. However, if we are supposed to be looking at inter-ethnic relations, we should be focusing on reconciliation, which would require changing the format of our Common Ground Reports and not focusing so much on emerging conflict trends.*” This argument points to the fact that the product design encountered problem from the beginning where it focuses on the conflict prevention modality in its design and reconciliation modality in its Theory of Change.

Developing criteria for assessing the relevance of a program to the context is challenging because of the lack of standards and the uniqueness of every context. One common approach is to identify relevance criteria within the program’s conflict analysis. There was no formal conflict analysis done as part of the design of the *KabarOrdo* project. However, SFCG’s baseline included some conflict analysis and did feed into the design, which led to shift in intervention priority. The review was preceded by the release of three different conflict assessments (from March 2011 to December 2012) by the International Crisis Group¹⁴, the Open Society Foundation¹⁵ and Chatham House¹⁶ that were combined with statements from interlocutors in assessing the relevance of the project. Although the analyses used here are recent, the dynamics they describe have been in play in Kyrgyzstan for some time, at least from the post-independence era of 1990s. Based on the limited reading of the context, the mid-term evaluation looked into the relevancy of the project in terms of the conflict analysis in the beginning as well as the sift in intervention strategy as guided by the post-design conflict analysis.

The conflict analysis done as part of the mid-term review and the analysis carried out by international organizations show that the conflict dynamics in Southern Kyrgyzstan are still chiefly driven by inter-ethnic tension and poor governance. In this context, the project’s goals and objectives conceptualized during the project design are still highly relevant to the conflict dynamics of the region. However, the sensitivity and volatility around the interethnic relations prevailing in south Kyrgyzstan prevented the project’s activities with media actors and community members from fully addressing these issues. Most of the activities implemented during the first year of the project did not address the interethnic issues directly and could not draw the desired number of young people to the community discussions. This has created a bigger challenge to the project team to enhance the relevancy of the project activities to the objectives and theory of change in the second year of project implementation, especially under the current trend of hopeless public opinion regarding the inter-ethnic dynamics. There is a need for the project staff to find a way for the project design to be more relevant to the conflict context, given the implementation challenges around which issues stakeholders are comfortable engaging.

The Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis training has been a milestone in the journalism training landscape of South Kyrgyzstan. The journalists, media directors and the media consultants unanimously reported that the training is the ‘first of its kind’ in the region and brought a commendable

¹⁴ICG 2012. Kyrgyzstan: Widening Ethnic Divisions in South. Asia Report # 222, 24 March 2012. International Crisis Group. Brussels/Bishkek.

¹⁵Megoran, Nick. 2012. Averting Violence in Kyrgyzstan: Understanding and Responding to Nationalism. Chatham House, Russia and Eurasia Program Paper 2012-13, December 2012. London.

¹⁶Melvin, Neil. 2011. Promoting a Stable and Multiethnic Kyrgyzstan. Overcoming the Causes and Legacy of Violence. Central Eurasia Project, Occasional Paper Series No 3, Open Society Foundations, New York.

shift among the participating journalists in the way they think and produce programs. Considering the negative role played by the journalists and media houses during the June 2010 events, the introduction of the Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis Training is highly relevant in shifting their approach journalism approach.

The *KabarOrdo* project has been addressing a number of issues that are concern to the local community around South Kyrgyzstan. The conflict analysis also revealed that the intra-ethnic socio-cultural conflicts and poor governance are the issues that are bothering everyday lives of the people. The project has been highly relevant in addressing such conflicts. The project has provided a common platform for different conflicting parties to raise their voices (through media) and convene community discussions. The media product and follow up community discussion have provided opportunity to conflicting parties to discuss their issues together and find a solution in a conflict sensitive manner. However, the relevancy of the project in relation to the deep-rooted inter-ethnic conflict, which was envisioned by the initial project design, remains very low during the first year.

The people interviewed, including the journalists themselves, reported that the common ground reporting training was the most appropriate training they had attended in their careers. The participants of the community discussion in Ala Buka said that the community discussions helped them to discuss issues together and try to find solution. Despite the project's weak relevance to the original design concept, it meets the stakeholders' expectation of the local relevance.

The Power of KabarOrdo: Hijab Controversy in Schools

Religion remains as a sensitive issue in Kyrgyzstan with increasing fundamentalist influence coming from across the border. The interviews during the evaluation revealed that it is not easy to talk about religious issues in public and debate about them. Often called an island of democracy among the countries of Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan tries to follow and respect the rights of people, especially women. Due to the rapid increase of interest in Islam, especially among youth, the government is trying to prevent the radicalization through various means. The Kyrgyz Government has issued a rule that prohibits girls from wearing a head covering (hijab) at school. This rule has created tension between the secular government and a religious population. Many parents and the religions leaders have been upset by this ruling and its enforcement by school administrators, creating further tension between these three groups. Using media product prepared by 7Channel that discuss the issue of hijab in schools, KabarOrdo conducted a series of community discussions with active participation of parents, school administrations, district education departments and other local government authorities. During those discussions, schoolteachers explained to religious parents that their daughters' active participation in school life is extremely important, and that such participation is restricted by the use of the hijab. They also explained that they are in a difficult position as of being required to follow the instructions of the Education Department while wanting to respect the opinion of parents. As a result of the discussion, the school administration and the local government are consulting parents and religious leaders to create an amicable solution.

Further, the review also administered a survey among the *KabarOrdo* Radio Program producers to explore the participants' opinion on the relevancy of the activities. The survey revealed that the Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis training and the coaching sessions are highly relevant to the current need of journalism sector in south Kyrgyzstan. The analysis showed that 50% of the *KabarOrdo* media program producers said that the training they attended was highly relevant to their work and professional development whereas 43% said it was relevant. More female (59%) found the training highly relevant to their work and professional development than their male counterparts did (38%). Similarly, 47% of the participating journalists found the coaching sessions done by the three media

consultants highly useful for improving their common ground skills, whereas 47% found it useful. The training materials distributed during the training were also rated highly by the participants as 36% rated them as very useful materials whereas remaining 64% found the materials useful in their work. The community discussions organized at different communities were also rated to be relevant to the life of community people. Among the 364 participants, 93% of them agreed that the program is relevant to the conflict dynamics they are undergoing in their life and community.

KabarOrdo did address an ambitious array of the relevance criteria in the context of highly volatile conflict situation in the region. It is unlikely that any single program would be able to address effectively the needs of ethnically divided population of South Kyrgyzstan.

Recommendations: The project is trying to address two different but interlinked issues in south Kyrgyzstan: government service delivery and interethnic reconciliation between ethnic Uzbek and ethnic Kyrgyz peoples. In order to achieve the objectives and fulfill the theory of change envisioned in the project design, the project has to move forward in implementing activities to address interethnic prejudices and stereotypes and promote interethnic relations. SFCG and its partners need to identify issues around interethnic relations carefully and come out with a doable action plan to promote reconciliation and cooperation between two divided communities. Considering that 70% of the deliverables have yet to be achieved, SFCG still has the opportunity to accomplish this. Since Search does not really do early warning and has not been able to provide any particular methodology or expertise in this area, SFCG should not have designed a project that included early warning.

2.4 Implementation Process

Result: The project has so far tried to model the Common Ground Approach in its program without addressing the interethnic relations. The implementation process has been slow and lagging behind the year 1 plan. Despite the delayed start of the project activities, the implementation of activities has continued without obstruction.

Findings: As of June 2012, the entire population remains divided along ethnic lines and interviewees reported that the sense of division is still prevalent. During the last three years, there were no other platforms or programs implemented to bring people together for dialogue and discussion. The participating journalists said that prior to the program their reporting mirrored the divided circumstances. They developed media products based on rumors or information supplied by selected social and political elites. However, the Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis Training and the follow-up coaching have helped them to develop a sense of understanding about the Common Ground Approach. However, the journalists still struggle to understand how the Common Ground Approach should be applied in Kyrgyzstan, as there is a persistent sense of fatalism around addressing the current interethnic conflict in the immediate future. The journalists, their bosses and the facilitators of the community discussions claimed that most of the media programs and community discussions are finding a win-win solution to the problem they are addressing. Some of the case studies explained during the mid-term evaluation vindicate their claim. However, due to the lack of monitoring data and assessment of media products against the Common Ground criteria, the evaluation cannot fully conclude that the community discussions and the media products actually modeled the Common Ground Approach.

The project design has strategically chosen to provide capacity building, individual and group coaching, incentives and technical equipment to the journalists to help them improve the quality of their media products. SFCG brought two of its best in-house trainers in Common Ground Reporting and dialogue facilitations to train the journalists. SFCG also hired strongly qualified media consultants/community discussion facilitators. However, the delays in web site development, production of the Common ground journalism training manual, creation of regular conflict analysis reports and translation of the five best

media products in English and Russian has slowed the overall pace of the program. The project has no formal reflection and learning mechanisms. However, there were a few sessions for the community discussion facilitators and the participating journalists to share feedback on the project. At the refresher workshop held in March 2013, the participating journalists showed enthusiasm to continue such initiatives on a regular basis. The feedback session for the facilitators after the Ala Buka discussion helped them to better frame the community discussion moving forward.

The project's monitoring tool included the pre and post-test carried out during the training, the Common Ground Criteria developed for assessing the media products, the participants' lists for both media training and community discussions, and the feedback forms used in the community discussions. The baseline study also provided high quality data for the project team to identify priority areas and to establish baseline indicators. However, this monitoring data has not been properly analyzed and utilized for several reasons, including the lack of human resources (as SFCG did not have an M&E staff), the lack of DME expertise of the Project Assistant of YoO, and the lack of an M&E plan to clarify responsibilities on collecting, compiling, analysing and utilizing monitoring data. As a result, much of the information collected remained in hard copy piles, un-used after collection, with the exception of the incomplete Pre-test and Post-test data of the Common Ground Reporting training. An additional problem is that the information and collected and stored often does not speak to the actual results of each activity or output. For example, this is the case with both neither the excel database of media products and the data compiled from the community discussions, which do not speak to what impact the media products or discussions had in the community..

Insufficient human resources to drive the implementation of project right from the beginning seemed to hamper the efficient implementation of the project. The project was being implemented by one fulltime project assistant, three part-time media consultants and two community discussion facilitators, other than the media producers. The who project management and implementation was overseen by the SFCG Project Manager and the YoO Director, who was giving little time to the project. Considering the volume of the deliverables and the work load explained by the project team, the project was definitely sort of human resources.

The start of the project was delayed by three to four months (depending on the activities planned)and all subsequent activities were delayed by almost same amount of time. As a result, the deliverables were lagging behind the schedule during the time of the mid-term evaluation and only 20% of media products and 29% of community discussions were delivered so far.

Despite the promise of using fulltime media coaches in the original program design, SFCG and YoO could not hire expert media persons to coach the journalists on fulltime basis. The initial project design did not plan for media trainers/consultants and the SFCG Project Manager was envisioned to mentor the journalists on a fortnightly basis. However, it did not materialize fully because managing the project alone created a substantial workload. The "conflict consultants/(community discussion) facilitators" were envisioned in the project design but the "media consultants" have been hired following the result of the baseline, which suggested that young journalists would need more support than planned in the project design.

The hiring of media consultants added value in the project because of their expertise in the media sector in South Kyrgyzstan¹⁷ as well as the level of respect they garnered from participating journalists and the directors of media outlets. It has greatly benefitted the participating journalists to have continuous coaching and mentoring by highly trained media professionals. However, their part-time engagement in the project still falls short of meeting all the training needs of the journalists, as they are extremely busy

¹⁷ The three media consultants hired by the project are the most experienced journalists in South Kyrgyzstan

individuals and worked without full supervision of the Project Manager. All of the media trainers agreed that they are overstretched and are working more than the TOR demands in order to provide even minimal coaching to the journalists. For instance, they have to advise the journalists up to three times on each media product created.

Similarly, the project design originally planned training of four Youth of Osh (YoO) staff, who also participated in 'Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis Training, on debate facilitation. The community discussion is one of the major components of the project and directly addressed the second theory of change articulated for the project. However, of the the four YoO staff selected, two were later not available to be part of the training, as they had been only budgeted at \$100/month and it was not enough incentive for YoO to make available to work for the *KabarOrdo* Project.

SFCG and YoO then decided to hire two external consultants to work as part-time facilitators. Together with the two Youth of Osh staff originally selected to facilitate the debates, the two consultants were trained in debate facilitation and collaborative problem solving from SFCG's Director for Leadership and Training, Shawn Dunning. However, despite the two YoO staff trained, one of them discontinued facilitating the community discussions, as she was assigned to work in a different project within YoO. The other YoO staff, who also works as a Project Assistant of *KabarOrdo*, had taken over the responsibility of inviting people and arranging the logistics of each of the community discussions. However, there were contradicting statements from the Project Assistant and the Facilitators regarding the logistics arrangement for the community discussions. Both the Facilitators said that their understanding was that they were only responsible for facilitating the debate as technical experts and not taking care of the event management. They further said that the added burden is stretching them too much as they have to spend more time for the project than they are supposed to do. When this issue was raised with the Project Assistant, she said that she is alone and cannot handle the pressure of logistics arrangement of all the community discussions.

This discussion highlights the weakness of the human resource allocation in the project. If we exclude the five consultants hired for coaching and community discussion facilitation, the project is severely short of sufficient full time staff to implement the project fully. For example, the Director/President of YoO plays more of a symbolic rather than practical role, and SFCG only recently hired a Communications and M&E Officer. Outside of these two personnel, the project is only managed by one person from both SFCG and one person from YoO. These two full time project personnel have an added burden of monitoring the work of the consultants, which is not happening as required. As a result, the project has been limited in its ability to properly supervise and support the journalists and properly collect and analyze monitoring data.

The interviews with the media consultants, training facilitators, and the journalists revealed that the training have helped them to get basic sense of Common Ground Approach, particularly among the media consultants. The evaluator determined that much of the Common Ground terminology taught during the trainings had been lost in translation from English to Kyrgyz. The person who worked as a translator during the media training said that she did not mention the terms in their technical wording but rather she tried to explain them in elaborated language.¹⁸ Most of the participants, including the facilitators, said that they need more training on Common Ground and dialogue facilitation. When the facilitators were asked what was their major take away from the debate facilitation training, they struggled to remember any of the concepts taught. Since there was no documentation available about the training, the evaluator could not formally figure out the effectiveness of the training on the two facilitators, other than the interpretation of responses during the interviews. Despite not having learned a great deal from the training, the facilitators are using their individual prior professional knowledge of facilitating meetings at

¹⁸The translator mentioned that she was not able to communicate many technical terms and terminology into local language and it was not possible to translate everything the trainer explained.

the local level in the community discussions, though they are missing the structured approach of dialogue facilitation that they had allegedly been trained in the dialogue facilitation training. This was clearly witnessed in one of the community discussions attended by the evaluators in Ala Buka, which clearly lacked the Common Ground approach.¹⁹ This was further reflected in the discussion session organized immediately after the program in Ala Buka. However, the feedback session organized within two days of the program provided an opportunity for the facilitators and the project team to reflect on the weaknesses of the programs and how to improve them in the future.

The producers of the *KabarOrdo* media products and the media experts are following the Planning Guide for Common Ground Reports (see annex) prepared as part of the training. Journalists and media consultants are also using the document to prepare the media products and assess their quality. The project team, with the help of SFCG the then Chief Programming Officer²⁰, has also developed the Common Ground criteria (see annex) for the media products. The media consultants are responsible for evaluating the extent to which the media products are fulfilling the criteria of Common Ground Approach and report to SFCG. However, because of their busy schedule and lack of follow up from SFCG, they have not done so yet. SFCG staff said that they have talked to the media consultants and they have committed themselves to randomly evaluating the products based on the criteria, and SFCG is already working towards developing a system where the reports of media consultants can be analyzed and given feedback for improvement.

However, the project is still lagging behind with some of the deliverables targeted to be finished by the end of first year.

- The project intended to train 15 young journalists from Youth of Osh media school, of which only 11 have been trained to date. Youth of Osh intentionally brought some of the Uzbek youth in the training. Considering the importance of bringing diverse group of youth into the training, YoO did not limit the participant selection within the YoO Media School and invited some potential young people from outside. However, once they complete the training, only two started working as online journalists. Most of the Uzbek youth have many more family responsibilities and are less engaged in civil society activities (such as Youth of Osh's programs) than Kyrgyz youth. Some of the participants selected did not complete the training due to the lack of motivation
- Although the project managed to train 64 journalists when only 50 were included in the initial design, few of these trained journalists are working at *KabarOrdo*. Furthermore, the project has no follow up mechanisms with the other trained journalists to see if they are practicing the knowledge and skills learnt from the training into their work. However, the recently started journalists' workshop could be a potential mechanism for follow up with these media professionals.
- The original project design included translation and publication of the Common Ground Training Manual into Kyrgyz languages as well as dissemination among participating journalists and other concerned stakeholders within first six month of the project. However, because of the shortage of the human resources within the project team, the manual has not come out as a final document and the draft document is still pending finalization.
- The media houses are lagging behind with the production of media products, which might pose a huge challenge to SFCG and to the media outlets because 80% products are due in the year two of the project.

¹⁹The community discussion organized at AlaBuka was on the impact of international border conflict on the people living in the bordering towns of Kyrgyzstan and it was a difficult topic to discuss at it involved Uzbekistan security forces and Uzbekistan Administration. Even the media product shown in the program did not meet Common Ground Criteria. I was told that the community discussion was one of the lowest point of all the community discussions, because of the nature of the topic and peoples heightened frustration expressed in the beginning of the program.

²⁰ She is appointed as Vice-President for Programs recently.

- USAID agreed to allow SFCG not to carry out the quarterly stakeholder meeting and production of local conflict trends because of its similarity with the conflict analysis workshop and the increasing participant fatigue on such activities. The participant fatigue was also evident in the community discussion in Ala Buka, as many participants said that there has been many such discussions that had not been effective at generating solutions.
- The original project design also stated that for every month in the first year of the project, Common Ground reports would be translated into Russian and English. However, by the time the mid-term evaluation took place, the process of selecting and translating the five best media products into Russian and English has not started yet. Similarly, the publication and dissemination of conflict trend updates has also been delayed significantly.
- One of the plans for the first year was to create a website for the project. However, neither SFCG nor YoO had the internal technical expertise to develop a website until the Communications and M&E Officer came on board. Though the process has been started, the website was not ready when the mid-term evaluation took place. The delay in creation of a website will lessen the ability of the website to disseminate information to project beneficiaries and local and national decision makers.
- The annual plan for the first year calls for organizing two conflict analysis workshops and disseminating their reports as early warning documents to the civil society, political parties and government authorities. The project held one conflict analysis workshop with 40 participants on February 26, 2013, but could not produce the conflict analysis report and disseminate it to wider stakeholders across the country. This is a missed opportunity to generate early warning among citizens when the third anniversary of June 2015 violence is fast approaching. However, the reports are no longer following the format of “early warning” as each one only focuses on one issue. The format of the report as-is would not provide any additional early warning for the third anniversary.

Despite overall slow progress and the project’s weak relevance to issues identified through conflict analysis, the project has been effectively addressing issues of governance and local community conflicts in a way that has won trust of local community members. The KIIs and FGDs revealed that the *KabarOrdo* project is connecting communities to the local authorities and highlighting their grievances through the combination of media products and community discussions.

Recommendations: SFCG and YoO should devise a clear strategy that expedites the implementation process without rushing too much and distribute remaining deliverables across remaining 9 months of so. A timely request of appropriate and affordable no cost extension of the project with the donor might help in smooth completion of deliverables and the final evaluation. As mentioned above, there are a number of activities of high strategic importance that could increase the visibility and effectiveness of the project, such as the creation of website and finalization and publication of Common Ground Training Manual, which should have been completed before the end of first year. SFCG now needs to develop a concrete plan and complete them as soon as possible probably within May 2013 the latest. Considering the burden of the deliverable for the second year, SFCG, YoO and Media partners should sit together, develop quarterly deliverable plans, and follow them strictly. The project team also needs to look into the underlying causes of project delay such as the staffing, their capacity and budget reallocation, if possible. Otherwise, the project will encounter serious challenge to be completed within the timeframe of two years.

2.5 Coherence and Coordination

This section looks into the complementarity of different project activities and the quality of coordination among partners.

2.5.1 Internal *KabarOrdo* Coherence

Result: The project has been able to generate internal coherence as well as institutional partnership and coordination despite initial challenges.

Finding: Project managers created internal coherence between the different activity streams within *KabarOrdo* by connecting the media products with the community discussions and by using different media outlets TV, radio, print and online to multiple the effect of each media product created.

While all project activities each had a unique scope, they worked on similar issues and were therefore all able to complement one another in providing a platform to civil society, local decision makers and young people to address governance and conflict at the community and inter-personal level. Each of the activity streams was implemented as a separate project. This is to some degree desirable as each implementing organization has its own constituency, geographic coverage and network of relationships. One of the ideas behind the multiple activity streams was to achieve a broad reach while maintaining the ability to address local issues in depth within each community.

One of the highlights of the *KabarOrdo* project is the creation of mutually reinforcing activities, especially the media products and the community discussions. Some of the important issues raised in the media products were also shown in the community discussion to supply detailed information to the participants as the launching pad for the discussion among the participants. The media products help people to understand better the agenda floated in the discussion and provided background information to many of the participating who are not aware of the issue in entirety.

The division of labor among the media consultants to create different types of media products also helped them disseminate similar messages across different media products. Since the three media consultants were trained together and have developed a similar understanding on Common Ground Principles and Approaches, they are able to deliver the same training to all of the journalists and ensure a similar quality of media products across different media outlets. The only weakness is that the media products created by the journalists and the community discussions are not formally assessed according to the Common Ground criteria. Consequently, it could not be verified that the media products and actual discussions are of quality. The evaluator was also unable to review the content of different media program and community discussion report directly because of the language barriers.

2.5.2 Coordination among Partners

Result: The coordination among partners SFCG and Youth of Osh (YoO) experienced challenges in the beginning. However, the coordination between these two organizations has been improving over the time. Further, the relationship and coordination of SFCG, YoO and the media outlets, especially the Media Directors, is very cordial barring some exceptions.

Findings: Since *KabarOrdo* is the first project of SFCG in Kyrgyzstan and the organization was new to the region, SFCG decided to locate itself within the premise of YoO office complex. The sharing of same office space has been a benefit and a drawback, at the same time. There has been some communication and coordination problem between these two organizations at the beginning of the project in the lack of proper understanding of the partnership modality. However, the visit of the Chief Programming Officer of SFCG during 7-19 January 2013 helped them to resolve their coordination issues. Despite having clear division of role and responsibilities between the two organizations, there remains a continued tension on completing tasks on time and submitting information and documentation in a prompt manner. One of the project staff said “May be we are expecting more than what we are supposed to do from each other.” The high mobility of Youth of Osh Director has left lots of project burden on the young Project Assistant, who does not have enough analytical ability when it comes to analyzing the data and information on program

implementation and monitoring. The recruitment of the Communications and M&E Officer has eased some burden from both the Project Manager (SFCG) and the Project Assistant (YoO). There is a continued effort between the parties to clarify what to expect from each other.

Further, YoO is undergoing a transition with its long-time Director in addition to one of YoO's most dynamic staff members stepping down from their respective positions by the end of March 2013. Despite the Director promising that she would continue to work with the project until it finishes, her engagement may in reality become more remote, which would add responsibility to the already overburdened Project Assistant. Considering the fact that the project team has to finish more than 70% of its deliverables in the coming 9 months, this transition could present a severe challenge to the project management.

Similarly, the partnership between the project team and the media partners is mostly smooth with some exceptions. The journalists and the media directors were very open and willing to meet the evaluation team and even visited the SFCG/YoO office to talk with the evaluator. This collaboration has also been strengthened by the significant equipment support from the project to the media outlets. All media directors interviewed acknowledged that the equipment support was the highlight of the partnership. One of the weaknesses of the partnership in the very beginning was the lack of coordination and commitment in organizing the in-situ training for journalists, where participation rate dropped down significantly in four of the seven media outlets despite the Directors' strong pledge that all journalists would attend the training fully. Further, few cases were reported where the media directors i) did not allow their journalist to carry out the cameras to the field visits, ii) did not allow their journalists to participate in the community discussions; and iii) did not allow their journalists to present the media products in the quarterly refresher meeting organized by SFCG/YoO.

As mentioned above, *KabarOrdo* is the first project of SFCG in Kyrgyzstan and obviously new experience of working with partners in an entirely new cultural and conflict context. Since the project team was very small and the media partners have service contracts with the project, not much attention was paid in the beginning to strengthen the partnership. Consequently, it did not have a wealth of tools and processes with which to add value to partners' initiatives. SFCG focused more on getting *KabarOrdo* activities done and less on how to use the experience of the project implementation to develop partnership systems. Further, because all the media outlets were treated as independent entities linked to this project through service contracts, SFCG also has its limitation on how much they could influence the media partners. However, considering the lessons of the past one year, SFCG has become more alert on how to strengthen partnership, especially between SFCG and YoO, in moving through this project and beyond. The planned move of SFCG office space out of YoO premise might prove to be a step towards improving relationship between the two organizations.

Recommendations: SFCG|Kyrgyzstan would benefit from research and benchmarking work on partnership on how other organizations are taking partnership with other organizations in the context of Kyrgyzstan. Certain challenges will occur in every partnership and applying lessons learned, strengthening relationships, and more clearly defining roles and responsibilities is the best possible way to move forward. In situations like *KabarOrdo* where only handful of staff are handling the project and they are over stretched, SFCG and YoO need to work together and develop strategies to make the leadership transition within YoO as smooth as possible. SFCG needs to take a leadership role in organizing regular meeting with the Media Directors in order to enhance their understanding of the *KabarOrdo* Principles (Common Ground Principles), to increase their ownership of the project activities, and to create an environment for sustainability of the media products in the post-project period.

III. CONCLUSION

KabarOrdo was conceptualized and implemented at a time of transition following serious ethnic violence between majority ethnic Kyrgyzs and minority ethnic Uzbeks. The conflict engulfed the three oblasts of South Kyrgyzstan (Osh, Jalal-Abad and Batken) in a wave of violence, socio-economic crisis, a widening gap, stereotypes and prejudices spread by both leaders and citizens. This dynamic worsened the ongoing political instability and manipulation of youth, despite the recent peaceful election. The *KabarOrdo* project mobilized media outlets, journalists and local community leaders who had been fomenting division and used them to consolidate a public discussion on issues of democratization and peacebuilding. The program interventions implemented in the first half of the project period were partially relevant to the conflict context in the region.

SFCG has significantly contributed in developing the professionalism of first and second generation of journalists in South Kyrgyzstan, a change that is visible in the increased enthusiasm, commitment and improved journalism skills among the journalists. The journalists are already demonstrating success in making their media products fairly conflict sensitive and “balanced” by including voices of all stakeholders affected by the issue or the conflict. The training were the first of their kind that the journalists has attended, and thus they are still struggling to effectively utilize the knowledge and skills imparted in the training. However, this challenge is being addressed through the three media consultants who are supporting the journalists in improving the conflict sensitivity of their reports. The project is contributing in bringing a notable shift among journalists on the way they approach issues and frame their stories or programs. The one-day follow up workshop with the participating journalists has been a valuable component for sharing learning and providing feedback for the project team. Their consistent support from the stage of identifying topics to finalizing the stories for broadcast/publication has been real asset for the journalists to improve the quality of their media product.

The community discussion facilitators bring a wealth of knowledge and expertise from their former work as university professors and NGO employees. They have an in-depth understanding of the local conflict dynamics and the intricacies of the conflicts are emerging in the communities. However, they need to have a better understanding of how to facilitate dialogue and frame issues during the community discussions so that people leave the program with hope and motivation to contribute in addressing such conflicts. Despite these challenges, the community discussions are successfully highlighting citizen concerns and grievances related to governance and service delivery and connecting local people with the government authorities. This is very important in the context of post-June 2010 violence because such a platform will help people come together to discuss their issues and build understanding. The use of media products as a foundation of community discussion has added value to the objective of the program by informing people on detailed information related to the issues. The community discussion has also provided opportunity to young journalists to connect themselves with the people and communities outside of the city area.

The project has been successful in targeting the ‘strategic who’ in the context of conflict dynamics of south Kyrgyzstan by working with journalists, civil society and local decision makers who can play a role in making or breaking the conflict in the region. However, it has failed to address the “strategic what” as envisioned in the program design and reflected through the theory of change. Because of the perceived high sensitivity about the inter-ethnic issues by the program participants, including the journalists, and unwillingness of the local government authorities to participate in activities or issues around inter-ethnic relation, the project has not initiated any activities relevant to inter-ethnic tensions. However, considering the groundwork done in the past one-year and the increased trust and confidence of the project stakeholders on *KabarOrdo* project, it is imperative that the project develops strategy to enter into uncharted territory to address seemingly harder issues in the region.

On implementation, SFCG is lagging behind with the annual work plan developed for the first year, and the number of activities planned for the year have been delayed because of external as well as internal reasons. Considering the lack of human resources within SFCG and YoO, and the part-time work of consultants, SFCG has a daunting task ahead in second year of the project implementation as it has to produce 70% of deliverables in the second year. SFCG needs to show urgency in finalizing the *KabarOrdo* Project Website, Common Ground Training Manual in Kyrgyz and Russian and the conflict analysis report, conflict trend updates and the translation of five best media products in Russian and English as soon as possible. This will help minimize the burden of work for the last six months and helps increase the visibility of the project activities among the stakeholders. It is also urgent that SFCG closely works with media partners and the community discussion facilitators to expedite the process of producing deliverables, as only 20% media products and 29% community discussions have been completed by the end of April 2013.

The internal coherence between the media products and the community discussion has helped build trust among community, civil society, local decision makers and media professionals. There are number of examples of successful resolution of problems faced by the people for many years. These programs have also helped establish the credibility of media outlets and the journalists among people in South Kyrgyzstan. The partnership between SFCG and the media directors and the media outlets is cordial and cooperative and SFCG needs to organize regular interactions and coordination with the media directors to increase their ownership over the project.

Despite the challenges in building partnership with YoO and the lack of a clear coordination and burden sharing strategy in the project, the partnership has emerged strongly in the last few months, especially after visit of Chief Programming Officer in January 2013. However, there is an emerging challenge with the leadership transition within YoO, and SFCG needs to pay extra attention in maintaining and build upon the existing degree of partnership with YoO's new leadership.

Despite the setbacks, the project has been able to generate a belief among people that there are mechanisms that can help them raise their voices, address their grievances and draw attention from the government authorities. It has provided a platform for people to initiative dialogue among all concerned stakeholders that helped resolve the long standing issues rather than living in the shadow of mistrust and frustration. The program has contributed in shifting the image of media organization in South Kyrgyzstan and developing a sense of trust and confidence in media organizations and journalists that they can connect government and local community in issues of concern and increase government accountability. The *KabarOrdo* project contributed in bringing numerous and divided media outlets and their journalists together into single platform and work towards achieving a common Goal: a Democratic and peaceful South Kyrgyzstan, where people have faith that they can raise collective voices through media and other forums and their voices are hear by the government authorities.

IV. APPENDICES

Annex I: Planning Guide for Common Ground Reports

Планирование по принципам СГ	
Планирование	Критерий для утверждения
Тема:	Есть ли существенное? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Это проблема, которая требует решения для общества? ✓ Это проблема, которая является объектом противоречий и повышением поляризации? ✓ Является вопрос, скрытым или каким - то образом неизвестен? ✓ Это тема для слухов или разных интерпретаций и видений?
Идея программы? («Почему»)	Понятно ли какой принцип СГ мы нацелены использовать в данной программе?
Чему научиться наши зрители? Какую позицию мы хотим мотивировать среди наших зрителей?	Какие факты будут уточняться в программе или статье? Какая информация будет передаваться, которую наши зрители еще не знают? Резонированы ли подходы согласно принципам СГ?
Угол зрения Важные вопросы	Представляют ли вопросы ситуацию точно? Рассмотрены ли причины ситуации и не только последствия? Направлены ли вопросы к разрешению и возможным областям совместных действий?

Формат	Критерий	
Репортаж с места события	Какую местность мы хотим проиллюстрировать? Почему эта местность имеет отношение/является подходящим для нашей цели? Кто должен говорить в этом репортаже? Какую ситуацию мы намереваемся показать?	
Профиль (свидетельство)	Кого мы хотим слышать? Почему? Для какой цели? О чем свидетельство?	
Вокс поп (Блиц опрос)	Какие вопросы мы задаем? Кому? Какое разнообразие мы ищем среди наших интервью? Какие вопросы должны поднять их комментарии?	
Портрет	Почему пережитый опыт этого человека важен для нашей цели? На что должно быть сделан акцент в портрете?	
Музыка	Какой певец? Какая песня? Почему?	
Сюжет	Какое сообщение? What creative format to captivate audience?	

Примерный перечень критериев для утверждения программ или статей

Принципы CG	Вопросы	Комментарии	Балл
A. Повышение осведомленности - уточнение проблемы			
1. Предоставлять точную и достоверную новость и информацию 2. Вскрывать противоречия конфликта, изучая проблемы беспристрастно 3. Опровергать слухи 4. Исследовать предположения	a. Уточнена ли ключевая информация? Опровергнуты ли всякие слухи? b. В программе представлены ли конфликт и его причины с точностью и беспристрастностью? c. Есть ли попытка осветить существующие усилия разрешения конфликтов или проблем? Подчеркивает ли программа/статья извлеченные уроки или положительные модели реакции конфликту? d. Представляет ли программа возможность разрешения проблем или конфликт совместными путям для продвижения вперед?		
B. Давать возможность диалогу и пониманию			
1. Исследует общие интересы, скрытые за противостоящими сторонами 2. Ведет к коммуникации между сторонами 3. Уважает интересы всех сторон, делать гуманным «других» 4. Предлагает альтернативы и возможные решения	a. Связана ли программа к текущему конфликту или совместному разрешению проблем, чем просто описывает изолированные события насилия? b. Включает ли программа причастные и заинтересованные стороны в проблему? c. Уточняет ли программа/статья основные интересы разных сторон и выявляет общие интересы и области согласованности? d. Мотивирует ли программа к общим подходам решения проблем?		
C. Предлагает решения и усиливает отношения			
1. Снижает стереотипы, предубеждения и недопонимания 2. Предоставляет голос не услышанному 3. Создает модель	a. Представлены ли все основные видения в сбалансированным путем? b. Избегает ли программа от продвижений стереотипов или мифов об определенных заинтересованных сторон, в особенности тех, которых мнения не были представлены в программе?		

<p>положительного поведения и подходов для решения проблем</p> <p>4. Позволяет сторонам установить их позиции не теряя престижа /не будучи униженным</p> <p>5. Поддерживает гибкость видений на будущее, смотря через видение «других»</p>	<p>c. Предлагает ли программа «непротиволожные /победа-победа» пути анализа конфликта или решения проблем?</p> <p>d. Усилена ли в программе ценность диалога между различными сторонами?</p> <p>e. Отражена ли ценность нашей общей человечности?</p> <p>f. Мотивирует ли программа аудиторию вдуматься как они лично и общество в целом могут содействовать совместному разрешению конфликта?</p> <p>g. Продвигает ли программа доверительные отношения и строение уверенности между конфликтующими сторонами?</p> <p>h. Продвинулась ли программа вперед от просто освещения конфликта или его влияния к обсуждению путей к миру и окончательного примирения?</p>		
Техническая оценка			
<p>Техническое качество (отдельно для радио, телевидения и печатных изданий)</p>	<p>Журналист задал точный и полный?</p> <p>Есть ли звуковые эффекты для медиа продукта; рекламная мелодия и соответствующий?</p> <p>Хорошо ли проведены интервью с точки зрения техники и качества?</p> <p>Хорошо ли построены и представлены элементы звука?</p> <p>Хорошо ли написан и представлен сценарий?</p> <p>Шоу соблюдает выделенное для него?</p>		
<p>Соблюдение планирования</p>	<p>Продюсеры/писатели смогли ли достичь то, что было запланировано?</p>		
<p>Использование форматов</p>	<p>Уместно ли были использованы форматы?</p>		
<p>Общее качество продюсеров/журналистов</p>	<p>Что было основными качествами производства?</p> <p>Что было основными слабыми сторонами?</p>		

Annex II: Criteria for Evaluating Common Ground Reports

Планирование по принципам КомманГраунд(Common Ground)	
Планирование	Критерий для утверждения
Тема:	<p>Есть ли существенное?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Это проблема, которая требует решения для общества? ✓ Это проблема, которая является объектом противоречий и повышением поляризации? ✓ Является вопрос, скрытым или каким - то образом неизвестен? ✓ Это тема для слухов или разных интерпретаций и видений?
Идея программы? («Почему»)	Понятно ли какой принцип КомманГраунд мы нацелены использовать в данной программе?
Чему научиться наши зрители? Какую позицию мы хотим мотивировать среди наших зрителей?	<p>Какие факты будут уточняться в программе и статье?</p> <p>Какая информация будет передаваться, которую наши зрители еще не знают?</p> <p>Резонированы ли подходы согласно принципам CG?</p>
Угол зрения	Представляют ли вопросы ситуацию точно?
Важные вопросы	<p>Рассмотрены ли причины ситуации и не только последствия?</p> <p>Направлены ли вопросы к разрешению и возможным областям совместных действий?</p>

Annex III: Community Discussion Planning Template

COMMON GROUND COMMUNITY DISCUSSIONS – Planning template		
Location	Oblast/Region:	Specific Location:
Target date for discussion		
Theme		
Clarification of alignment of theme selection with CG approach	What dynamic of the Common Ground approach will we use? ✓ Clarify issues (facts, information) ✓ Strengthen relationships between different stakeholders ✓ Counter rumors/misinformation/manipulation ✓ Seek solutions (areas of common ground/agreements) ✓ Promote collaborative solutions (non violent) ✓ Uncover hidden information or misunderstood root causes behind this conflict ✓ Other....	
Media product	Do we have at least one media product addressing this subject? Which part will we show?	Name of media product: Format Duration:
Angle Essential Questions	What angle will we take on the theme? Are we exploring the causes and not only the consequences? Do the questions look forward towards solutions and possible areas of collaborative action?	Guiding questions (at least 3):
Participants/Resource people	Who needs to be in the room to ensure that the above objectives are achieved? Are there any testimonies/personal stories which need to be heard? Are there any local authorities which need to be present? Are we collaborating with any local associations in organizing this?	Key participants & profile:
Vision for the Community Discussion outcome	What facts will be clarified during the discussion? What attitudes will be encouraged? Where might there be Common Ground potential between the participants?	
Other planning notes	Any logistics to be aware of? Space rental, etc..	

Annex IV: List of people interviewed during the midterm evaluation

IkbolIsakov, SFCG Communications and M&E Officer
BektourIskender, Founder, Kloop Media (partner of Youth of Osh Media School)
Nona Lambert, SFCG Project Manager
AizhanToktosheva, YoO Director
AkmaralSatinbaeva, YoO Project Assistant

30/03/2013 meeting in Ala - Buka:

KamchybekKambarbekov - director of AyilAkiykati

01/04/2013 - Meetings in JA:

AltynbekJumaev - Channel 7 Director
RuslanKalmatov and Eliza Akjoltoeva - 7 channel journalists (there was one more female journalists_
BaysalbekKadyraliev, MunaraJaparova and IlyazTurdubayuulu - JTR journalists
KutmiddinBizrukov - Director of JTR

Meetings in Osh

Suita Sourbaeva - Director of Osh TV
TolkunErmekbaev - Director of Bashat TV
TurgunAbdumomunov - Director of Osh Shamy
KaarmanbekKuluev - Deputy Director of YntymakTV&Radio

Meeting with journalists in Osh

ShirinMuktarbekova - Osh TV
ShirmonoyBaynazarova - Osh shamy
NazgulAbdyrazakova - Osh shamy
IdrisIsakov - Yntymak
UmidaMirzabayeva - Yntymak
Samara Parpieva - Bashat TV

The two Facilitators

Rasul
Asel

Three Media experts

ElimaJaparo
DaniyarSadiev
SanzharEraliev

Journalists

ShirinMuktarbekova
SaltanatIsakova
NazgulAbdyrazakova
AdylKajoluulu
SayragulOrozbekkyzy
KanishayErkinbekova
Samara Parpieva
NazgulAhunova
SanavarSadirova
TolgonayTemiralieva
ZiynatTurdubekova
AzamatAbdiev
AskarMamatisakov
RamizKaimov
MirgulEshbaeva
RuslanKalamatov
MunaraJaparo
IlyazTurdubaiuulu
BaysalKadiraliyev
UmidaMirzabaeva
GulkairMoldubaeva
AkylbekOrozmatov
DavronbekNasiphanov

AsanbekKarakozuev
YdyrysIsakov
ShirmanayBainazarova
ErkinnazarBoinazarov
NazgulMuratova
KanatbekAbdylkasymuulu
Eliza Akjoltoeva
30 Participants of the community discussions in AlaBuka

Annex IV: Interview Checklists

FGDs and KIs checklist for journalists

- How do you assess the conflict dynamics of South Kyrgyzstan? Does it affect men and women separately?
- What are the major challenges faced by people in the region?
- What are the visible conflict and what is the invisible conflict in the region?
- Is the conflict scenario shifting in the region? If yes, how?
- What did you learn from the Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis Training?
- Was it helpful for you as a media professional?
- Is it similar types of training as compared to other media training or different? If different what was the difference?
- What are the new things that you learned from the training? Any new terms and terminology?
- As a journalist, what are the things you focus on while producing *KabarOrdo* media products?
- Have you observed any changes in your media products after you participated in the training?
- Are there any positive changes brought by the *Kabar Ordo* media products or community discussions?
- What do you want to learn more from SFCG?
- What is your impression about the refresher work of journalists? Is it helpful? If yes, how?
- How often do you participate in the coaching provided by the Media consultants?
- What is your impression about the coaching? Is it helpful for you? What do you want to improve in coaching?
- How cooperative are your directors while you work for *KabarOrdo* products?
- How is your impression about the community discussion you participate in as journalists?
- How do people react/respond to the media products?
- Do you have any feedback for SFCG and Youth of Osh?

KII/FGDs Checklist for Media Directors

- How do you assess the conflict dynamics of South Kyrgyzstan? Does it affect men and women separately?
- What are the major challenges faced by people in the region?
- What are the visible conflict and what are the invisible conflict in the region?
- How do you perceive the interethnic conflict three years after the June 2010 violence?
- Is the conflict scenario shifting in the region? If yes, how?
- What are the differences of conflict dynamics in 2010 and now?
- What are the challenges of media outlets in the region?
- How relevant is the Kabar Ordo Project in the current context of South Kyrgyzstan.
- How do you see the progress of your journalists after they participate in the training?
- Do you see any benefit of coaching in the journalists working in Kabar Ordo Projects?
- What are the benefits you are getting from SFCG as part of the project?
- How do you evaluate the support?
- Are the media products bringing any positive changes in the community?
- How do you evaluate the partnership with SFCG? Is there any room for improvement? Do you want to continue working with SFCG in the future?
- Do you have any suggestions to SFCG?

KII checklists for Media Consultants

- How do you analyze the social and political dynamics of South Kyrgyzstan? How is the gendered aspect of conflict in the region?
- What types of challenges are there in the society? How are the interethnic relations three years after June 2010 violence?
- What types of activities are needed to address those challenges or address the conflict?
- Has there been any effort in promoting the reconciliation between two different communities?
- Do you think the activities organized under *KabarOrdo* are relevant to the conflict context in Kyrgyzstan?
- How often do you conduct coaching?
- What are the things they focus on coaching? To what extent do you help them? Do you develop product them, if they could not do themselves?
- Do you follow any specific coaching framework?
- What types of additional support do you provide them?
- What are the things you have felt proud of while being part of the project?

- What is the role of radio /TV/newspapers in resolving or fuelling the conflict?
- How do they evaluate the work of media persons?
- How effective are those media programs in changing the perception of people in the society?
- Which media sector is the most closer to people in South Kyrgyzstan?
- What are the challenges you are facing while working with YoO and SFCG?
- What are the challenges you are facing while working with the media outlets or journalists?
- How do you evaluate the support of the Directors of the media outlets?
- What can be done more? Do you have any suggestions for SFCG?

KII Checklists for Community Discussion Facilitators

- How do you analyze the social and political dynamics of South Kyrgyzstan? How is the gendered aspect of conflict in the region?
- What types of challenges are there in the society? How are the interethnic relations three years after June 2010 violence?
- What types of activities are needed to address those challenges or address the conflict?
- Has there been any effort in promoting the reconciliation between two different communities?
- Do you think the activities organized under *KabarOrdo* are relevant to the conflict context in Kyrgyzstan?
- How was the training provided by Shawn Dunning on Dialogue facilitation? What are the things you learned from the training?
- Do you remember any specific tools, terms or terminology from the training.
- How many CD you organize every month? How do you choose the topic and how do you plan the meeting?
- How do you frame the discussion? Do you follow any specific framework under which you frame the discussions?
- What do you think you are doing good and what aspect you are still learning? What do you want to learn more?
- What are the major challenges you faced while organizing the community discussions?
- Are there any stories of success that you like to attribute to community discussions?
- How do you coordinate with YoO staff and journalists in organizing the event?
- How do community people react/respond to your call for discussion?
- Have you seen any meeting fatigue among them community people?
- How do the government authorities and political leaders respond to your call for meeting?
- Do you have any suggestions for SFCG and YoO? What can be improved?

KII Checklists for Project staff

- How do you analyze the social and political dynamics of South Kyrgyzstan? How is the gendered aspect of conflict in the region?
- What types of challenges are there in the society? How are the interethnic relations three years after June 2010 violence?
- What types of activities are needed to address those challenges or address the conflict?

- Has there been any effort in promoting the reconciliation between two different communities?
- Do you think the activities organized under *KabarOrdo* are relevant to the conflict context in Kyrgyzstan?
- How effective are those project activities in bringing desired change in South Kyrgyzstan?
- What has been the contribution of the project so far? What are the things that you feel proud of as a project staff?
- What added value this project is bringing in the region?
- What are the things that we are doing, which others have not done so far?
- How do you evaluate the training organized as part of this project? What you would like to change out of the training if you have to do the training again?
- How do you see the work of journalists? Are they making progress? Are there any mechanism that helps you measure the success of the journalists and see if they are following the CG principles?
- How do you evaluate the partnership with the media outlets? How do you see your relationship with the media directors?
- Have you done any specific work to build ownership of the project among media directors?
- What are the technical and financial support you have offered to the media outlets?
- How do you see the partnership between SFCG and YoO? How cooperative it is? What are the things that are not working? What do you want to change out of this partnership in the future?
- How satisfied with the overall progress of the project?
- What are your plans to complete the deliverables within the timeframe of the project without unnecessary rush?

Annex V: Mid-Term Terms of Reference (TOR)

“KabarOrdo: Our Time for Dialogue” **TERMS OF REFERENCE for Mid-Term Project Review**

Project Title: *KabarOrdo: Our Time for Dialogue* (formerly Engaging Young Reporters and Community Leaders in Early Warning and Conflict Prevention in Kyrgyzstan’s South)

Donor: USAID

Scope of Project: South of Kyrgyzstan (Osh and Jalal-Abad Provinces)

Project Duration: February 2012 – January 2014

Lead and Technical Partner: Search for Common Ground Kyrgyzstan

Implementing Partners:

- Youth of Osh
- 7 local media outlets and one national TV station

I. Project Background:

Kyrgyzstan is still recovering from inter-ethnic fighting that took place in Osh and Jalal-Abad during the 2010 “June Events,” which led to over 400 deaths and significant destruction of property. In the aftermath of violence, there was widespread consensus that the media played a negative role by inciting hatred and failing to provide objective, accurate information that could have mitigated the strength of dangerous rumors. In this context SFCCG|Kyrgyzstan implemented the *KabarOrdo* project in Southern Kyrgyzstan, which seeks to address three specific conflict-related problems:

1. Poor quality of reporting: Journalists, particularly young, do not have adequate training to cover difficult issues in a conflict-sensitive way.
2. Lack of quality information in the public sphere: Poor reporting and a lack of serious, relevant coverage of conflict issues has reduced public trust in the media and allowed rumours to proliferate.
3. The need for collaborative problem solving: Kyrgyzstan faces many serious problems that could be underlying causes of future violent conflict. A different kind of dialogue is needed in the media and society regarding these problems, focusing first and foremost on finding constructive ways to deal with them.

The underlying hypotheses and the theory of change of the project are:

- Accurate, impartial and responsible information reflecting the concerns of ethnic-Kyrgyz and ethnic-Uzbeks will combat stereotypes and prejudices as they focus attention on the underlying causes of conflict and opportunities for solutions.
- Dialogue between youth of diverse communities with local leaders and decision makers, including media practitioners, will open the door for collaborative problem solving and enhanced relationships.

II. Objectives:

The **overall goal** of the project is to prevent the re-emergence of violent conflict in Kyrgyzstan's South through more comprehensive and accessible conflict-sensitive reporting and early warning analysis. More specifically, the **project's objectives** are to:

- 1) Support the dissemination of conflict-sensitive information and analysis of local conflict trends.
- 2) Increase public awareness and understanding of collaborative approaches to inter-ethnic conflict dynamics.

The **expected outcomes** of this project are:

- 1.1. Young journalists increase their capacity to produce conflict-sensitive reporting and early warning analyses;
- 1.2. Participating media outlets publish/air conflict-sensitive media outputs;
- 1.3. Young journalists engage with local community leaders in the production of analyses on local conflict trends;
- 2.1. Policy-makers have increased access to conflict-sensitive news coverage and early warning analysis;
- 2.2. Channels for constructive dialogue on local conflict trends are established between policy-makers and civil society actors;
- 2.3. Citizens from local communities in the Osh and Jalal-Abad oblasts have increased understanding of local conflict dynamics.

III. Activities:

SFCG Kyrgyzstan is currently implementing this project with the following complementary and overlapping activity streams over a period of 24 months:

1. Common Ground Journalism: In-residence training and coaching at 8 regional and national media outlets. Production of 450 media products that are broadcast/published by partner media outlets.
2. Dialogue: Facilitate 72 community discussions, each including a presentation of a media product by a young journalist. Community Discussions are attended by relevant parties to conflict and community leaders.
3. Policy: Conduct 6 round tables with higher level leaders to collaboratively address conflict issues, produce 6 written analyses on these topics and produce and broadcast 6 talk-shows on national television.

The targeted **outputs** of this action include:

- 8 Trainings in Common Ground Reporting and Conflict Analysis for 50 young journalists and 4 Youth of Osh staff;
- Partnership Discussions with the editors of key departments within 7 media outlets;
- Ongoing coaching for 50 young journalists during 18 months;
- One SFCG Training Manual on Common Ground Reporting adapted to Kyrgyzstan's context, translated into Kyrgyz and Uzbek and published (500 copies);
- One Training for 4 Youth of Osh staff in Debate Facilitation;
- Production and dissemination of 450 conflict-sensitive 'Common Ground' Reports;
- Production and dissemination of 6 Quarterly Analyses on Local Conflict Trends;
- Update Youth of Osh website for the dissemination of CG reports and conflict analyzes;
- 72 Information & Debate sessions in local communities across Osh and Jalal-Abad oblasts;
- 6 TV and 6 Radio Debates around the conflict analyzes;
- 6 Conflict Analysis Workshops in Osh, Jalal-Abad and Bishkek.

IV. Geographic Coverage:

The geographic reach of the Project is 2 provinces in southern Kyrgyzstan that experienced conflict in June 2010 – Osh and Jalal-Abad. Within these provinces, there are 8 target regions, including two cities and six districts:

Provinces/ Regions	Province	District
1	Osh	Osh City
		Aravan District
		Kara-Kulja District
		Kara-Suu District
		Nookat District
2	Jalal-Abad	Jalal-Abad City
		Aksy District
		Ala-Buka District

V. Target Groups:

The Project aims to reach the following target groups:

Primary target groups:

- 50 media professionals from radio, television and print media
- 1,200 members of local communities, including local leaders

Secondary beneficiaries:

- Communities across southern Kyrgyzstan who will benefit from increased access to reliable information about issues that affect their communities and from a non-adversarial approach to dialogue.

VI. Timeline:

The project was initiated in January 2012, and implementation began in late March 2012. It is projected to last through January 2014 with the possibility of extending 1-2 months at the end.

VII. Purpose of Mid-Term Project Review:

This is the first project SFCG has implemented in Kyrgyzstan. The Mid-term will measure progress toward targets set in the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (PMEP) submitted to USAID in February 2012. The Mid-term will also be used to: gauge how well the project is responding to community needs through an assessment of relevance; examine the project's effectiveness measured by how well it is achieving outcomes and outputs; assess the implementation process and use of the Common Ground approach; and finally, assess overall management, including management of relationships with media partners. Overall, some of the key questions that should be addressed by the Mid-term review are as follows:

1. Relevance/Appropriateness:

- Are the project's stated goals and objectives relevant to the issues central to the conflict in Kyrgyzstan one year into the project?
- Do the activities and strategies fit project objectives?
- Is the project adding value that other actors in peacebuilding and the media were not previously providing?
- Is the project covering the right conflict themes and convening dialogues that would not otherwise happen?
- How relevant is the project strategies and activities as perceived by the beneficiaries and other community stakeholders?

2. Effectiveness:

- Has the project achieved its milestones set for the period in a timely manner?
- Are there any signals of increased capacities and skills of skills of project beneficiaries such as media professionals, in particular?
- Has there been any significant change in attitude or behavior of media professionals, local leaders or other stakeholders as a result of the project activities?

3. Implementation Process

- Do all project team members share a vision for what the Common Ground Approach is/should be in Kyrgyzstan?
- Do all project activities model the Common Ground Approach?
- Are all necessary tools in place to ensure methodology for conflict transformation is sound?
- Is there effective monitoring of the project implementation? What are the mechanisms of the reflection and learning process?
- What are the major factors that are contributing towards the achieving or non-achieving of the stated objectives?

4. Coordination:

- How smooth is the coordination, communication and synergy between SFCG Kyrgyzstan and implementing partners?
- Are there any room for improvements?

VIII. Methodology:

The methodology of the review will be designed by the Consultant, and submitted to SFCG Kyrgyzstan for approval. The following tools are recommended. However, this list is not exhaustive, and is open to additions:

- Desk Review of Relevant documents (proposals, periodic reports, baseline report)
- Qualitative and Quantitative Survey Tools
- FGDs and KIIs with Beneficiaries, Partners, SFCG staff
- Case Studies/Success Stories

IX. Deliverables and deadlines:

- Mid-Term Review Inception Report– 19 March
- Mid-Term Review Action Plan(*detailed activities, visits and meetings*)-20 March

- First Draft of Preliminary findings of Mid-Term Review: 4 April 2013
- First Draft of Mid-Term Review Report – 19 April 2013
- Review and comments on the First draft: 24 April 2013
- Final Mid-Term Review Report (*for the reporting format: see Annex I-* 30 April
- All data collected, forms, recording and other tools used- 30 April 2013

X. Duration:

The duration will include 2 weeks in-country, during which time data will be collected and preliminary results will be presented to the project team for a day-long workshop. In-country travel will be approximately from March 23 to April 5, 2013.

XII. Logistic Support:

SFCG|Kyrgyzstan will provide logistical support to the Consultant. SFCG|Kyrgyzstan Review Manager will assist the Consultant in logistics, travel, translation, communications and scheduling of meetings and appointments. The Monitoring & Evaluation Officer will also provide the Consultant with all documentation, literature and background materials as required.

XIV. Total Budget of Activity:

\$10,000 for Mid-Term Review plus additional monitoring activities,.

Annex I: Report Format

Title Page: Title, Address of SFCG Country Office, Name of Primary Contact, Name of Internal Evaluator, Time-frame of evaluation, Date of Report, Name of Organization commissioning evaluation (donor), SFCG Logo

Table of Contents : Main headings and page numbers

Executive Summary (2 pages) : A description of the project that was evaluated

- A description of the purpose of the evaluation and the evaluation objectives
- Main audiences and users of the review findings
- A short description of evaluation methods
- Short summary of key findings, conclusions and recommendations

Introduction (1 page): Explanation of the context in which this evaluation was conducted.

- A description of why the evaluation was conducted (purpose) and why is it being evaluated at this particular point
- A description of who the primary audience and users of the evaluation

Project Overview: (2-3 pages) This section of the report is to provide enough information to the user or reader about the project in order for them to understand the evaluation results. It must include Project Goal, Objectives, Phases, significant challenges or alterations to the project (plans, strategies, logical frameworks), scale of intervention, key partners, total resources, context (socio-economic, political, institutional), and implementation constraints (i.e. resource limitations).

Evaluation Methodology (2 pages): Evaluation Scope: name of geographical areas, data gathering time period

- Data Sources: Type of data collected (Documents, surveys, FGDs, KIIs)
- Evaluation Team and corresponding responsibilities
- Ethical considerations
- Limitations to methodology

Key Findings (10 pages max): In this section the evaluation questions must be answered using evidence and data. This section should be structured in a way that the reader can easily make connections between the purpose of the evaluation and the data gathered.

- Include if there is any variances between planned and actual results
- Assumptions or risks in the project or programme should also be stated

Conclusions: Summarize any overarching lessons learned, for instance what new knowledge was gained from this particular intervention that can be applicable in similar contexts

- Highlight strengths and weakness of the intervention
- Conclusions should be based on evidence and address evaluation questions

Recommendations:

- Practical, feasible recommendations for the intended users (program staff, country director, SFCG, or donors) should be included.
- Proposed additional monitoring activities jointly developed with Monitoring & Evaluation Officer and including a budget.
- Recommendations should be supported by evidence gathered and linked to conclusions related to key evaluation objectives
- Recommendations should be action oriented

Appendix/Annexes

- Short biography of internal evaluator
- Copy of methodology (Survey questions, FGD and KII checklists)
- If appropriate: a list of individuals interviewed, supporting documents reviewed, summary tables displaying progress on key indicators, outputs, outcomes

Annex VI: Survey Questionnaires Administered to the Journalists

Search for Common Ground|Kyrgyzstan Common Ground Journalism and Conflict Analysis Training

Participants' Reflection Survey, 2013

1. Name	
2 Media Outlet/School	
3. Oblast	
4. City/region	
5. Sex	<input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Other
6. Age (yrs completed)	<input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 <input type="checkbox"/> 20-24 <input type="checkbox"/> 25-29 <input type="checkbox"/> 30-34 <input type="checkbox"/> 35 and above
7. Education back ground	<input type="checkbox"/> High school (Grade 11) <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Licence <input type="checkbox"/> University continuing <input type="checkbox"/> University Degree
8. Affiliation with Media (Print/Radio/TV)	a. How long you are working with current media outlets? <input type="checkbox"/> Less than a year <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 years <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 years <input type="checkbox"/> More than 5 years
	b. Until Now, how many media outlets you have worked for? <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 or more
	c. How many training related to conflict resolution / peacebuilding you have undergone before CGRCA Training? <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> One <input type="checkbox"/> 2-4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or More
9. Relevance of the training	How relevant was the training for your professional work? <input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant <input type="checkbox"/> Some what relevant <input type="checkbox"/> Not relevant at all <input type="checkbox"/> can not say
10. Skills of the trainers	How do you rate the skills of trainers? <input type="checkbox"/> Very effective <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinary <input type="checkbox"/> Not effective

	<input type="checkbox"/> Can not judge/do not want to judge
11. Follow up coaching	a. Have you participated in follow-up coaching activity? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	b. How do you rate the coaching session? <input type="checkbox"/> Very useful <input type="checkbox"/> useful <input type="checkbox"/> Can't say <input type="checkbox"/> Little useful <input type="checkbox"/> Not useful at all
	c. What additional issues you want the coaching to address?
12. Usefulness of the resource materials/booklet	How useful are the resource materials or booklet given to you during the training? <input type="checkbox"/> Very useful <input type="checkbox"/> useful <input type="checkbox"/> Little useful <input type="checkbox"/> Not useful at all <input type="checkbox"/> Have not read them as yet
13. Experience of the CSJCA Training	<p>a) What are the three most important things you learnt from the training/coaching that you did not know earlier?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>b) What are the things that you want to learn more about from CGRCA Training/coaching?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>
14. Application of the CSJCA Training	a) What type of work/media product you were engaged with before taking part in the training/coaching ?

	<input type="checkbox"/> Station Manager/Administrator/Director <input type="checkbox"/> Editor <input type="checkbox"/> Radio/TV Magazine Producer <input type="checkbox"/> Radio/TV Talk-show Producer <input type="checkbox"/> Host of Discussion/Conversation/Interview <input type="checkbox"/> News Anchor <input type="checkbox"/> News desk editor <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondent <input type="checkbox"/> Entertainment Program Host <input type="checkbox"/> Camera Person <input type="checkbox"/> Writing colum/article <input type="checkbox"/> Others.....
	<p>b) What additional or new type of work/media product you are engaged in now?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Station Manager/Administrator/Director <input type="checkbox"/> Editor <input type="checkbox"/> Radio/TV Magazine Producer <input type="checkbox"/> Radio/TV Talk-show Producer <input type="checkbox"/> Host of Discussion/Conversation/Interview <input type="checkbox"/> News Anchor <input type="checkbox"/> News desk editor <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondent <input type="checkbox"/> Entertainment Program Host <input type="checkbox"/> Camera Person <input type="checkbox"/> Writing colum/article <input type="checkbox"/> Others.....
	<p>c) What specific things did you do because of your participation in the training/coaching ?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Nothing specific until now <input type="checkbox"/> Shared the knowledge and skills with other colleagues <input type="checkbox"/> Applied the knowledge/skills in already existing programs <input type="checkbox"/> Started a new product <input type="checkbox"/> Other.....
	<p>d. If, Yes, Can you provide a concrete example (such as what program or which publication?)</p> <p>.....</p>
	<p>e) What are the knowledge and skills you remeber that you applied in producing/writing the media peoduct?</p> <input type="checkbox"/>

	<p>f) What are the changes you made in your audio visual programs or print products after participating in the CGRCA training/coaching?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <hr/> <p>g) What are the issues that you addressed through your product after the Training? (list all program issues that you can remember)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>16. Role of media professionals in peacebuilding</p>	<p>a. What are the three important skills that one needs to be a successful media professional from peacebuilding perspective ?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>17. Your say</p>	<p>a. If you have any suggestions, please feel free to write.</p>

Thank you so much for your time!