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1. Executive Summary

The cross-border project in Tajikistan (TJK) and Kyrgyzstan (KGZ) is supported by the German Federal Ministry for Development Cooperation (BMZ) since September 2013. The overall objective of the social structure funding project is the contribution to building capacities and increasing resilience of the Red Crescent structures and target communities at local, national and regional level in selected countries of Central Asia. The specific objective aims at strengthening the preparedness for response capacities of the disaster-prone communities as well as the National Red Crescent Societies in both countries. Furthermore, the project also aims at improving the cross-border cooperation between the respective civil protection agencies in both countries.

In the second phase of the project strengthening of the Primary Organizations’ (PO) structure of the two Red Crescent Societies through income generating activities is among the key priorities. The conducted activities to strengthen the DM capacities (first aid trainings, awareness raising activities, simulations, etc.) will also be supported through the income generating activities in the primary organisation. The second phase will end in December 2019.

Key questions of the evaluation

The conducted evaluation took place in the middle of the project implementation period and its aim was to assess the implementation and the achievements against the relevant objectives. Beside the evaluation of the progress so far, a focus was also given on recommendation on whether and how to proceed to the next phase and ensure all strategic goals of the intervention are met, strengthen the project and on how to be able to support the sustainability of the POs after the project finished. Therefore, the evaluation focuses also on the planning’s for a potential third phase. The priority for the report at hand was the community-based activities. The evaluation is based on the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coherence, coverage and coordination of the project.

Key findings

The project focuses on strengthening the DRM capacities of local communities in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan through awareness raising activities, simulations exercises at community and school level, small scale-mitigations measures and it aims at strengthening the sustainability of the established RCST and RCSK POs through income-generating activities. The implementation of the project is effective and efficient without any delays in the implementation. The constructed buildings hosting the branches and/or the POs have a major impact on the recognition of the RCST and RCSK by the community members as well as by the local authorities.
In general, the recognition of both National Societies by their governments has improved significantly and the coordination and cooperation with the governmental authorities on all levels is excellent. Through the establishment of the LDMCs (Local Disaster Management Committees), which have been then transformed into and are now functioning as the Red Crescent Primary Organizations (POs), the National Societies in both countries have proven that the Red Crescent Societies are important partners for their governments at the community level. As first responders the POs are now well trained and equipped to respond to disasters until the government emergency actors arrive (fire brigade, ambulances, emergency rescue teams, etc.).

The cross-border simulation in 2016 went very well and the national government authorities in both KGZ and TJK are very keen in repeating the simulation again in 2019. The simulation furthermore also supported the peace building efforts in the region. As it has been expressed by one interviewee, the simulation in 2016 was the reason for the idea of an emergency preparedness workshop in 2019 between all Central Asian countries, hosted by UNISDR.

**Conclusion & Major recommendations**

The community-based activities have a major impact on the improvement of the behaviour and disaster response of the community members and the targeted schoolchildren and the teachers. It is therefore highly recommended to continue the activities in the communities including the establishment of small-scale mitigation measures.

The importance of buildings for the RC district branches has been stressed out by various actors, including government authorities. Apparently, this is an aspect that should not be underestimated in terms of reputation and perception of the respective RCST/ RCSK lower level structures in the view of the community members and the government authorities. If planning these building it would be of great importance to already think about incorporating the income-generating activities as well as a small warehouses to have a certain amount of relief items already in the communities in case a disaster strikes.

The identification and implementation of the income-generating activities will be one of the backbone for the future of the POs and therefore for the sustainability of the whole project. To be able to support the POs after the start of the activities it will be important to give them guidance by an expert on how to strengthen the customer basis as well as adapting it to the developments throughout a potential third phase.

This mid-term evaluation has revealed that the project phase II is on the right track and the team is implementing project components correctly. The extension of the project area towards Uzbekistan is the logical step to further strengthen the cross-border response capacities of all three countries as the target areas in all the three
are located in the same geographical area – the Ferghana valley. As the community-based activities will now also be implemented in Uzbekistan, a third phase is necessary to be able to use the best-practices from the RCST and RCSK to also strengthen the response capacities in the communities in Uzbekistan as well, to give them opportunity continue what was started in phase II and reach the same level of outcomes. It is recommended to also already include Uzbekistan in the planned cross-border simulation together with TJK and KGZ. The success and influence of the 2016 simulation is outstanding. The inclusion of Uzbekistan will not just support the response mechanisms in Uzbekistan and the cross-border cooperation among the three countries, it will rather more also further strengthen the peace building process in the whole region.
2. Introduction
This mid-term evaluation report about the German Red Cross (GRC) cross-border disaster risk reduction project in TJK and KGZ was developed based on the results of evaluation mission conducted in the period of September 18th – 22nd 2018.

The report presents the results of the mid-term evaluation and also expresses the major conclusions and recommendations for improvements and for a potential third phase of the BMZ social structure funding project.

3. Project description and context

3.1 Project overview
The cross border DRR project initiated in 2013 follows the overall objective, which is the contribution to strengthen the resilience of the most vulnerable cross-border communities in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. It is supported through the specific objective through which the target communities and the National Red Crescent Societies of TJK and KGZ are more resilient and their capacities are strengthened to effectively prepare for, withstand, respond and recover from stresses and shocks.

In order to achieve the specific objective, the following three results have been set:
1. Target communities have capable and improved RC structures able to facilitate population groups for sustainable community development [through various socio-economic, resource mobilisation, income generation, DRR and WASH measures] aimed to reduce disaster risks and strengthen community resilience.
2. National Red Crescent Societies of KGZ / TJK have improved institutional capacities at all structural levels, better capable of socio-economic development activities and have stronger resilience for recurrent crises.
3. Regional and cross-border cooperation and coordination mechanisms between KGZ and TJK state emergency bodies and national RC societies maintained effective and ready for joint cross-border disaster response.

The project follows the Social Structure approach targeting three levels to achieve the objectives that have been set:
1. Micro-level – Strengthening the resilience of the targeted communities.
2. Meso-level – Strengthening the institutional capacities of the National Red Cross Societies in both countries at local and national level
3. Macro-level – Improving the coordination and cooperation of the disaster response authorities at the cross-border and regional level and strengthening the institutional capacity of the DM authorities